

**ORAL**

**NO. 1 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state whether the joint venture company between the existing bus operators and the Government have now been set up, and if so, what is the equity shareholding of each party?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos 2 and 3 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state whether they have now entered into an agreement with the two existing bus operators for the provision of a new bus service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos 1 and 3 of 2004.

**NO. 3 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state what is the total cost of the purchase of the 18 new transbuses?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

These negotiations are commercially sensitive and it is not appropriate to comment until they have concluded. Government expect to make an announcement shortly about when the new bus service will be operated.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 1 TO 3 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In press release No 241 the Government said that the service would be introduced in the early new year, can Government confirm that that would be 2004?

**HON F VINET:**

The 1<sup>st</sup> of April is the target date.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I notice that the answer has been framed around the commercially sensitive nature of the negotiations surrounding the joint venture and I think that is a perfectly correct answer but I think that there is an oversight in so far as concerns to Question no 3 of 2004 which does not relate to the negotiations but rather to the cost of the buses which is a bit of information that the Government can give and it is not involved in

the negotiations so it is not sensitive. The cost of the 18 buses has been £1.875 million.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Chief Minister then state what is the variance with the budget for the purchase, how much was budgeted and what was the variance?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The cost of these buses depends so much on what equipment, whether they have air conditioning, whether they are tilting or not tilting or whether they have a ticket machine in it or not. Basically it was in that order of £2 million the original budget. I think that they have come in at a smidgen over £100,000 each which is what we were originally advised before we embarked on the procurement, that it would be something of that order per vehicle.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

At the moment the buses are owned by the Government and then they have to be transferred to the joint venture or are they currently jointly owned?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The position is that these negotiations and the hon Member will remember from the last House of Assembly that the negotiations had two facets, one was the negotiation with one of the existing operators which was the negotiation in the form of a buy-out because they were not going to carry on in the new system and the other negotiation was with one of the other existing operators who was in a sense to become a partner of the Government in going forward. Those are the two negotiations that have taken place. They have been going on as the hon Members know for quite some time. They are about to be struck but we did not wish to mortgage progress on the ground to the successful outcome of those negotiations as the buses had to be purchased. Anyway the Government made it clear that we would continue with the purchasing of those buses because if an agreement had not been reached by a certain date we would have proceeded differently so the position as we speak today given that there has not yet been a formal signed agreement although I am confident that we are well on the road to one, is that the buses have been purchased using public monies, I cannot tell the hon Member whether it is Consolidated Fund monies or company monies but as far as I am concerned public money is both of them and that will then be dealt with in the context of the new arrangement when it materialises. Neither the company or the joint venture vehicle if it turns out to be a joint venture vehicle nor any other party has yet put forward any money towards the cost of those buses.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Government have issued a statement last week in relation to the size of the buses and the time it will take to make them operational. There is some difficulty with the traffic regulations are Government in a position to say when they expect the buses to be fully operational?

**HON F VINET:**

The new venture will come into operation on the 1<sup>st</sup> April.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We have to amend the regulations not the Ordinance itself, the regulations made under the Ordinance which still curtail the size of buses to what they were a long time ago in relation to some areas of town and therefore it is just a question of changing those regulations.

**NO. 4 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SCADA CONTROLLER LINK PROJECT**

Can Government state the date the Scada controller was brought into operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The SCADA controller was brought into operation on the 19<sup>th</sup> December 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 4 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister confirm that that was six months after the deadline given at the last meeting?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member can do his own mathematical calculations.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Thank you I am just trying to point out that this is yet another slippage in the deadline set by Government.

**NO. 5 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ORANGE BASTION**

Can Government say when the Orange Bastion project will be put out to tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No. Government will make an announcement when they have decided to proceed with this project.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 5 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the case that the projects might actually not be put out to tender?

**HON F VINET:**

No.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister in a position to say when they expect to have taken that decision?

**HON F VINET:**

No.

ORAL

**NO. 6 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**WASTEWATER SEA-OUTFALL STUDY**

Has the final Phase 1 report of the Wastewater Treatment Works Sea Outfall Study now been submitted to the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Yes.



**NO. 7 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**RUBBLE TIP**

Can Government say who was consulted over its decision to create a rubble tip next to the Caleta Hotel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No 25 of 2004.

**NO. 8 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**REFUSE DISPOSAL**

Can Government now provide the details of the new business venture for recycling some elements in refuse disposal referred to in answers to supplementary questions to Question No 132 of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No 9 of 2004.

**NO. 9 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**REFUSE DISPOSAL**

Can Government state whether the new business venture to recycle elements in Gibraltar's refuse disposal referred to in answers to supplementary questions to Question No 132 of 2003 I think is now operational and if not when it is due to start?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

A licence was issued to Steelmac Limited on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2003, for the recycling of some elements of Gibraltar's refuse, namely cans, bottles and plastics. The company is still to submit further details as part of their submission for planning permission. On the issue of a Planning Permit, operations can commence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 9 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister tell us whether any conditions have been attached to that licence, what type of licence is it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think we would need notice of that question. There is an agreement but we do not carry it around in our minds it is not a particularly complex agreement I think it just entitles them at their own cost, these are bits I remember from memory, to extract this and also they are allowed to put up bins and things separation of collection bins upon which I think they are allowed to have advertisements and the Government have to consent to the location of these bins but otherwise that is how they will collect the stuff as they do in other EU countries. Green for glass, blue for plastics or

whatever. I do not think that there is any cost to the Government I think this is just a concession on the basis that they can do it at their cost and then keep the economic value and benefit of the stuff that they collect which apparently has some economic value in disposal and that is the nature of the arrangement but this is what I can remember. I think that everything that I have said to him is true but it may not be the whole story I think he might have to give me notice of the question if he wants it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Chief Minister saying that the licence is a licence to place bins in certain places in relation to the land where the bins will be placed rather than any other type of administrative consent or permission?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it is both. There are real estate elements to it, for example, I think that the company in question got EU funds or Gibraltar Enterprise Scheme funds for the purchase of the bins. I cannot remember how but there was some element of public funding in the element of the bins and I think that that places some constraints on him as to how he can dispose of them or not as there are things to do with that and then there are what one would call the landlord and planning type issues, the location where these things can be deposited and then there is the licence which is also the a concession to actually collect public refuse which does not just raise issues of planning but as one knows public refuse is Government owned, I do not want to stray too much into this aspect of it but one of the things that was delaying this thing was that until we made different arrangements for the incineration of waste we had a contract with another company for them to access Gibraltar's waste. Plastics in particular is one of the highest calorific items in our refuse so there was a contractual difficulty in allowing somebody else to collect it under another arrangement because this was all part of the in-town contract to allow them exclusive access to Gibraltar's domestic waste.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will we therefore be seeing a recycling plant in place in Gibraltar to recycle all of this refuse or not?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I understand the refuse collecting will be exported?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

To such a plant.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not very clear reference to "*in-town calorific value*" is since we have not to my knowledge burnt refuse since 1996 and is it that the refuse that is collected prior to

transportation to Spain will be separated to remove these things if the individual person does not put them in different containers?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes since the settlement of the in-town contractual situation there is no longer a contractual impediment to that so they can either separate at the rubbish tip or, which is what they will be hoping, is separate at the separation bins.

**NO. 10 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Can the Minister for the Environment state by when an air quality monitoring station will be operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 10 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Government confirm that before the election the previous Minister for the Environment had confirmed publicly that an air quality monitoring station would become operational at some stage in the near future in order to ensure that Gibraltar complied with its EU obligations and that we had not yet provided such a monitoring station because of the costs involved?

**HON F VINET:**

The setting up of such an air quality monitoring station is indeed a manifesto commitment which we fully intend to adhere to. I hope is to have this up and running prior to the end of this year. We cannot give an absolute guarantee as to when.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Minister have any indication to provide to this House of where such an air quality monitoring station will be provided?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is a report which Government are presently considering which raises many issues amongst them issues precisely of that sort, different options, is it just one monitoring station or a series of little monitoring points all over. Those are precisely the issues which are presently under consideration.

ORAL

**NO. 11 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**OESCO – NOISE POLLUTION**

Can the Government state what action they intend to take to reduce noise pollution, in particular to reduce noise pollution emanating from the OESCO power station to levels below the recommended levels?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No 12 of 2004.



**NO. 12 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**OESCO – NOISE POLLUTION**

Can Government state what are the measures that have been agreed with OESCO to reduce noise levels emanating from the plant, when are they expected to be introduced and is Government satisfied that these measures will bring down noise levels to those required for compliance with the relevant EU directives and local legislation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government do not accept that relevant EU directives and local legislation relating to noise are not being complied with. With regards to noise reduction measures, these are a Government manifesto commitment and the Government will make an announcement as to when they propose to proceed and how, when they are ready to do so.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 11 AND 12 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister for the Environment as a result of that answer further confirm that there is in fact an Ombudsman's report that indicates that the noise levels being suffered by those who live near the OESCO plant are above recommended levels and also confirm to this House that the manifesto commitment on noise reduction has been contained in his party's 1996, 2000 and 2003 manifestos?

**HON F VINET:**

The position of Government remains that we are in keeping with EU Directives and local legislation relating to noise levels. With regards to the second comment all I

can say is that this Government have been elected with regards to the manifesto of 2003.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So, the Minister for the Environment entirely disregards the conclusions of the Ombudsman in relation to this issue.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Minister of the Environment does not do that but nor does the Minister of the Environment consider that the Ombudsman has the status of Privy Council. The fact that the Ombudsman has come to a conclusion certainly does not compel the Government to accept the judgements made except on matters of administration not on matters of law and certainly if the hon Member asks supplementaries to suggest that there would be something outrageous in the Government not accepting the judgement of the Ombudsman the hon Member should know that there are many instances in which the Government do not accept the judgement and findings of the Ombudsman.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would not the Minister for everything or the Chief Minister who is here to answer most questions it appears not agree with me that the fact that his Government disregards a hell of a lot, sorry, a very large number of Ombudsman's Reports is absolutely outrageous?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Chief Minister does not agree with you for two reasons. First of all the Government do not agree with *"a hell of a lot"* of the Ombudsman's ruling and secondly if the Government did disagree with a *"hell of a lot"* of the Ombudsman's rulings it would be because it was applying the same criteria to each of them and that is, the Ombudsman is not a court of law he does not adjudicate legal rights as between the Government or anybody else. The Ombudsman is there to adjudicate on matters of maladministration they are the vast majority, contrary to what the hon Member says, entirely contrary to what the hon Member says. The vast majority of the Ombudsman's commentaries in relation to administrative matters are taken on board at an administrative level by the relevant Government department and are acted upon. Many are not but many is not necessarily the majority indeed it is a very long way short of being the majority.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Chief Minister agree with me that the decision of the Ombudsman in this case in particular dealing with noise levels does relate to administrative failure, an administrative failure by the Environmental Agency to act in relation to those noise levels?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**NO. 13 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELECTRICITY GENERATORS**

Can Government state whether it will be seeking to ensure that all new electricity generators imported either for OESCO or Government are the best available technology?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No. There are issues of cost and value for money that have to be factored into the decision. As far as OESCO is concerned, the technology will be at least as good as the generators imported by that Company when the GSLP were in Government.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 13 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister for the Environment not kindly note that the integrated pollution and prevention control directive will require that as from now on not in relation to the previous GSLP Government or even previous GSD administrations new technology imported into any Member State of the European Union for the generation of the electricity or any other equipment which creates environmental impact has to be best available technology because (a) that would reduce pollution and (b) that will create better levels of efficiency?

**HON F VINET:**

We do not accept that as the correct analysis.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister for the Environment then provide what his alternative analysis is?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member has asked a question about a directive which the Government have not yet made any attempt to comply. If the Gibraltar Government are going to reinvest in future generating capacity which we need to get on doing, we will not necessarily be going for the most expensive latest technology. I suppose for that we would have to go to NASA or something but we will be going for the sort of technology that communities of our size are using in Western Europe for the generation of their electricity. It is just that the phrase "*best available technology*" means the technology that is available anywhere in the world regardless of its cost, regardless of its price, regardless of economies of scale, in other words the latest best technology available for the generation of electricity. That is what the Government are not committing itself to but if the hon Member is asking whether in terms of what is reasonably accessible to us in resources terms we will be using technology that on the whole is environmental friendly as opposed to environmental unfriendly just because it is cheaper then obviously the answer to the latter question is yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will Chief Minister and or the Minister of the Environment agree with me that the definition of "*best available technology*" does not mean the costliest most advanced technology but doing a balance between cost and efficiency which is the best available technology to be used making that balance and that in the regeneration in particular electricity generators we should be looking to ensure that we have technology which is up to date et cetera and that this should not even be a politically controversial issue in this House.

**HON F VINET:**

The hon Member seems to be in complete agreement with my previous answer. My answer has been there are issues of costs and value for money that have to be factored into the decision and not just the facts that the item in question might be the best technology or otherwise.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not obviously in agreement with the Minister's earlier answer because as I am sure that he will agree when he listens to Hansard he prefixed his answer to me by saying, "*No. We will balance .....*," when what I was asking was that we go for this best available technology in every case where possible.

**NO. 14 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**LICENSING DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state whether the Licensing Department is providing at present all of the services it should to the public, and if not can they give the reasons why?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Department of Transport is presently not providing all the services it should to the public. The Driving and Vehicle Examiners are currently in dispute with the Government and are currently not undertaking part of their duties.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 14 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister say or give a date by which time this dispute will be resolved?

**HON F VINET:**

No.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state what is the reason for the dispute?

**HON F VINET:**

Essentially the Driver and Vehicle Examiners are seeking a regrading of their job.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will this have an unfavourable impact on the introduction of the bus service? I say this because we may not have sufficient people with licences to drive those buses.

**HON F VINET:**

We do not envisage that to be the case.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister for the Environment quickly state since when the dispute that he has referred to started?

**HON F VINET:**

The 28<sup>th</sup> February 2003. That was the date when the T&G representing the Driver and Vehicle Examiners informed the department of this.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Do Government consider this to be selective industrial action?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In our view of facts yes, on their view of facts no, but because this is not a clear case of somebody saying I accept what my duties are but I will simply not do some of them it is not a clear cut case of selective industrial action. Part of the dispute which the Government do not and will not accept is that the things that they have stopped doing and which they have always done are not required by their job description so it is a disputed case of selective industrial action in the sense that the dispute relates to what the job description is.

**NO. 15 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**TRANSPORT – MOT TEST**

Can Government state when they intend to change the regularity of MOT tests to once every two years, as the Minister announced last June during the budget session?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Government expect to make an announcement shortly.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 15 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister state how shortly is “shortly”?

**HON F VINET:**

No.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister agree with me that he and I apart of being namesakes are also new in this House and that we should both hope that we are not going to conduct ourselves for the rest of the time that we are here with such level of obfuscation rather than accountability, transparency et cetera?



**HON F VINET:**

I certainly have no intention to do so.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that the announcement of the MOT changes was made last June what announcement is it that he is going to make?

**HON F VINET:**

The announcement will be the manner in which the new system will be operational.

**NO. 16 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state whether they still expect all the employees of the Electricity Department to join the Electricity Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The problem is that there has been a sort of breaking news since which I heard when I went back to the office after this morning's session. The position had been that although a majority of the workers in the generating station had voted last week in favour of joining the authorities that minority that did not included a majority of the mechanical shift workers so within the various sections a majority of mechanical shift workers had voted against but they were in a minority overall. I am told that that has now changed and that the mechanical shift workers have themselves now revisited their position. Until I get formal confirmation of that I would not wish to be categorical but certainly the answer that we have here in any event would no longer be accurate.

**NO. 17 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**CEMETERY**

Can Government state whether they have awarded the contract for a programme of on-going embellishment, upkeep and maintenance of the cemetery, and if so, to whom and on what terms?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 17 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can you at least say when you expect to award this contract?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Shortly before the election various tests had been carried out by the possible future tenderers and contractors were being evaluated. One of the plots had been subject to some vandalism and the contractor carrying out the tests was not satisfied with the results and the whole thing had been put on hold following the election when the whole situation would then be reassessed. Until Government are in a position to assess the plots and the tests that had been carried out and make a decision on what is the way ahead such contract cannot be effectively put into place.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister at least give an indication of when this will be done?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I would have thought from the nature of the reply it would have been obvious that the answer to that is no.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just add to that that it will be apparent to hon Members from some of the answers and some of the answerers that a lot of these issues have changed ministerial responsibilities, a lot of these issues go back quite a long time to the last House. There has been a change of ministers, Christmas period and therefore that is why questions are being answered sometimes by ministers that are not currently responsible for the matter however nor have all these issues that were going to be left until after the elections themselves been revisited to decide about how they were going to be pushed forward. We expect these decisions generally to be made within the next couple of months, whether this one will be in the first batch or not in the first batch but certainly all of these things that had been left pending the election and where there has been a change of minister I think the hon Member I would not wish him to have him hold me to the date commitment but I would be surprised if on issues such as this there had not been progress and in another one that falls into the same category is the one about the change of motor vehicle two year testing. I would be very surprised that both of those were not progressed and resolved in the next month or two. Two months at the outside.

**NO. 18 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PARKING TICKETS AND CLAMPING VEHICLES**

Can Government state how many parking tickets were issued and how many vehicles were clamped in the year 2003, giving a breakdown of locally registered vehicles and foreign registered vehicles for each category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the Schedule that I now hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 18 of 2004**

<b>Parking Tickets</b>			<b>Clamps</b>		
<b>Month</b>	<b>Local Reg</b>	<b>Foreign Reg</b>	<b>Month</b>	<b>Local Reg</b>	<b>Foreign Reg</b>
January	783	68	January	89	24
February	803	95	February	85	21
March	767	57	March	122	18
April	793	59	April	100	18
May	1156	145	May	73	23
June	1307	103	June	116	16
July	1033	97	July	107	14
August	1133	92	August	57	18
September	1053	72	September	105	9
October	1105	97	October	155	29
November	1011	89	November	74	12
December	626	63	December	47	11
Total	11570	1031	Total	1130	213

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 18 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can Government state how many of the 1,031 foreign registered vehicles that received parking tickets the drivers actually paid their fine?

**HON F VINET:**

I do not have that information with me at present.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Does the Minister undertake to provide this information in writing or whatever?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes.

**NO 19 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EUROPORT – PARKING FACILITIES**

Can Government state whether they propose to provide parking facilities in the area of Europort, other than for the hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government have no plans to do so.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 19 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Do Government not accept that parking is becoming very scarce in that area and would they reconsider their decision?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government believe that parking in that area is not as scarce as it is in most other areas in Gibraltar given that all the housing there, because of its recent construction, have underground parking facilities which is not to say that there is a shortage of parking but that the shortage of parking problem is not necessarily acute as it is for example, in areas where we have a manifesto commitment to provide more parking facilities, for example, the old town area and the south district where properties are older, there are no purpose built parking facilities so such resources as the Government are going to deploy in the next two or three years for the creation of parking facilities is going to be concentrated in the areas of Gibraltar such as the Upper Town and the south district where there is a very, very acute, as the hon Member knows as he lives or used to in that area of town, there can always be more parking the Government do have a policy of opening up as many areas as possible

for free parking. We have just done so with the Landport Ditch nor is there in that particular area of town it depends on how he defines the Europort area but there is not much publicly held land left in that area in which any such additional parking facilities could be built. If we proceed as we are very hopeful of doing with the reclamation in front of the Yacht Club, Rooke, No 4 Dock, then that will throw up areas of land some of which might be available for that but until more land is created in that area I do not see that there is any scope, for example, the Europort area extends to Waterport Road in his mind but there is the coach park area when we build part of the new housing is going on the extreme western end of the coach park so bits that are presently used but not very much for private parking that is going to be reprovided underneath the block so that there is no loss of parking area.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister note that the shortage that he has referred to is not one that arose when the housing was provided in the area but since a large commercial entity that has its out-of-town superstore if I can call it that made a decision that it would not allow residents in the area to use its extensive parking facilities overnight and that is what is causing problems for those in the area. Can the Government undertake to see whether they can assist those in the area for the reprovion of those facilities?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The cause for any recent increase in the problem does not alter the answer that I have given. I cannot wave a magic wand and create new parking land because Safeways decides to change its policy on access to its car park. If there were areas of public land lying fallow there at least in the meantime it could be flattened and made available for parking but the fact is that there is no land around there. I do not really see how the Government can do what the hon Member is urging it to do, perhaps rightly urging it to do but there is a matter of physical impossibility.



**NO. 20 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the parts of Gibraltar's roads that they plan to resurface during the quarter ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government do not consider it appropriate to provide such details of their on-going road works plans. Individual schemes will be announced as and when they are to be executed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 20 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister of Environment agree with me that certainly his answer makes it sound as if there is no plan for immediate resurfacing of roads, an issue which is of concern to all of us in Gibraltar who are motorists including the Ministers I am sure who are motorists themselves and feel the bumps on occasion as they drive along?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The amount of money being spent by Government in maintenance and repair of the highway, of refurbishment of the highways is at an all time unprecedented level in contrast to times when very little was spent on that. The issues being alluded to in the answer are not that there is no plan unless the hon Member thinks that my Colleague has lied to him. My hon Friend has said that the Government do not consider it appropriate to provide such details. If there were in fact no such details then my honourable friend would have simply lied to the House which I am sure is not what the hon Member is intending to insinuate. The factors which affect the Government's decision now not no longer to publish these plans quarterly planned

or half-yearly planned in advance is that it gives contractors the ability to see ahead the workload that is around the corner and this has pricing implications for the work that they bid because of how busy they think the place is going to be. Those are the factors and nothing else. For the rest of it I hope that by the end of this year and indeed of this term the hon Member will feel obliged to congratulate my honourable friend for the amount of road resurfacing and refurbishment that he will have done.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Certainly I think that the Chief Minister will agree with me that if the Minister for the Environment had given the answer which the Chief Minister has given at least we would know that the reason for not making the announcement is what appears at first brush to be a valid one rather than simply saying we will not make an announcement?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member did not ask for the reasons the hon Member asked whether we would publish the plans.

**NO. 21 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**OESCO – ADDITIONAL GENERATOR**

Can Government state whether the recent announcement of an additional generator at the OESCO plant is the result of a renewal of the contract with OESCO?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 21 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Government state the length of the renewed contract and also whether there is provision in the contract for additional generators?

**HON F VINET:**

The lengths of the contracts we understand is approximately 10 years. There is no entitlement to an additional generator

ORAL

**NO. 22 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DISPOSAL OF REFUSE**

Can Government state what is the latest position regarding the tenders for the disposal of waste and refuse by any process and has a Transaction Manager been appointed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos 23 and 24 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 23 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EUROPA INCINERATOR LIMITED**

Can Government state how many employees were employed by Europa Incinerator Limited as at 1<sup>st</sup> January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos 22 and 24 of 2004.

**NO. 24 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**INCINERATOR**

Can Government state whether it is still their intention to proceed with the purchase, installation and operation of a new incinerator plant, and if so, when is this expected to happen and where will it be located?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Government will continue with the existing arrangements for the disposal of its refuse until it is able to implement its long-term strategy for future disposal. It continues to be the Government's intention to replace the existing incinerator with a new plant, to be constructed on the site of the existing plant. The tender for the appointment of a Transaction Manager has not yet been awarded although an appointment should be made shortly. As at 1<sup>st</sup> January 2004, 16 employees remain in employment with Europa Incinerator Company Limited.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 24 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

So that means that it was 16 it is still 16 so the options which were open to the Government to reduce that number by retirement, transfer to GOG employment retention and redundancies have not been taken up?

**HON F VINET:**

The number continues to be 16.

**NO. 25 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**RUBBLE TIP**

Can Government state whether they have identified a new site for the disposal of construction rubble in the event that the present site is used for development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

**Answer to Question No 7 of 2004**

The Government have made no decision such as the one described in the question.

**Answer to Question No 25 of 2004**

Several sites are under consideration. None has yet been finally selected.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 25 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is an area next to the Caleta Hotel one of the sites which is under consideration?

**HON F VINET:**

Government have been considering a number of sites for depositing builder's gravel. The site next to the Caleta Hotel is currently Government's preferred option.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In taking the decision in making that particular site the preferred option can the Minister say whether there has been any consultation with interested parties with regard to that?

**HON F VINET:**

There has been consultation with the major stakeholders who will be affected by this namely the GONHS and the Caleta Hotel.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister in a position to tell the House what the results of the consultation have been and were those consulted favourable to having a rubble tip there or were they against it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As one can imagine the owners of the Caleta Palace are not overjoyed at the prospect I think that would be an understatement, as far as GONHS is concerned I seem to recall, it is just that my honourable and new friend in the House has not yet really had an opportunity to familiarise himself with the consultation process which took place before the election. I think GONHS position was that they were content provided part of the newly created site was used as a wetland or some sort of natural habitat. This is rapidly becoming a dilemma for the Government. We do need a site for rubble the east side project really has no further capacity if the hon Members drive past the east side reclamation site they will see that it has almost risen above road level around the plateau of the mound. A site can only be somewhere along the coast much of Gibraltar's remaining coastline is natural rock habitat which would be environmentally impossible to use for these purposes so it is not that the Government specifically wants to create a reclamation in the area of the Caleta Palace it is just that that is one of the remaining coastal sites which has been identified which would not cause a nuclear war with one or other environmental lobby group in Gibraltar. We might be cruising for such a battle with the owners of the Caleta Palace but we are not making the decision until we are absolutely 100 per cent certain that there really is absolutely no other alternative and if we can find another alternative we will do it.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government say how they expect the creation of such a site would impact on the tourism industry in that particular sector particularly on the hotel itself given that I understand just by picturing the building that there are rooms which will face onto the rubble site?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The extent to which the site would come directly in front of the hotel is a matter of design it is a question of how far north the site encroaches. It would be possible



actually not to encroach very much but then one will have a smaller site with relatively higher construction cost because what really costs is the bunding and all of that. I think that the owners of hotel are more concerned by the sort of aesthetic considerations of a sort of what they will regard as a typical site but I see that the owners of the Caleta Palace themselves wish to do some real estate development next to the hotel so it is not that they object to building works I think it is more to the unsightly nature of the sight as it progresses and one option maybe to see a way of operating this sight in a way which minimises the aesthetic problems. It may or it may not be possible but those are the sort of things that are being looked at the moment.

**NO. 26 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SIGNAL STATION ROAD**

Can Government state whether they have now concluded their consideration to road maintenance on the Upper Rock generally, including Signal Station Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 26 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will Government not accept the fact that the state of the roads is deteriorating very, very rapidly and unless something is done quickly traffic may have to be closed to access to St Michael's Cave et cetera?

**HON F VINET:**

We do not accept the hon Member's view. We have not had site reports to that effect.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I can assure that the professionals who use that road have.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

You mean the taxi drivers?

**HON L A RANDALL:**

The professionals that use that road have reported to us that the road is in imminent need of repair.

**NO. 27 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DUDLEY WARD TUNNEL**

Can Government state whether they have concluded their assessment of the full viability of their preferred option for the remedial works that will enable the reopening of Dudley Ward Tunnel for vehicular traffic?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 27 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

At what stage is the consideration or when do they foresee a decision being taken?

**HON F VINET:**

If I can just give a short background to this. Government have considered in some detail the various recommendations and options that were submitted in the report prepared by the appointed engineering consultant on the work that is considered necessary as having to be undertaken in this area before a through flow of traffic can be re-established. A preferred solution was identified from the various alternatives that were submitted however before a final decision can be taken on this ground investigation works need to be undertaken to confirm the viability and constructability of the preferred option. Such exploratory works additionally provide necessary data for use in a design. Several elements of this investigation have already been undertaken but there is still a need to complete this exercise and until such time as all the required data is obtained we will not be in a position to confirm the full viability of a preferred option.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

The answer provided by the Minister is not much different to the one provided on the 28<sup>th</sup> March 2003. That was nine months ago so how much longer is this consideration going to take?

**HON F VINET:**

Hopefully as little time as possible we have no specific date to go.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Will the Minister state whether the consultants are private consultants or just Government consultants?

**HON F VINET:**

Private consultants.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Has the Minister got an indication of how much these consultants are costing?

**HON F VINET:**

No.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister agree with me that in answers to questions so far what we are hearing, namely that there is going to be a plan or there is not going to be a plan for the resurfacing of the roads in the Upper Rock, that there is going to be a rubble tip next to the Caleta Palace Hotel and that it is not yet clear when we will be able to drive all the way round Gibraltar but that is of very little use to our tourist product that we should find ourselves in that particular predicament?

ORAL

**NO. 28 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**AQUAGIB**

Can Government state whether the stake of the equity they hold in Aqua Gib is the same as the one they held in Lyonnaise?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No 29 of 2004.

**NO. 29 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**AQUAGIB**

Can Government state whether they propose to dispose of any part of their stake in the equity of Aqua Gib during the course of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

There has been no change in the company. The same company has simply changed its name. There has been no change in the Government's shareholding and Government have no plans to do so.

**NO. 30 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GNC/GIBTEL**

Can Government state whether there have been any new developments on the part of the European Commission in respect of the complaints filed in 1996 by GNC and Gibtel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The EU Commission has decided to take no action on the roaming complaint filed by Gibtel in 1996. The Board of Gibtelecom has consequently decided to initiate legal proceedings against the Commission. Gibtelecom lodged the applications with the Court of First Instance of the European Communities on 24<sup>th</sup> December 2003. The EU Commission has not yet taken any formal decision on the numbering complaint filed by GNC in 1996.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 30 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can Government confirm that they have received the final decision from the Commission with respect to the roaming agreement and whether it was any different to the provisional decision?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Knowing the hon Member personally as I do I know that he would not be taking advantage of any inside knowledge of the affairs of Gibtelecom given his previous senior management position in that company for use in the House today and on that basis the answer to the question is that as indeed I have said in the House before there is a provisional negative decision on both. It has been made final on one not yet on the other. I suppose and hope that if the decision on roaming is made final if it is on the same lines as the provisional that the Board of Gibtelecom will make the same decision as it has made in relation to the roaming agreement.



**HON L A RANDALL:**

Firstly, let me just say to the Chief Minister that I took early retirement from Gibtelecom six months ago or more and a lot has happened since. I was referring to the roaming agreement, my understanding and that was in answer to a question which was posed in March by my predecessor that there would first be a preliminary decision which the company could then challenge and then there would be a final decision and court proceedings would not take place until after the final decision was received.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is a confusion I think it is provisional rather than preliminary. The procedure as it has been explained in this House before the hon Member was in this House is that the Commission writes a letter saying, "*We have provisionally decided to make the following decisions,*" and gives you a period of time and says what do you think of what we have provisionally decided and then there is a whole procedure that gives the complainant the opportunity to come back saying we think you are completely and utterly wrong for the following reasons and that was done. The fact is that it then took the Commission a long time after Gibtelecom, I think it would have been the company separately Nynex and Gibtel one for each complaint, they quite quickly responded to those provisional decisions but the Commission took quite some time to come back. When it came back on the telephone one it was negative and therefore they made the decision that they have now made and we have not quite yet reached that same position in respect to the numbering one but we have no doubt that they will come it is just a question of dressing it up. It really is very disappointing.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

The answer given by the Chief Minister is that only one of the complaints is going ahead with litigation, the roaming one?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Only because that is the one that has reached the stage where it is the end of the road. We are half a step from the end of the road on the other one as well and I hope that the Board of Gibtelecom will make the same decision when that one eventually comes through as well. Both were the subject of adverse provisional decision.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can we have confirmation just to make sure that we know where we are the other one is what Spain's refusal to recognise the country code, the 350 code?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is the so-called numbering issue.

ORAL

**NO. 31 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GNC/GIBTEL**

Can Government state whether they propose to dispose of any part or their stake in the equity of Gibtelecom (GNC/Gibtel/Gibconnect) during the course of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government have no plans to do so.

**NO. 32 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – POWER FAILURES**

Can Government state the number of power cuts that affected whole districts in the year 2003, their duration, the areas affected and the reason why they occurred?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The number of power failures that have occurred in the year 2003 and which have affected whole districts have been 17. I will now hand over to the hon Member the requested information.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 32 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Am I right in assuming that the reasons provided have been accepted by the respective parties, so when it says OESCO, OESCO has accepted that they are responsible for this failure?

**HON F VINET:**

That is correct.

**Answer to Question No 32 of 2004**

<b>ncident No</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Duration</b>	<b>Areas Affected</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>1</b>	Wed 5 Feb 03	7mins - 1hr 19 mins	Three districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10,14,15	The power failure was caused by the contractor engaged in works at Corral Road (Pipework Ltd) damaging one of our 11,000 volts high voltage feeder cable.
<b>2</b>	Fri 21 Mar 03	3 mins – 10 mins	Four districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 14, 15	Fault in generator set No 4 at OESCO.
<b>3</b>	Sat 29 Mar 03 06.25 hrs	1 min – 4 mins	All the 8 districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10 – 18	Fault in generator set No 4 at OESCO.
<b>4</b>	Sat 17 May 03 21.30 hrs	9 mins – 11 mins	Four districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 14, 15	Sudden frequency dip.
<b>5</b>	Wed 21 May 03	1 min – 10 mins	Five districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 13, 14, 15	Fault in generator set No 6 at OESCO.
<b>6</b>	Sun 8 Jun 03 20.37 hrs	11 mins	Four districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 14, 15	Sudden frequency dip
<b>7</b>	Tues 10 Jun 03 16.45	7 mins - 11 mins	Five districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 13, 14, 15	Fault in generator set No 2 at Waterport Power Station.
<b>8</b>	Tues 15 July 03 18.38 hrs	17 mins	Four districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 14, 15	Fault in generator set No 2 at Waterport Power Station faulty jacket water trip amp.
<b>9</b>	Tues 9 Sept 03	34 mins – 1 hr 37 mins	Total blackout	Fault in generator set No 2 at Waterport Power Station AVR failure.
<b>10</b>	Mon 15 Sept 03 07.45 hrs	2 – 5 mins	Seven districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18	Fault in generator set No 2 at Waterport Power Station AVR failure.
<b>11</b>	Tues 21 Oct 03 14.05 hrs	20 mins – 1 hr 5 mins	Four districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 11, 13, 15, 17 and one district from KBDC 9	Human error caused trip of generator set No 2 at Waterport Power Station.

<b>12</b>	Tues 21 Oct 03 18.00 hrs	8 mins	Four districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 13, 15	Generator set No 2 at Waterport Power Station tripped manually VCCW temp & press high
<b>13</b>	Sun 26 Oct 03 11.37 hrs	18 mins - 43 mins	Eight districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18 and one district from KBDC 7	HV fault at KBDC feeder to S28 (KBDC 7)
<b>14</b>	Sun 26 Oct 03 13.55 hrs	15 mins – 20 mins	Eight districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18 and one district from KBDC 7.	When S28 was reconnected through S29, No 5 OESCO tripped for no apparent reason.
<b>15</b>	Fri 31 Oct 03 01.50 hrs	8 mins	Eight districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18	Fault in generator set No 5 at OESCO Reverse Power Relay operated for no apparent reason.
<b>16</b>	Wed 19 Nov 03 10.50 hrs	15 mins – 37 mins	Four districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 10, 11, 14, 15	Generator set No 1 at Waterport Power Station tripped on reverse power during commissioning tests on the SCADA System.
<b>17</b>	Sat 13 Dec 03 11.31 hrs	2 mins – 6 mins	Two districts supplied from Waterport Power Station 14, 18	The high voltage feeders tripped during commissioning tests on the SCADA System.

ORAL

**NO. 33 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

On what date did the tender for the John Mackintosh Square beautification stipulate that the works had to be finished?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No 34 of 2004.

**NO. 34 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

What is the projected additional cost and the additional delay of constructing underground toilets in the Piazza project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The original contract completion date is the 26<sup>th</sup> March 2004. At the time of going out to tender a final decision as to the design and location of the WC block had not been taken. The preferred option was to construct an underground facility within the Square and thus a provisional sum of £75,000 was included in the tender documents based on a preliminary design. Subsequently, the detailed design was produced incorporating a larger facility than originally envisaged and including a more robust and reliable drainage system ( mini pumping station) and the new access to the air-raid shelter. The final cost is still subject to negotiation with the contractor. The original scope of works encompassed the construction of underground toilets thus this element of the works has not contributed to any additional delays.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 33 AND 34 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Where there any other locations considered apart from the underground facility?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it is clear that the hon Member is referring to facts which were notorious before the hon Member had responsibility for these things perhaps you will let me answer. The answer is that it was mooted that there was no decision made or ministerial

consideration of any alternative but it is also true that a ministerial slip of the tongue in an interview led to much misunderstanding on the part of other people. The answer is yes it was said but no it had never actually got to a state of discussion that sustained the certainty of the statement that was made. It was one of the options under consideration, the guardroom. It was never bought back for discussion by those who made the decisions in relation to the whole project in the first place. It was being dealt with in a technical committee chaired by one minister and the ideas were being bandied about as a possibility but it was never in the project as being there.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Where there any other options considered at whatever level which would have been perhaps quicker and more cost effective than the present alternative?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think so. The alternatives were somewhere on the Square which would not have been desirable. Under the Square or off the Square somewhere, the people doing the brainstorming around this project thought that the guardroom was a possibility at the technical level but that there were no others unless one went in away from the Square and tried to find, one might have wanted to put them in the Police Station or somewhere like that going off the Square but there was no other obvious possibility and I think there is some on several occasions people expressed the view that there are not enough public convenience utilities facilities around Gibraltar and I think this is one that will become a central facility. The costs are not excessive given the nature and size of the facility, their permanence, their unobtrusiveness which has an aesthetic value.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that the Government have confirmed that the toilets will have their own pumping station are they also in a position to confirm that they will have their own generator in the event of a power cut?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot remember the technicalities of it. There are certainly two in case one breaks down but I think that there is a sort of some arrangement so that actually there is a lot of capacity for accumulation before a power failure will result in any terrible inconvenience.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government confirm that there are two toilet facilities within the John Mackintosh Square?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Only to the extent that I can confirm to him that we are not planning to have boys and girls share toilets. There is one for the boys and one for the girls. I suppose that is two there is also a toilet above ground limited for the disabled but if he means male and female here and then male and female there the answer is no.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I meant two different sites for men and women or boys and girls on one side as in one set of toilets for men and women probably the disabled at the top and another completely different facility for either public or private entity.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is a second option, no.

**NO. 35 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**UPPER ROCK**

Has the cleaning of the slopes in the Upper Rock been allocated to any company or will this be put out to tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The cleaning of the slopes in the Upper Rock was allocated to Master Service (Gib) Ltd as an extension of the Upper Rock cleaning contract which they already held.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 35 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When we have discussed this issue in the House in the past the Minister originally expressed the view that they were looking at one new contractor for the slopes but subsequently came to the conclusion that it was better to have the same one doing both the slopes and the roads otherwise there might be a potential difficulty. Can the Minister say what the terms of that contract are and how much is being paid to the contractor?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The rates that were agreed with the contractor are based on the original contract for the cleaning of the Upper Rock bearing in mind that there are some specialised work to be done because of the needs of the cleaning to be done on slopes which need an element of specialisation I am told. Initially we were going to go down the route as the hon Member clearly pointed out of having separate contracts those within the Department of the Environment who really handled this particular contract advised that it was better to have one contractor doing both sets of work than actually having

two companies operating within a very limited amount of time. The cost of the contract was £4,887.50 per month and the contract was contracted for a period of five months and subsequently extended and we believe that during the next two or three months we will be monitoring to see the need that there is in actually undertaking this work. The cost of £4,800 is quite a significant expense and considering that this sort of work was done on an ad hoc basis in the past having a contractor actually carrying this out on a monthly basis all through the year is not justified so we are now monitoring to see when but they know that within the next two or three months we will have to call them back and restart the cleaning process.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I do not know whether the Minister answered this or not but just to clear the point does this mean they have to clean the rock every month or every week, what is the frequency of operations?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Whilst they are actually on contract there is a daily cleaning being undertaken but obviously it covers quite a long list of slopes so I assume that it is done on a rotational basis but monitored by the Cleansing Superintendent to ensure that the slopes are kept clean.

**NO. 36 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**UPPER GALLERIES**

Can Government say what was bid by each of the four tenderers who submitted a tender for the repair of the retaining wall at the Upper Galleries?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The following four quotations were received from tenderers for the undertaking of these works:

- i. £44,161.52
- ii. £64,615.26
- iii. £85,541.65
- iv. £91,074.46

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 36 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister then say which of those four was awarded the tender because what was actually published in the Gazette was the sum £45,701.50.

**HON F VINET:**

The contract was awarded to AMCO in the sum as the hon Member has rightly said of £45,701.50. The difference between AMCO's tendered sum and the contract sum was due to additional requirements from the client, the Gibraltar Tourist Board, which resulted in additional traffic management measures they needed.

**NO. 37 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EUROPE 2005**

Can Government state whether Gibraltar is required to switch over from Analogue to Digital TV as part of action plan eEurope 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

This matter is under consideration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 37 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is the Minister aware that the closing date for publishing of intentions was December 2003?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The hon Member must be aware that the action plan eEurope 2005 is simply a proposal from the Commission to Member States to consider should this later become a directive I can say that it is the policy of this Government to meet all its international obligations. I would add that the hon Member has been until recently a Member of the Gibraltar Co-ordinating Group looking into this matter and he must be aware of the latest situation which is precisely that this matter is to be considered.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I have to admit to not being able to recall eEurope 2005 being considered by the Committee which the Minister mentions and I can tell him it is over a year and it is

driven by the person who is the CEO of the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority. I can assure the Minister that the European Commission recommended to Member States that their intentions should be published in December 2003, just their intentions nothing more.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

It is a recommendation as the hon Member rightly says.

**NO. 38 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**MINISTRY FOR CULTURE**

Can the Minister for Culture state whether more staff have been employed in his ministry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Two officers have been deployed from within the Service, a Principal Officer (Senior Officer Grade) and a Typist.

**NO. 39 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THREE KINGS CAVALCADE**

Can Government state how much has been spent on the preparation of the Cavalcade Parade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Government of Gibraltar did not pay for any of the costs of this year's Three Kings Cavalcade.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 39 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does that mean that the camels were actually paid by the Cavalcade Committee?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The camels were sponsored by Gibtelecom.

**HON S E LINARES:**

What about the cost of the person organising all the cavalcade, is that not part of the costs of the cavalcade parade?



**HON C BELTRAN:**

The cavalcade is organised by the Cavalcade Committee not a Government organisation.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Did Government not deploy a Youth Officer into the Ministry of Culture in order to organise this because he was not allowed to use the phone in the other place?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The question is *“How much has been spent on the preparation of the cavalcade?”* The salary of the civil servant in question was not spent on the preparation of the cavalcade parade he was already on the Government’s pay role costs and the question is whether he did that or something else. The hon Member knows that the particular officer in question has now been transferred to the new Ministry for Heritage, Culture, Youth and Sport as an events organiser. He will organise the cavalcade, he will be involved in the organisation of the fair, of other Government hospitality events and indeed of any event of a sporting, cultural, heritage nature and indeed for any other Government department and the Government do not allocate a proportion of his salary cost to the cost of each of those events anymore than the Government do not allocate to the cost of any other Government activity a proportion of the salary of part of one civil servant.

**NO. 40 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**NEW YEAR CONCERT**

Can Government state what was the cost of this year's New Year Concerts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The total cost of this year's New Year Concert was £26,043.53.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 40 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister give a breakdown of this amount?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I can write to the hon Member and give him the details I do not have the breakdown with me here, that was not in the original question.

**NO. 41 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can the Government state how many Youth Officers are currently in employment with the Youth Service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Currently the Gibraltar Youth Service employs the following:

- 1 - Senior Youth Worker
- 2 - Youth and Community Workers
- 1 - Trainee Youth and Community Worker (currently studying in UK)
- 1 - Part-time Youth Worker
- 9 - Session Youth Leaders

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 41 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is this figure since the new officer was moved to the Ministry of Culture?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No.

**HON S E LINARES:**

What the Minister is saying is that this figure counts him as well, he is included in this list?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The staff complement that I have just given out includes the post but not the body of the person that we are talking about.

**HON S E LINARES:**

The question is currently, what is the staffing currently, now, not the posts?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The approved staff complement for the Youth Service is one Senior Youth Worker and four Youth and Community Workers which is five the same amount as I explained before in terms of numbers.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does that mean that the Minister has one less now than he had before?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No.

**HON S E LINARES:**

How can he then deploy a body from one department to another which the Chief Minister has stated in the previous question, he has deployed to have an organiser person in the Ministry of Heritage and Culture and now he has deployed him from the Youth Office to the Ministry of Culture where is that body because he is including it now?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The post is being covered by a part-time worker. The body will be full-time as soon as the advert comes out and it is filled.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister then state who is currently manning the post or place where the current Youth Officer was that is Laguna Estate Youth Club?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I honestly do not think it is appropriate to mention individual officers .....

**HON S E LINARES:**

As a point or order.....I have not mentioned any person or any name of anybody so I would not like the Chief Minister to start twisting the fact that I have named anybody specifically. I have not done so, if he wants to mention it that is up to him but I would rather clear it now before he starts saying that I have been mentioning people. I am mentioning a post.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It seems clear that my command of the English Language not being as complete as his I obviously do not understand what is meant in the English Language by the words "*who*". "*Who*" is a request to identify a person by name. We have already gone through the question of the post. He then stands up and asks "*Who is covering?*" and the only answer to that is the name of an individual and when this is pointed out to him he accuses everybody of twisting his words. Perhaps he would like to rephrase the question if "*who*" is not the invocation of the name then what information is he seeking exactly?

**HON S E LINARES:**

By "*who*" it means that there has to be a body there one does not have to mention his name. Is he or she a Youth Officer or is he or she an EO in Government or is he or she a PTO from the Industrial side this is what I meant?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member has already been told that it is being covered by a part-time Youth Worker and I know of no way of identifying a body than by the name that it was given at birth.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister agree with me that the best way to do that if he finds himself in that predicament again is by saying when asked who he can say instead of the name the person who is doing that other job et cetera is the person filling post whatever there is no need to deploy I am sure the Chief Minister will agree, the suggestion that only he has the command of the English Language which enables us to determine who he is being asked about?

**NO. 42 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state how many Youth Leaders who completed the course this year and those who completed the first course on Youth Leaders are currently working with the Youth Service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

This year's Youth leader training course is not expected to be completed until July 2004, having started in October 2003. Two training courses have already been completed and a total of 10 Youth Leaders (nine paid session workers and one volunteer) who have completed training courses currently work for the Youth Service.

**NO. 43 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state whether the Youth Clubs were opened during the Christmas and New Year period?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Yes. The Youth Clubs were opened, several days and for varied purposes during the Christmas and New Year period.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 43 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Firstly, I would like to congratulate the Minister that he is opening it for Christmas since the last time and the last Minister did not believe that the Christmas period was the right period to have the Youth Clubs opened. I am glad that the policy of Government have changed to open these Youth Clubs during the Christmas period. I would like to state that because last time I posed this question there was a bit of controversy as to why it should open and I am glad it does now.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

If the hon Member would refer to Hansard and the discussion he and I had on this subject last year he will read that I explained that the policy of the Government was to open the Youth Clubs over the Christmas period as and when necessary and that it had been open as and when necessary during last Christmas not that there was a policy decision to close them and that that has changed.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I beg to differ that he did actually believe that the Youth Clubs, in fact he stated that the youths did not use it during the Christmas period and that that was why they were closed. Does that meant that the youth are now using it?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I have already said it once, once more and not again. Last year I said that the Youth Clubs should be opened as and when necessary because the youth did not use them normally so they were opened as and when necessary which included for the making of the floats and there has been no policy decision to close them and therefore no change in policy to reopen and I will not say it again because the hon Member has the habit of repeating the question.



**NO. 44 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GOVERNMENT LOTTERY**

Now that the contract for the running of the Gibraltar Government Lottery has been awarded, can Government state whether they propose to implement any changes to the structure of the Lottery?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

This issue remains under consideration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 44 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Without wanting to question the Minister's command of the English Language what issue is under consideration?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The issue of whether there is any proposal to implement any changes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I can understand changes being under consideration but what I cannot understand is whether there ought to be changes being under consideration, is that the state of play they do not even know if changes are needed?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Should changes become necessary and some may be necessary, they would certainly be implemented.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So, at the moment the Government have not yet decided whether there is a need for any change is that the correct state of play?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Government increasingly accepts the fact that some sort of change is necessary. The participation in the lottery continues to decline, the number of unsold tickets continues to rise it is increasingly becoming a lottery not so much for the players as for the Government as to whether we win or lose money in any one year so I think some change is going to be. Too many things have changed around the lottery and although the previous Member whose seat the hon questioner has taken was a passionate believer in that the two-weekly lottery draws was a good and not a bad thing that is itself one of the issues under consideration. I think that the Government accepts that some change in the lottery is desirable to revitalise it, to recommercialise it, to make it more habit forming not in the bad sense but a lot of people fell out of the habit when it stopped being weekly. Indeed I recall that a study has been done, a consultation process was done and gathered by the Hon Colonel Britto when he was the Minister responsible and some suggestions were made none of them it has to be said very, very enlightened so we are really in the stage of accepting that a change seems to be indicated and still at the embryonic stage of considering what those changes might be but the more time passes the more urgent it becomes to address the question of change and take the bull by the horns.

**NO. 45 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KINGS BASTION**

Can the Minister for Sport confirm whether there are any new developments as to their long-standing promised conversion of Kings Bastion to a leisure centre, since a leisure centre was promised in their Manifesto of 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No 46 of 2004.

**NO. 46 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KINGS BASTION**

Can the Government now state whether negotiations with the MOD referred to in answer 359/2003 have now been completed and consequently, by what date they expect the King's Bastion Leisure Centre will be completed and open to the public?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Government's negotiations with MOD, referred to in the answer to Question No 359 of 2003 have not yet been completed. The Government have been elected on 27<sup>th</sup> November on their manifesto published for that General Election. The Government expect to honour the commitments in that manifesto during the next four years.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 45 AND 46 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister agree with me factually that the commitment in relation to the King's Bastion Leisure Centre was actually a commitment contained also in the 1996 manifesto and 2000 manifestos of the GSD administration?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are not accountable to the Opposition for manifestos that have been superceded by subsequent manifestos and subsequent elections. We have a four year term ahead of us, we have been elected with a manifesto, it contains a commitment to build a leisure centre and the electorate are entitled to expect us to honour our commitments. When as happens to all governments, governments finish their term not having completed all their commitments some members of the electorate generously forgive the Government for those failures others do not and desist from voting for it and that is the extent of the Government's accountability for what might or might not have been in its 1996 manifesto.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister or the Minister the Hon Mr Beltran agree with me that in fact the original answer to this question now amounts to a commitment in this House to complete the project within the life of this parliament?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member can deduce from my friend's answer the words that he has uttered in the answer namely that the Government expects to honour the commitments in its 2003 manifesto during the next four years. The words are clear they are not ambiguous and then he is not entitled to deduce from them anything other than their natural meaning.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Government confirm whether this project is still or is going to form part of a wider project that was mentioned by the Chief Minister in the last meeting of the House?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I consider that to be an entirely fair question. The answer is that if the negotiations with the MOD which are referred to in the answer can be brought about to an end quickly the answer to the question is yes. If on the other hand the negotiations have not come to a favourable conclusion quickly then the answer is that we will peel that aspect of the project away from it and proceed around those negotiations. It will alter the nature the project that might otherwise have taken place but it means that we will proceed otherwise we cannot wait indefinitely for those negotiations to complete.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does that answer also mean whether the Government will decide whether the Leisure Centre will be privately run or publicly run?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think that question is still open in either case whether it is done with or without those negotiations having been successfully completed.

**NO. 47 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**EUROPA SPORTS GROUND**

Can the Minister for Sport confirm whether the Government have now successfully completed negotiations with the MOD in relation to the hand-over of the Europa Sports ground to the Government which in turn would be handed over to the Gibraltar Cricket Association, something which his predecessor announced would happen over 3 years ago?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The situation remains the same as explained in the reply given to previous similar questions namely Question Nos 100, of 2002 and 100 of 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 47 OF 2003**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, but in all the past questions that I have asked I get different answers and I would like the Minister for Sport to confirm whether it is still the position of the MOD that they require the sportsgrounds for emergency military situations and that is the reason why after his predecessor announced in this House three years ago that the Cricket Association would be happy at the news that he had received that the MOD would be handing over the sportsground at Europa, does that mean that they are still negotiating because in the last meeting of the House I got another conflicting reply from the Minister because he said he thought that the MOD would not change its mind?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

My reply is quite clear I believe that the situation remains that there are no indications that MOD will change its mind.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In effect it means that the Government will no longer try to negotiate with the MOD does it mean that the Government have given up then is that the situation?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Government have not given up and as the Chief Minister has just mentioned we are not actively engaged in the matter.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Have the Government looked at a possibility that the MOD might be able to release another area whereby they could actually provide the facilities that the Cricket Association presently have at Europa?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I understand that the Cricket Association at the very present moment is quite happy with the allocations they have in the place that they have them.

**NO. 48 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 7 – SUBHEAD 9 (D)**

Can Government say how much of the £25,000 Heritage budget for the promotion of heritage issues (Head 7, Sub-Head 9 (d)) has been spent so far, giving a breakdown of the sum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is provided in a separate schedule which I will now hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 48 of 2004**

£3,460.00	-	Printing of colour magazine – issue – 4 (Gibraltar Heritage)
£ 888.31	-	Rita Benitez Mota – lectures on ‘International Museum Day’
£5,000.00	-	Grant for publication of book – Mr Serruya
£3,750.00	-	Prince Research Consultants Ltd (Moorish Castle)
£1,060.97	-	Transportation of Exhibits
£1,000.00	-	Insurance
£ 489.60	-	Travel and Accommodation
£ 415.90	-	Hosting of Visitors
£ 62.00	-	Printing of Invitations

---

£16,126.78

---



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 48 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The schedule shows that of the £25,000 about £16,000 has been spent, does the Minister forecast that this particular item of expenditure will fall within the budget for the year?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes I expect it to be within budget.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In respect of the £5,000 spent for the publication of a book can the Minister elaborate on that particular item of expenditure?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The book referred to is entitled *'The Royal Gibraltar Regiment in Ceremonial Dress'* published as the Gibraltar Government heritage monograph.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the policy of the Government, as somebody with an interest to declare, to give grants to people who publish historical works of this nature?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not all of them. I rise because it precedes the Minister's responsibility for these matters. This was a grant that was requested it was acceded with a very marginal case a lot of people write books a lot of people ask for Government support. The Government obviously cannot afford to fund them all there is a bit of a concern that it might have created a precedent and I hope that the hon Member's last comment will not encourage it.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the £3,750 of expenditure to Prints Research Consultant Ltd in respect of the Moorish Castle can the Minister elaborate on that item?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Essentially Prints Research is really involved in the moving of the prison but obviously this is linked to the castle, really the jewel in the heritage crown as I believe has been the name given to the Moorish Castle.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

This was for what exactly for reports into the move or....?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes reports on the whole move and developments in the castle area.

**NO. 49 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport confirm whether any agreement has now been reached with the Union as to the transfer of staff to the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 49 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm when the last meeting was held with the Union as regards this matter?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I cannot confirm a date. I know that work is continuing on the contracts, conditions of service, of future Gibraltar Sports Authority Employees but to-date no agreement has been reached with the Unions regarding the transfer of staff.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister give an indication as to when the Government expect to meet with the Unions over this matter?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The ball is in the Government's court to the extent that the draft proposals to put to the men by way of contract terms is in No 6 for consideration and really the next stage of the negotiation will be for the Government to produce these to the staff and their representative for them to consider. The hon Lady is asking for indication of when that might happen, I think that is one of those issues that falls into the category that we discussed before tea of pre-election issues that were left pending the election which we would hope to have cleared the decks of within the next month or two like the other two that we discussed earlier. I would say that in a month or two we would certainly have pushed out to the staff and their representative the proposed terms of contract.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does it therefore mean if my memory is correct that in order for the Sports City to function Government will need to employ extra staff and therefore does that mean that unless they come to an agreement with the Union and they start employing more staff the Sports City will not be functional?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It does not mean that at all it means the opposite of that. The Sports Authority exists, the Government will proceed with the new facilities as soon as they are all ready in the Sports Authority with new staff and that is not something that will be negotiated with the existing staff or anybody else. It is a new operation, new entity, new staff, in new premises. What is going to be negotiated or rather the subject matter of the negotiations to which our exchanges have so far been referring is whether terms can be agreed for the existing staff and the existing facilities, the Victoria Stadium and the Government department also to be moved into the Sports Authority or whether they both stay separate and the Authority goes forward on its merry way and the Government continues with the Victoria Stadium and its sports facilities with its separate staff as at the moment which is what would happen if the staff opt not to go into the Authority which as the Government said we would respect that.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Chief Minister give an indication whether the Government will shortly in quotes "*advertise the posts that are required for the running of the new Sports City*"?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

At the moment and without prejudice to what I explained to the hon Lady before about the Government going forward its own way with the new facilities the sensible policy of the previous Minister for Sport was that whilst negotiations with the staff of the Victoria Stadium looked as if they might be successful to hold back to see if it could all be evened out at the same time I think that remains the position coupled with the fact that until the facilities are ready, only the hockey pitch is ready so far, until the facilities under construction are ready the situation has not become urgent. I stick to what I said in answer to the last supplementary but one which is that in the next month or two there is bound to see movement whether positive or negative

movement remains to be seen this matter will be brought to a head in a couple of months. Whether during those couple of months any attempt will be made to recruit staff for the Authority that I could not tell her. I do not think it is sensitive because as the next question in the Order Paper alludes to the only thing that is currently sensitive in terms of the new facilities is looking after the hockey pitch none of the other new facilities are operational yet.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Would the Government accept the situation where within the existing sporting facilities meaning the Victoria Stadium, the Government would have employees working side by side that have decided not to go to the new Sports Authority or together with those that have decided to join the Authority would they have two sets of employees within the same environment?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a very, very long way from the Government's preferred option. The Government have a commitment to respect any decision made by a majority of the workers in the department and I think we have said that in the House before. The circumstances that the hon Member describes in the question would only arise if the majority of the staff in the Victoria Stadium let us call it the department, were to opt in favour and a minority were to opt against then the question would arise for consideration whether the facilities would go to the Authority the majority of the staff that wanted to go to the Authority would go to the Authority and whether the minority would remain civil servants seconded to the Authority. It is an untidy messy situation. The Lyonnaise experience has not been a particularly happy one when one mixes people so it is to be avoided at all costs but before .....it would require discussion with the staff because even secondment is something that requires as element of goodwill on the part of the staff. It may even require some degree of acquiescence on the part of the secondees to agree to be seconded outside of service.

**NO. 50 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport confirm when the Government expect to employ persons who will be responsible for the up-keep of the water-based hockey pitch?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The relevant staff will be employed when the Gibraltar Sports Authority becomes operational.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Here we have the opposite situation where the facility is running without having employees .....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Interim arrangements.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Interim arrangements and the Government I assume I am going to get the same answer as I did the last time, are they at all willing to listen to the proposals by the staff members of the ground-staff of the Victoria Stadium that they are willing to do this without any prejudice to whatever meetings that the Government may have with the Union.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer remains the same as she anticipated not just for the reasons that I explained last time but indeed because the staff at the Victoria Stadium are already working exceedingly long hours, exceedingly long hours and frankly to take on additional responsibilities I think is probably not a realistic physical proposition but I do not want to hide behind that reason the principal reason is the one that I gave her last time that these things are very difficult to extricate oneself from.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Say, for example, and this is hypothetical if the groundsmen decide at any stage to join the Authority would they be responsible for the upkeep or would the Government employ extra personnel.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is open, once one has an Authority with staff and with additional sporting facilities it then becomes a question for the best deployment of resources. There may be a need, there is bound to be a need to recruit extra staff there is no possibility of the existing body of men being able to run the existing facilities and all the new facilities when they come on stream, How the existing workforce would be distributed within the Authority is a matter for management and for discussion. Some may end up working on the hockey pitch it is just a matter of work organisation but only once they join the Authority and if that is the deployment decision that management take.

**NO. 51 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Has any expenditure taken place by the Gibraltar Sports Authority in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 51 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it likely therefore then that we shall have a repeat of what was still in Appendix 'G' of last year's Estimates that is that the out-turn for the year will be that nothing has been financed so far of the amount that was voted by the House is that correct?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Funds provided in the Estimates as contribution to the Gibraltar Sports Authority will probably need to be vired to other subheads to cover expenses required to be met in respect of works, facilities and so on which were at the time of preparation of the Estimates expected to have become the responsibility of the Authority during the current financial year that is the situation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the biggest element in the expenditure which was the personnel emoluments, the salary of the person that was supposed to be in charge of that Authority is that something that has not been triggered off yet because the Authority is not functioning?



**HON C BELTRAN:**

No it has not been triggered off yet.

**NO. 52 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT LOTTERY**

Did the Government achieve the forecast out-turn of £247,000 from the Gibraltar Government Lottery for the financial year 2002/2003 and does it still expect to achieve the £556,000 for the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The actual surplus for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 was £752,000 compared with the forecast out-turn of £247,000. The latest forecast out-turn for the current financial year has been revised by the Treasury Department to £300,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 52 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister explain how it is that the forecast out-turn was so far out of the final result given that the forecast out-turn is made only a couple of months before the end of the financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am told that the explanation for that is that the Government won the lottery several times in the last two months between the date of the calculation forecast out-turn which is projected forward it is not calculated, remember that this goes out to print long before the end of the financial year, so the forecast out-turn is itself based on guessing the last couple of months of the last financial year. If in that period the Government wins the lottery which is a prime illustration of the point that we were discussing before that the latest forecast out-turn for the current financial year is £300,000 so there is £450,000 difference turning whether a couple of things happen

or do not happen and I believe from the purely financial point of view that the lottery has become far too volatile for the Government.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In relation to what was said before about the decision not yet being taken, I note that in the Audited Accounts that have been tabled today on page 18 the Auditor does say that the week ticket sales for some time now have been under review but he has not been able to obtain an indication as to when the exercise will be completed.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He is in the same position as you.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes and I could not have more luck now than he had in 2002 are we likely to see something being done this year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The only thing that has happened in the meantime that in effect removes one of the psychological obstacles to change is that the Lottery Administration Contract has now been awarded, extended. So, this uncertainty of about is it worth changing given that there might be a change of operator? Is it appropriate to negotiate a change with the incumbent operator that might not be around in a few months time? All that was operating on people's minds as a sort of damper on any enthusiastic. He was not particularly enthusiastic, they were not particularly enthusiastic either because they did not know whether they were going to be around so the only thing that has happened I do not think it may have had the effect yet but will have the effect that now that there has been an extension of that contract the company now knows there has not been a change it is the same one that really they are now in a position to make proposals to the Government in the knowledge that it is not going to be for somebody else's benefit.

**NO. 53 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE CREDITS**

Has the Minister for Social Services now been able to determine whether everybody who is on the social wage is also registered with the ETB as an unemployed in order to obtain the social insurance contribution credit, as she undertook to do in answer to supplementary questions arising from Question No 15 of March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

What I undertook to do in answer to supplementary questions arising from Question No 15 of March 2003, I did by way of a lengthy letter to the Leader of the Opposition dated 9<sup>th</sup> June 2003. I again confirm however that those persons receiving credits in the year 2000, 2001 and 2002 were not, from an Employment Service perspective registered as unemployed. I should point out that the relevant regulations were amended on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2003 and credits are now awarded automatically to entitled persons on application, without any further requirement to register as unemployed at the Employment Service.

**NO. 54 OF 2004****THE HON C A BRUZON****SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government state what increase there has been in the return of social insurance schedules for each quarter of 2001 since the answer to Question No 14 of 2003?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 54 of 2004****Social Insurance returns increase as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003**

	<b>Private</b>	<b>Official</b>	<b>Self-employed</b>
	<b>Return Increase</b>	<b>Return Increase</b>	<b>Return Increase</b>
<b>Quarter 1/01</b>	212	191	No Increase
<b>Quarter 2/01</b>	348	186	No Increase
<b>Quarter 3/01</b>	647	190	No Increase
<b>Quarter 4/01</b>	667	206	55

ORAL

**NO. 55 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state how many elderly citizens have applied for a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital, in each month of 2003, giving a monthly breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No 56 of 2004

**NO. 56 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

How many elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

A total of 98 elderly persons have applied for and are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia as at the end of December 2003.

A total of 37 are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital. The breakdown of months, age and sex requested by the hon Member will be forwarded to her as soon as the information has been compiled.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 55 AND 56 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the Minister will recall the early part of last year I think it was, during a meeting of the House she answered a question based on the same question that we are asking today and she said that she was hopeful that more patients from St Bernard's would be allocated shortly at Mount Alvernia because the Government were keen in refurbishing the second floor at Mount Alvernia, can she say whether there are any plans to refurbish or whether the Government have started the refurbishment of the second floor at Mount Alvernia?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

It is not just the refurbishment of the second floor that I was talking about it is the refurbishment of the whole of Mount Alvernia, of all the floors including the opening of the annex which was never used before. It is envisaged that these works would be finalised by April 2004.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not the case that the second floor is still closed?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I believe, if my memory serves me right, that the second floor has just been refurbished and patients are being transferred from one floor to the other.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The second floor of Mount Alvernia is now empty and is being refurbished at this point in time is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In the second floor refurbishment has just been finished and patients who are residents are about to be decanted to it so that refurbishment of the next floor can start.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is the first floor the floor above the ground floor, obviously it is, now the second floor is the one above the first floor, that second floor looks like a demolished area and is being I suppose refurbished and the people from the second floor have now been moved to the fourth floor which I must confess looks very beautiful and nicely refurbished?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes the hon Member might be correct it is just a question of refurbishing a floor and decanting as the process goes along.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister at this stage confirm how many beds there will be available eventually once the refurbishments are completed in April?



**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes, a total of 140.

**NO. 57 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DR GIRALDI HOME**

In relation to the Doctor Giraldi Home, can Government state why two of the senior management at the Social Services Agency responsible for the home, have resigned?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The two resignations in question have come about due to the post-holders' disagreement over a matter of disciplinary procedure.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 57 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

My concern is the welfare of the disabled as I am sure the same will apply to the hon Lady. I just want to make sure in asking that question that if there is anything wrong that has to be put right regarding the disabled in Dr Giraldi Home that it will be done as soon as possible.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I can assure the hon Member that the welfare of the disabled is being considered by me obviously as Minister responsible for the disabled and they are perfectly well looked after. The resignation of these two employees does not affect them in any way.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister saying that these two individuals resigned before disciplinary action could be taken against them, is that what she meant?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Government are not just responsible for the welfare of the users of the home it is also responsible as an employer to ensure that its staff is subject to fair disciplinary process. Disciplinary action was taken against two or three quite junior members of staff not the two that have resigned, in circumstances about which they approached No 6 Convent Place complaining that they had been unfairly treated. The Chief Secretary conducted a thorough review and concluded that indeed they had been unfairly treated in that without going into the merits the Disciplinary Procedures followed were not correct and did not amount to a fair opportunity to address the issues against them. The Chief Secretary therefore directed that they be reinstated and subjected, if necessary, to a proper Disciplinary Procedure in response to which these two more senior members of staff resigned. That is both the chronology and the relationship of the two resignees so to speak.

**NO. 58 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DR GIRALDI HOME**

Can Government state why the respite unit at the Dr Giraldi Home has remained closed since November 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 59 and 60 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 59 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DR GIRALDI HOME**

Can Government state how many individuals applied for respite facilities at Dr Giraldi Home and how many were accommodated giving a breakdown by age and sex for each month of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 58 and 60 of 2004.

**NO. 60 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DR GIRALDI HOME**

Can Government state what has been the total number of residents at Dr Giraldi Home in respect of each month of the year 2003, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No 58 of 2004**

The respite Unit previously operated from Dr Giraldi Home was moved in November 2002 to the Bishop Healy Home situated at Europa Road, after the flooding of the former. Respite provision still remains at Bishop Healy until a decision on the future use of the respite unit at Dr Giraldi is reached.

**Answer to Question No 59 of 2004**

I will now hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 60 of 2004**

I will now hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 59 of 2004**

Month	Applied	Accommodated	Female	20 Years	36 Years	58 Years	Male	6 Years	13 Years	14 Years	15 Years	16 Years	18 Years	19 Years	21 Years	25 Years	27 Years	43 Years
Jan 03	14	14	3	2	Nil	1	11	3	1	Nil	Nil	Nil	2	Nil	3	Nil	Nil	2
Feb 03	23	21	6	3	Nil	3	15	5	Nil	Nil	Nil	2	3	Nil	3	Nil	1	1
Mar 03	20	19	4	2	Nil	2	15	4	Nil	Nil	Nil	2	2	1	3	Nil	1	2
Apr 03	15	13	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	13	1	2	Nil	1	Nil	1	2	2	Nil	1	3
May 03	19	16	3	3	Nil	Nil	13	Nil	1	Nil	Nil	2	3	2	3	Nil	1	1
June 03	18	14	2	2	Nil	Nil	12	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	2	2	4	2	1	Nil	1
July 03	14	10	3	2	1	Nil	7	Nil	2	Nil	Nil	Nil	2	Nil	2	Nil	Nil	1
Aug 03	11	11	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	11	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	3	3	Nil	3	2	Nil	Nil
Sept 03	11	10	1	1	Nil	Nil	9	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	3	1	1	2	Nil	Nil	2
Oct 03	13	10	1	1	Nil	Nil	9	Nil	1	Nil	Nil	1	2	Nil	3	Nil	1	1
Nov 03	16	16	2	1	1	Nil	14	Nil	2	1	Nil	2	2	Nil	3	1	1	2
Dec 03	9	9	1	1	Nil	Nil	8	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	2	2	1	Nil	1	Nil	2

**Answer to Question No 60 of 2004**

	Number of Residents	Female	25 Years	40 Years	45 Years	48 Years	50 Years	51 Years	55 Years	58 Years	Male	7 Years	10 Years	23 Years	30 Years	39 Years	47 Years	54 Years
Jan 03	16	9	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Feb 03	16	9	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mar 03	16	9	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Apr 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
May 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Jun 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Jul 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Aug 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Sep 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Oct 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Nov 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Dec 03	17	10	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 58, 59 AND 60 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Once again I thank the Minister for the information given but there is a lot here so would it be acceptable procedure for me to approach her department or herself at some future date for clarification rather than spend another five minutes studying this?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Certainly.



ORAL

**NO. 61 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY BOARD**

Can Government state how many times has the Social Services Agency Board met during 2003 giving a breakdown of the dates of any meetings?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 62 and 63 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 62 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN CARE**

Can Government state how many children are held in care giving a breakdown by age and sex as at the end of each month of the year 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 61 and 63 of 2004.

**NO. 63 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

Can Government state, out of the £2,250,000 expenditure of the Social Services Agency, how much is earmarked for support for persons with disabilities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No 61 of 2004**

The Social Services Agency Board has met 3 times during 2003. On the 27<sup>th</sup> January 2003, 6<sup>th</sup> May 2003 and 14<sup>th</sup> October 2003.

**Answer to Question No 62 of 2004**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 63 of 2004**

I am not clear whether the hon Member is referring to expenditure relating to Dr Giraldi and services for the disabled, like residential or respite service, St Bernadette's Stay and Play and services of that nature. If this is what he is referring to, it is impossible to give a figure as this is globalised within all the services provided by Social Services. If however, he is referring to the contingency fund under the control of the Principal Secretary Social Affairs, which provides mobility aids for disabled people, £34,000 are budgeted for this purpose.

Month	Number	Female	3 Years	5 Years	9 Years	12 Years	13 Years	14 Years	16 Years	17 Years	Male	3 Years	6 Years	7 Years	8 Years	9 Years	13 Years	16 Years	17 Years
Jan 03	18	9	Nil	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	9	1	1	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
Feb 03	19	10	Nil	1	Nil	1	2	2	2	2	9	1	1	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
Mar 03	19	10	Nil	1	Nil	1	2	2	2	2	9	1	1	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
Apr 03	19	10	Nil	1	Nil	1	2	2	2	2	9	1	1	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
May 03	19	10	Nil	1	Nil	1	2	2	2	2	9	1	1	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
June 03	21	11	1	1	Nil	1	2	2	2	2	10	1	2	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
July 03	21	11	1	1	Nil	1	2	2	2	2	10	1	2	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
Aug 03	21	11	1	1	Nil	1	2	2	2	2	10	1	2	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
Sept 03	21	11	1	1	Nil	1	2	2	2	2	10	1	2	Nil	Nil	3	2	1	1
Oct 03	23	12	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	11	1	2	1	Nil	3	2	1	1
Nov 03	24	13	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	11	1	2	1	Nil	3	2	1	1
Dec 03	25	13	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	2	12	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	1

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I was referring to disabled people in general, the overall picture.

**HON MISS Y DEL AGUA:**

As I said it is impossible to gauge or to extrapolate from the globalised figure given for social services just relating to disabled people. It is impossible to do that.

**NO. 64 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**GASA – SWIMMING POOL**

Can Government state when they expect works to begin on the swimming pool for the disabled to be provisioned at the GASA site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The swimming pool is intended for the elderly and for the disabled. This is a manifesto commitment and so the Government will proceed with it and make public announcements when it is ready to do so.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 64 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the swimming pool be run by Government or will it form part of the facilities run by GASA?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Making due allowance to the fact that the person who actually knows the answer is not here and that I am speaking to you from a distant knowledge I believe that the answer is that whilst the swimming pool is for the use of the elderly and the disabled which I think is in the summer months, it is the responsibility of the Government but whilst it is in the use of GASA for their general training purposes which I think is in the winter months I think it is their responsibility. I think there is some sort of carve-up in time but I cannot be 100 per cent I would urge her not to rely entirely on that and perhaps put it to the honourable and gallant gentleman who is not here at the moment.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Seeing that the hon and gallant Gentleman is not here can I ask the Chief Minister the next supplementary and I accept that the Government might not know it but can the Government confirm when and if the information is correct as the Chief Minister has said that some months it would be GASA run and other months it would be Government run, when it is GASA run will the Government be providing GASA with extra funds in order to be able to run that swimming pool?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know probably they are quite keen just to get hold of it I do not think that they have asked for money on top but I cannot be sure I do not think so but again I will have somebody speak to the hon Lady about it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It will also be interesting for the Opposition to know whether this site is going to be handed over on a lease basis as the previous site was to GASA that would also be interesting if the Government can look into that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have another distant recollection that this is GASA's site it is not a question of leasing it to them it is already their site. It is a case of us building a pool .....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Lease-in pool.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well as the hon Member sitting next to her will tell her *"if you build something on land that is already leased to somebody else you are hard put to argue that the pool is not included in the lease."*

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So then I am correct in assuming that the pool will become the property of GASA?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Leased.

**NO. 65 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state of the persons receiving social assistance in respect of the end of the fourth quarter of 2002 and at the end of each quarter of 2003, how many were registered with the Employment Agency as seeking employment, how many have been employed since and how many are still receiving social assistance giving a breakdown by month, sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 66 to 74 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 66 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving social assistance for the fourth quarter of 2002 and each of the months of 2003 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 65 and 67 to 74 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 67 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE CREDITS**

Can Government state how many men aged 60 years and over were receiving social insurance credits in each month of the year 2003 giving a breakdown detailing how many of these were registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 65, 66 and 68 to 74 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 68 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a disability allowance under the social assistance arrangements for each month of the year 2003 giving a breakdown for each month, their sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 65 to 67 and 69 to 74 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 69 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government state what is the number of the social insurance schedules returned to-date for each quarter of the years 2002 and 2003 to-date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 65 to 68 and 70 to 74 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 70 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**OPEN LONG TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 65 to 69 and 71 to 74 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 71 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts and the months of each transfer for each month in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 65 to 70 and 72 to 74 of 2004.

**NO. 72 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of 2003 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners showing the number of Gibraltar/UK Nationals, Moroccans and other nationalities for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 65 to 71 and 73 to 74 of 2004.

**NO. 73 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each of the months of 2003 showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 65 to 72 and 74 of 2004.

**NO. 74 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The Government remain willing to provide to the Opposition detailed information of this sort which is unprecedented in Gibraltar before 1996. However, given the intense administrative burden of preparing this information within 5 days, I will forward this information in writing to the hon Member within 10 days.



ORAL

**NO. 75 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government confirm how many persons are receiving visits by the domiciliary care service as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, providing a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 76 to 79 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 76 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government confirm whether there is a waiting list in respect of persons deemed to qualify for domiciliary care service as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, providing the number of individuals , broken down by age and sex on any such waiting list?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 75 and 77 to 79 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 77 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government state the name and shareholding of the company to which domiciliary care service has been contracted out, the terms of the contract, and give a breakdown, by nationality of the employees of that company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 75, 76, 78 and 79 of 2003.

ORAL

**NO. 78 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the expression of interest received by the Government for the provision of domiciliary care services, providing a list of the names of the parties that submitted tenders and the terms of each proposed tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 75 to 77 and 79 of 2004.

**NO. 79 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government state the total number of employees as at the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 of the company that provides domiciliary care to the Elderly Care Agency and of these, how many are Gibraltarians and how many are Spanish?

**ANSWER**

**Answer to Question Nos 75, 76, 77 and 79**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 75 of 2004**

41 persons received Domiciliary Care as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003.

19 Males, 29 Females

<b>Age</b>	<b>60-65</b>	<b>66-70</b>	<b>71-75</b>	<b>76-80</b>	<b>81-85</b>	<b>85-90</b>	<b>91-</b>
<b>Males</b>	1	2	2	4	2	1	-
<b>Females</b>	1	1	2	7	8	5	-

**Answer to Question No 76 of 2004**

There is a waiting list for Domiciliary Care Service.

On the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 the Waiting List stood at 45 –

9 Males, 36 Females

Age	60-65	66-70	71-75	76-80	81-85	85-90	91-
<b>Males</b>				2	6	1	-
<b>Females</b>			5	6	17	7	1

**Answer to Question Nos 77 and 79 of 2004**

ADA Company Ltd  
22b Crutchett's Ramp  
Shareholder

50 per cent Mrs Dominguez  
25 per cent Mrs Buttigieg  
25 per cent Mrs M Guerrero

15 months contract.

Total number of employees	Gibraltarian	Spanish
<b>9 Carers</b>	-	9
<b>1 Supervisor</b>	-	1
<b>Management</b>	-	3
<b>Office Staff</b>	-	2

**Answer to Question No 78 of 2004**

Two expressions of interest were received for the provision of domiciliary care:-

ADA Company Ltd - 22 Crutchett's Ramp  
Serviceall Centre Ltd - 230/6 Main Street

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 75 TO 79 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In relation to Question No 78 of 2004 which I think is the one being particularly answered by the Minister not in writing the question also asks at the terms of each proposed tender is the Minister in a position to provide that?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Government do not consider it appropriate to disclose the terms of any tender or expression of interest in this case which has not been accepted.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister confirm that that is in relation to this case or is that the policy of the Government generally?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

It is a policy in general.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister note that in relation to an earlier question by my learned friend in relation to repairs to a wall in the Upper Galleries a breakdown of even unsuccessful tenderers was given and will she therefore reconsider at least whether that is the general policy of the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

She will not. There is nothing that the hon Member can call in aid of the previous issue to that. When Government puts out a tender the Government are happy to give the name and amount of the successful tenderer and the amounts but not the names of the unsuccessful tenderers and that because I think that the hon Members are entitled to know whether the Government have accepted the lowest bid so that if we have not accepted the lowest bids they can exercise their right to scrutinise why we have not accepted the lowest bids which sometimes it happens. There is a difference between giving that sort of information and giving details of unsuccessful expressions of interest which do not relate to monetary matters about bids for services at particular levels. So, the Minister has correctly stated the Government's policy and there is no inconsistency between her answer to the hon Member on this occasion and the breakdown given to the Hon Dr Garcia both in which questions relate to wholly different types of issue.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Nonetheless would the Minister address her mind to Question No 77 of 2004 which asks also what the terms of the contract contracted are given that that part of my question has not been replied to?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I believe that part of his question has been answered by stating that it is a 15 month contract. The other terms of the contract I believe are too numerous to mention across the floor in this House.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister consider providing a copy of the other terms?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. It is not the policy or the practice of this or of any other Government, other Governments indeed have had wholly different practices, it is not the policy of the Government to make available copies of all the commercial contracts that it signs. The hon Member is entitled to ask the Government specific questions about the principal areas of the contracts if he wants to know for how long, what the rate is, he should ask specific questions but he cannot expect to have access to Government's commercial documentation in the sense of providing copies. If that were to be extended to all contracts that the Government signs then this would be terribly onerous and burdensome and it has never been the practice it has to be said to give even as much information as we give but we do try to give as much as is possible.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Nonetheless I am referring now to the schedule kindly provided by the Minister, is she satisfied by the fact that none of the employees of ADA Company Ltd which her schedule refers to are Gibraltarians?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

The company is a Spanish company registered in Gibraltar and all its employees are generic to the company. They came with the company and unfortunately no other expression of interest received met the requirements or the needs of the ECA to provide this kind of service in the community.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Minister on what she bases the suggestion that this is a Spanish company given that the information provided to me by her is that this company is called ADA Company Ltd thereby suggesting that it is a Gibraltarian company and that the shareholding does not reflect ownership by a Spanish SL or SA and in fact it is in the personal names of three individuals?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister has not said that, the hon Lady has said that this is a Spanish company registered in Gibraltar by which the hon Member must at least deduce that it is a Gibraltar company owned by Spaniards. ADA Company Ltd established in Gibraltar can only be a Gibraltar company or a company at least incorporated in some Anglo-Saxon jurisdiction, I suppose it could have been a company incorporated somewhere else where they use the limited in that sense and established in Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In which case I am sure the Chief Minister will agree with me that it cannot adequately be described as a Spanish company.....



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think she has.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Then, would the Minister or the Chief Minister, given his interventions, state whether they are satisfied that this company employs no Gibraltarians?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

The reason why they do not employ Gibraltarians at this moment in time I understand is because the qualifications that they require of their employees no Gibraltarian that has applied, because Gibraltarians obviously have a right to apply for any post or vacancies that they open, have the required qualifications.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister indicate what qualifications if any the Elderly Care Agency require this company that provides employees to it to ensure that its employees have?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I can say that one of the terms of the contract that the hon Member was referring to before states that all careworkers will be expected to have qualifications or recognised experience in care of the elderly.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister therefore saying that she is satisfied with the explanation provided to her by ADA Ltd that there are only at this stage Spaniards with those relevant qualifications who make up the total of 15 employees employed by this company and no Gibraltarians with those qualifications?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I am satisfied that the Elderly Care Agency who is responsible ultimately for delivering the service is satisfied in itself and I must say that the delivery of the service is appreciated by all the members in the community who are receiving it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

There is absolutely no question of the Opposition questioning that.

**NO. 80 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**DRUG REHABILITATION PROGRAMME**

Can Government state whether there has been any increase in the number of employers participating in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No 81 of 2004.

**NO. 81 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****DRUG REHABILITATION PROGRAMME**

Can Government state whether there has been any increase in the number of persons that have been placed in employment, giving a breakdown by age and sex, in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

There has been an increase if one might call it an increase because in my previous answer there were no people participating in the scheme as it has just been approved but since then there has been an increase of five employers in the Wage Subsidy Pilot Scheme and an increase of five employees placed in employment with the assistance of the Wage Subsidy Pilot Scheme broken down as follows:-

Age 18	-	0 Males
Age 18 – 24	-	1 Male
25+	-	4 Males
Total		5 Males

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 80 AND 81 OF 2004****HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister clarify an increase in the number of employers and employees or only employees?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Employers and employees.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So we have a situation as we had last time I think it was her colleague at the time the Minister for Employment the Hon Mr Corby, who had clarified that there were four employers and four employees, now we have gone up to nine and nine just for clarification?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

That is correct.

**NO. 82 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government state what is the latest forecast expenditure in the current financial year for the Elderly Care Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The forecast expenditure for 2003/2004 of the Elderly Care Agency is as follows:

Total recurrent	£3,432,625
Total Capital	£ 150,000
Trust Fund Expenditure	£1,751,457

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 82 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the figure is not far out from the original estimate but is slightly above the recurrent expenditure is it likely that it will mean a slightly higher contribution from Head 5A Consolidated Fund contribution to the Agency in the current year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. That is the only source of funding to the Elderly Care Agency in respect of overspends.

ORAL

**NO. 83 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Is there a requirement, on the part of the Elderly Care Agency that its employees should be resident in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Questions 84 to 87 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 84 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government say how many Spanish nationals are employed in the Elderly Care Agency with a breakdown by position held and the comparable figure for Gibraltarians?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 83 and 85 to 87 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 85 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government say how many Spanish nationals are employed in the Elderly Care Agency with a breakdown by position held and the comparable figures for Gibraltarians, as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 84, 86 and 87 of 2004.



**NO. 86 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can the Minister for Social Services now confirm, as she undertook to do in reply to supplementary questions arising out of Question No 28 of 2003, whether there were Gibraltarian applicants who were unsuccessful in filling the vacancies with the Elderly Care Agency which have been filled by Spanish nationals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 83 to 85 and 87 of 2004.

**NO. 87 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can the Minister for Social Services now confirm, as she undertook to do in reply to supplementary questions arising out of Question No 28 of 2003, that the vacancies that had been filled by March 2003 in the Elderly Care Agency were opened initially with the Employment and Training Agency and that the Spanish nationals who were successful in filling a number of those vacancies, applied for those vacancies through the ETB?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No 83 of 2004**

Yes. Although applications are accepted from non residents who are in possession of the relevant qualifications. This happens primarily with posts for staff nurses where there are non available locally.

**Answer to Question Nos 84 and 85 of 2004**

I will now hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested in Question Nos 84 and 85 of 2004.

The total number of staff as at December 2003 is 45.

The total number Spanish nationals employed is 23.

<b>Trained Nursing Staff</b>	<b>Spanish</b>	<b>Gibraltar/Other Total Complement</b>	
<b>Registered general nurses</b>	4	18	22
<b>Nursing Assistants</b>	13	58	71
<b>Cooks</b>	1	2	3
<b>Assistant Cooks</b>	2	3	5
<b>Domestics</b>	3	16	19
<b>Other Grades*</b>	-	25	25

**\*Example**

Administration/Catering Manager/Physiotherapist/Domiciliary Care Co-ordinator/  
Industrial Technician/Maintenance/Operative/Laundress/Storeman/Seamstress/Labourer.

**Answer to Question No 86 of 2004**

Since the ECA took over there has only been one Gibraltarian who has been unsuccessful in filling a vacancy against a Spanish national. The Gibraltarian in question was unable to meet the working hours.

**Answer to Question No 87 of 2004**

All ECA vacancies are initially opened with the ETB and advertised in the local newspapers, as I informed the Leader of the Opposition by letter dated 9<sup>th</sup> June, 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 83 TO 87 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In answer to Question No 83 did I understand the Minister correctly when she answered yes is there a requirement on the part of the Elderly Care Agency that its employees should be resident in Gibraltar?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

The answer was 'Yes' but I did go on to mention that applications are accepted from non-residents when there are non locally to fill specific posts.

**NO. 88 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

Can Government state what is the latest forecast out-turn for expenditure in the current financial year for the Social Services Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The latest forecast out-turn for expenditure in the current financial year for the Social Services Agency is £3,200,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 88 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

This is compared to the estimate of £2,300,000?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has there been additional work or activities taken on by the agency since the beginning of this financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are several departments of Government where expenditure is demand led which are serious over spenders as the hon Member will see when he gets the figures for the current financial year compared with the estimates. The problem is that in an attempt to impose discipline in control of expenditure and in curtailing increases in recurrent annual expenditure the Financial and Development Secretary when departments submit the original bid at the beginning of the year for the next financial year's budget as is happening now, for example, in respect for the forthcoming year, eliminates provision, reduces the bid and makes a provision in the estimates and then the department appears to proceed to spend the money anyway. There is much to be done in persuading the departments that they must exercise the budgetary discipline that the approved budget is intended to impose on them.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am aware of the syndrome the Chief Minister is explaining but it is just that it is difficult in the context of this particular department because demand led in the area of the Social Services Agency, that is why I asked if it meant that they had taken on additional activities subsequent at the beginning of the financial year which had not been foreseen and the other point is that if one looks at the original estimates two thirds are personal emoluments so it is difficult to see that being cut back or subsequently increased.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Apart from the reason that the Chief Minister has just given there is a combination of other factors in the area that the hon Member has described, for example, there has been 66 per cent increase of children taken into care which obviously increases provision considerably. A greater demand in the respite services offered at Dr Giraldi Home and apart from that also there is the fact that what were previously Millbury employees and are now Agency employees were offered a package of measures which they obviously accepted which included better pay conditions, better allowances and obviously all that increases the budget as well.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Obviously this is Question Time and I do not want to slip into the budget debate but I thought that had already been worked into those estimates at the time. I would have thought that at the time of last year's budget the Millbury thing was out of the way already?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

At the time that the last estimates were prepared the Agency had only been in operation for six weeks so it is very difficult to gauge. We could give an approximate state of expenditure but it would be very difficult to gauge exactly what the expenditure would be.

**NO. 89 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can Government give a breakdown for the number of pensioners in receipt of the Minimum Income Guarantee, showing the number receiving the single and married couple rates in bands of £5 up to the full amount as at December 2003?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS****Persons In Receipt of Minimum Income Guarantee As At 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003**

	£		£	ALL No		Couple No		Singles No
<b>From</b>	120.00	<b>To</b>	115.00	3		3		Nil
<b>From</b>	115.00	<b>To</b>	110.00	Nil		Nil		Nil
<b>From</b>	110.00	<b>To</b>	105.00	Nil		Nil		Nil
<b>From</b>	105.00	<b>To</b>	100.00	Nil		Nil		Nil
<b>From</b>	100.00	<b>To</b>	95.00	Nil		Nil		Nil
<b>From</b>	95.00	<b>To</b>	90.00	2		2		Nil
<b>From</b>	90.00	<b>To</b>	85.00	8		Nil		8
<b>From</b>	85.00	<b>To</b>	80.00	2		Nil		2
<b>From</b>	80.00	<b>To</b>	75.00	Nil		Nil		Nil
<b>From</b>	75.00	<b>To</b>	70.00	3		Nil		3
<b>From</b>	70.00	<b>To</b>	65.00	2		Nil		2
<b>From</b>	65.00	<b>To</b>	60.00	1		Nil		1
<b>From</b>	60.00	<b>To</b>	55.00	27		2		25
<b>From</b>	55.00	<b>To</b>	50.00	2		1		1
<b>From</b>	50.00	<b>To</b>	45.00	4		Nil		4
<b>From</b>	45.00	<b>To</b>	40.00	5		1		4
<b>From</b>	40.00	<b>To</b>	35.00	14		2		12
<b>From</b>	35.00	<b>To</b>	30.00	17		Nil		17
<b>From</b>	30.00	<b>To</b>	25.00	17		Nil		17
<b>From</b>	25.00	<b>To</b>	20.00	35		1		34
<b>From</b>	20.00	<b>To</b>	15.00	25		2		23
<b>From</b>	15.00	<b>To</b>	10.00	236		1		235
<b>From</b>	10.00	<b>To</b>	5.00	16		Nil		16
<b>From</b>	5.00	<b>To</b>	0.00	18		4		14
				<b>437</b>		<b>19</b>		<b>418</b>

**NO. 90 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can the Minister for Social Services state what the amount of 'pocket-money' she referred to in her answer to Question No 16 of 2003 is in cases where the minimum income guarantee is reduced or withdrawn as a result of hospitalisation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 89 and 91 to 93 of 2004.

**NO. 91 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can the Minister for Social Services now confirm the number of cases referred to by her in answer to supplementary questions arising from Question No 16 of March 2003 for the period up to March 2003 of persons who have had the relevant amount of minimum income guarantee withheld or reduced as a result of their hospitalisation for a period in excess of 13 weeks, and give the figure for the amount of reduction in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos 90 and 92 of 2004.



**NO. 92 OF 2004****THE HON C A BRUZON****MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can the Minister for Social Services provide the number of persons for the period since March 2003 to date of persons who have had the relevant amount of the minimum income guarantee withheld or reduced as a result of their hospitalisation for a period in excess of 13 weeks, and give the figure for the amount of reduction in each case?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS****Answer to Question No 90 of 2004**

A pocket-money allowance of £15.00 a week or an amount that will top-up the pensioner's income to £15.00 is payable if the Minimum Income Guarantee is withdrawn as a result of hospitalisation.

**Answer to Question Nos 91 and 92 of 2004**

I will now hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 91 and 92 of 2004**

Relevant cases whose Minimum Income guarantee payments have been withheld or reduced for period up to end of March 2003.

<b>Claimants</b>	<b>Entitlement</b>	<b>Reduced</b>	<b>Withheld</b>
1	£0.70		£0.70
1	£35.05		£35.05
1	£20.55		£20.55

Relevant cases whose Minimum Income guarantee payments have been withheld or reduced since March 2003 to date

<b>Claimants</b>	<b>Entitlement</b>	<b>Reduced</b>	<b>Withheld</b>
1	£56.80	£41.80	
1	£56.80	£41.80	
1	£56.80	£41.80	
1			£9.00

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 90-92 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Was the figure quoted £16 to £50, did I understand correctly?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The figure was £15.

**NO. 93 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can Government state what is the latest estimated expenditure for the elderly persons Minimum Income Guarantee in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list for Question No 89 of 2004. The latest estimated expenditure for the elderly persons minimum income guarantee in the current financial year is £500,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 89 AND 93 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the amount which is below the budget that was provided which was £550,000 and we have been told that it is £500,000 is that right?

**HON MISS Y DEL AGUA:**

I did not actually query it but I noticed it myself and I believe that if one adds up all the sums shown in the list it actually comes up to £550,000 and not £500,000.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is to the end of December, the budget figure is to the end of March.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the numbers are the ones provided by the hon Member for the position until the end of December still based on the original criteria that there had to be people living with a pensioner couple or another pensioner or has there been any change in that criteria as at December?

**HON MISS Y DEL AGUA:**

There has still not been any change.

ORAL

**NO. 94 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – POST-WAR HOUSES – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, how many tenants of post-war housing units are on rent relief and how much has been spent from the £455,000 provided for in the Social Assistance Fund Appendix 'H' to date in respect of these post-war properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No 95 of 2004.

**NO. 95 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR HOUSES – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, how many pre-war housing units are on rent relief and how much has been spent from the £455,000 provided for in the Social Assistance Fund Appendix 'H' to date in respect of these pre-war properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question Nos 94 and 95 of 2004**

A total of 513 tenants are in post-war and 43 in pre-war housing.

A total of £341,250.03 has been spent from the £455,000 Social Assistance Fund as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003.

ORAL

**NO. 96 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the formula in place as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 to determine eligibility for rent relief and the amount payable in respect thereof?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 97 to 103 of 2004

ORAL

**NO. 97 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government confirm that the rent relief scheme also applies to rent controlled private sector tenants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 96 and 98 to 103 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 98 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state whether there are any tenants in private rented accommodation currently receiving rent relief?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 96, 97 and 99 to 103 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 99 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households on rent relief that had this terminated during the financial year 2002/2003 and how many households have had this terminated in the current financial year 2003/2004 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 96 and 100 to 103 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 100 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that had the level of rent relief reduced for the financial year 2002/2003 and how many households have had this benefit reduced in the current financial year 2003/2004 to date

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 96 to 99 and 101 to 103 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 101 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households on full rent relief for the financial year 2002/2003 and how many households have been assessed as entitled to receive the full amount for the financial year 2003/2004 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 96 to 100, 102 and 103 of 2004.

**NO. 102 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households applying for rent relief for the financial year 2002/2003, the final number approved and the comparable figures for the current financial year to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 96 to 101 and 103 of 2004.

**NO. 103 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that were receiving rent relief in the financial year 2002/2003 and the comparable figure for the current financial year to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No 96 of 2004**

The formula is shown on the attachment which I shall now hand over to the hon Member. The amount payable is the balance remaining after deducting the rent relief awarded from the full weekly rent.

**Procedure for Calculating Rent Relief for Tenants Residing in Government Flats**

1. Add all Gross Income declared within the same household. Multiply by 12 and then divide by 52.2 to calculate the Gross Weekly Income per Household.
2. Subtract all applicable allowances from total.
  - (a) Married **over** 65 years = £64.00
  - (b) Single **over** 65 years = £46.00
  - (c) Married **under** 65 years = £57.90
  - (d) Single **under** 65 years = £36.80
3. When amount has been obtained multiply by 25 per cent. This amount represents the new weekly rent payable by the tenant.
4. Ultimately should the applicant declare their children on the application a further £0.60 is then deducted from the total obtained in paragraph 3.

**Answer to Question No 97 of 2004**

I confirm that the Rent Relief Scheme also applies to rent controlled private sector tenants.

**Answer to Question No 98 of 2004**

A total of nine tenants on rent controlled accommodation are currently in receipt of rent relief.

**Answer to Question No 99 of 2004**

A total of 11 households have had their rent relief terminated in 2002/2003, which 10 have had theirs terminated in 2003/2004 to date.

**Answer to Question No 100 of 2004**

I confirm that a total of 112 households have had their rent relief reduced for 2002/2003, whilst a total of 145 have had their rent relief reduced in the year 2003/2004 to date.

**Answer to Question No 101 of 2004**

I can confirm that a total of 109 households were on rent relief in 2002/2003, whilst 71 were on rent relief in 2003/2004 to date.

**Answer to Question No 102 of 2004**

I confirm that up to 113 applications have been received for the year 2002/2003 of which 96 were approved, 13 rejected and four pending. Similarly, for 2003/2004 to date up to 81 applications have been received of which 63 were approved and 18 rejected.

**Answer to Question No 103 of 2004**

The final figure of households in receipt of rent relief for 2002/2003 is 889 whilst for 2003/2004 to date there are 775.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 96 TO 103 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In connection with the answer given by the Minister to Question No 102 of 2004 what is the criteria for rejecting or accepting the matter of rent relief?

**HON J J NETTO:**

The answer to that question is in relation to the answer given in Question No 96 of 2004, it depends on the household income then the formula which I have supplied is taken into account in terms of the income within that particular household, that formula is applied and that formula determines whether someone gets a full rent relief or a partial rent relief.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Apart from the formula is there any other criteria or is it just purely on a financial and statistical way in which the Minister has set it out.

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes the hon Member is correct.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is a fully objective and mathematical criteria and formula nothing else?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes that is correct. I should also add that this is a discretionary benefit but other than that it is basically on the mathematics of it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is discretionary but if one comes within the mathematics of it there is little chance of getting confused.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No 102 can I just clarify the figures because they do not seem to add up unless there are some that are still pending. We were given 113 applicants of which 96 were approved and 13 were rejected, there are some missing there and then we were given 81 applicants of which 63 were approved and eight were rejected there is also a number missing there, are those pending consideration or...?

**HON J J NETTO:**

In relation as to whether they add up this is the information that has been given by my administration staff but in relation to the hon Member's second supplementary as to why they were rejected obviously it is because the mathematics did not add up but in relation to the first one these are the figures that have been given.



**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister clarify it for us?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes.

~~~~~

**HON J J NETTO:**

With your indulgence Mr Speaker could I very quickly go back to Question No 102 of 2003. I can confirm that it is 113 applications that have been received for the year 2002 and 2003 of which 96 were approved as stated and 13 rejected but what I have missed to point out the fact that there were four remaining pending simply because they had asked for further information which had not bring brought back to the office.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the clarification just made by the hon Member the second figure that he gave which was 81, 63 applications and eight rejected also did not add up. The total of 63 and eight rejected did not add up to 81.

**HON J J NETTO:**

It was 18 rejected not eight.

ORAL

**NO. 104 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state as at the end of December 2003 how many private sector properties were rent controlled and occupied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No 105 of 2004.

**NO. 105 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state as at the end of December 2003 how many private sector properties were rent controlled and un-occupied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The Ministry for Housing has sought to find the number of rent controlled private sector properties, both occupied and unoccupied but regrettably, this information is not available.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 104 AND 105 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In view of that response can the Minister then tell us how they can say in their electoral manifesto that empty private properties will be available to solve the housing problem?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I think that is not quite correct what the GSD said in these elections what they did say was that the information that we have derived from the Associations of Landlords is that there are a number of empty flats lying empty but whether the resolution of the housing problem is one which is far more generic as to the number of empty flats in the private sector it is a combination of many factors one of which is this one but not the only one.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That with respect is not what is stated in the manifesto and I have heard what the Chief Minister said before about the manifesto but just on a point of information what the manifesto says is this reform relating to the Landlords and Tenants Ordinance will release hundreds of empty private sector flats onto the affordable rental market. Will the Minister confirm in his view these reforms will release hundreds of empty private sector flats and on what basis he reaches that judgement if he does not know how many are empty?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I can confirm that what the Association of Private Landlords have told us is that there are hundreds of empty flats but at the same time I can tell him that the information that we are trying to seek from them is so fragmented in terms of individual landlords that they themselves do not have an asset register to be able to count scientifically the number of empty flats. So, given that I am not the landlord of the private sector I am not in their shoes to be able to determine how many private sector properties there are standing empty.

**NO. 106 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state what they consider to be the level of rent in the 'affordable rental market' in the private sector for residential use?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The Government will announce their reforms of the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance when they are ready to do so. Affordability varies from person to person depending on wealth and income.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 106 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I understand that the Government will make their reforms known when it is ready but will the hon Gentleman at least give us an indication in relation to properties, rental properties, what the Government consider to be affordable for the Government to provide and in the private residential market what do Government consider is an affordable level of rent.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are implicit in the answer that Government are not willing to give that indication ahead of announcing their reforms of the Landlords and Tenants Ordinance.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Chief Minister at least give an indication of what the Government's thinking is even if he is not prepared to give a figure what it is that the Government are going to be careful to ensure that people can afford?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member can vary the formulation of the question marginally as many times as he likes, the substantive answer is the same. I do not think governments are obliged to share with Opposition parties their thought processes leading up to a policy which has not yet been announced. I think Government are entitled to do their thinking in private and when it is ready to announce its policy to announce its policy. The idea that we should debate hypothetically and in advance one strand of a policy which is under review is not something which is helpful because it simply starts all manner of speculation before it can be viewed in the context of the remainder of the regime that the reform will introduce. I do not say that that is the reason why the hon Member asks it but that might be the unintended effect of putting information in the public domain in isolation of the context in which it would actually be implemented and deployed, for example, will there be rent relief differences, what will the terms be of any tenancy at particular rents? All this is vital in assessing whether it is a reasonable or unreasonable proposition. The rent by itself can only serve as a headline.

ORAL

**NO. 107 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**EDINBURGH HOUSE**

Can Government state how many tenants at Edinburgh House are on rent relief as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

A total of 19 tenants were in receipt of rent relief as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003.

**NO. 108 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state how many private sector flats are presently empty?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

This information is not available.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 108 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As I understand it the answer that the Minister has given is the same answer in relation to Question No 107 and Question No 108 of 2004?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Correct.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is the same question.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

With respects it is not the same question, Question No 107 relates to rent relief and how many of the people are on rent relief at Edinburgh House and Question No 108 relates to private sector flats. Taking the Minister's earlier answer in relation to rent control private sector properties et cetera we have to accept that that information is



not available that is what he told us before that no such register exists but in relation to No 107 of 2004 will the Minister not agree with me that if he has given us the figure of people on rent relief can he not just look at the addresses of all of those in receipt of it and determine the number of them who live at Edinburgh House? I would have thought it is a very easy calculation.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He has given the answer.

**NO. 109 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – VACANT FLATS**

Can Government state how many Government housing units are vacant which have been declared void, giving a breakdown of address and room composition and the date that each of these properties became vacant and whether each of the properties is pre or post-war?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

This is a question which is difficult to answer with a full degree of accuracy due to the lack of attention given to this subject in the past. Since the GSD Government introduced additional personnel within the Ministry for Housing to conduct a Register of Government properties, we can say that there are:-

- (a) a total of 56 in the system awaiting refurbishment by either Buildings and Works or the Electricity Authority;
- (b) 80 properties requiring major extensive refurbishment;
- (c) a total of 166 properties identified for possible demolition.

I am afraid that I am not able to give the hon Member the precise details of the addresses since this could be used and targeted by squatters. With regards to room composition, internal condition surveys have not been undertaken. The information requested as to the dates when these became vacant is not available from our records. With regards to the breakdown between pre or post-war. I will make this available to him in due course, once the information has been done administratively.

Finally, there is an impression that there are supposedly many vacant Government flats. The figures above give an approximate indication as to their status. However, these figures will fluctuate continuously, as and when dwellings are processed internally through Buildings and Works and/or the Electricity Authority. In addition, that is not to say that maybe there are cases whereby some Government tenants have decided to purchase alternative accommodation elsewhere, or the fact that some tenants are housed elsewhere on social or medical grounds. The fact is that this is a complex variable to measure.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 109 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Would the Minister consider giving the Opposition the information in confidence concerning the addresses?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If their only concern was not to encourage squatters are they concerned that one of the seven Members or relatives might squat in one of these flats?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know what need might any of the hon Members have to squat in due course but certainly as valued Members of this House certainly the Government will always relieve them of the need to have to resort to squatting we would not like the dignity of the Members of this parliament to be tarnished in that sort of way. The whole question of these voids which was the original question is fraught with difficulty, what the Minister for Housing meant when he said in the original answer given the little attention that has been given to this in the past it was not actually a side swipe at the immediately previous GSLP administration going back post-war administrations properties were abandoned, demolished, the concept of void properties is a financial control mechanism. When the Government's Accountants stopped rent being collected from properties where they were once collected they are declared void its income is no longer coming in but that does not mean that they are no longer available for rental they could have over the years simply ceased to exist and the appropriate entry has not been made or the appropriate information has not been communicated to the book keepers so, the real debate is how many rentable properties or how many properties subject to refurbishment or preparation for rental are still regarded as rentable by the Government and are lying there unrented due to delays in Government being able to do that. In the context of a debate on Housing that really is the statistic that we should be interested in, "*How many houses which might be rented out if the Government only proceeded with their normal repair are there available lying empty?*" To talk of void and things like this throws up a number which is completely meaningless in the concept of housing availability as such. Prefer not to give even confidentially the addresses. I might try to persuade the hon Member to identify those houses which are vacant which form part of the active housing stock. The houses which are in the normal system of Buildings and Works, the 56, I do not think that there can be any, he might have a different view but I will try to persuade him that there is no reason why he should not give you confidentially the addresses of the 56 because those are in the system so to speak but as far as properties requiring major extensive refurbishment where the Government might decide not to do the major refurbishment or perhaps sell them rather than repair them, or to the properties identified for possible demolition we would prefer not to hand out that information. So, if they would settle for the ones which are

unquestionably still in the housing stock that we could possibly strike a bargain on that concept.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Referring to the answer of Question 71 of 2003 which dealt not with voids but that is where the issue of voids first came up in the supplementary from Mr Baldachino, there the Chief Minister did refer us in relation to vacant properties not to the addresses but at least to the areas, can we have the areas at least to continue the statistic going forward as it was provided previously?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I said I will try and persuade the Minister to give you the addresses of the 56 at least.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the Chief Minister is successful can he also try and convince him to give the room composition of the 56?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes I will try my luck.

**HON J J NETTO:**

In relation to the 80 properties requiring major extensive refurbishment and the 160 properties identified for possible demolition generally speaking but not exclusively most of them will be in the Upper Town but not all of it.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Do those figures apply to the 100 that were announced before the elections to be sold on or is this separate? The Chief Minister mentioned that some might be sold but what I am saying here is do the 100 that were announced at the time, are these numbers part of that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**NO. 110 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – SOUTH DISTRICT**

Can Government state if they have any plans to provide affordable local housing in the South District and if so whether this will be for homeownership or rental?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

When and if Government had any such plans they would announce the fact at an appropriate time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 110 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether they are envisaging to have any plans within the four years of this term of office?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I know that the hon Lady and Gentlemen in Opposition are determined to pretend that there has not just been a general election and therefore I suppose as a consequence of that they ignore things that are said. Government have just published a manifesto in which they have identified their housing schemes. Government have made public statements identifying the locations of its various planned housing schemes, three weeks later to ask the Government whether it has plans to build housing in sites which have not been identified in the manifesto or in any of those public statements is a somewhat curious thing which I think is a product of their failures to take account of the fact that an election has just taken place. The Government do not presently have any plans to build houses in the South District which is not to say that at some stage during the next four years the Government

may develop such plans but they do not exist now even as a possible project although the Government are aware that there are several sites in the South District which lend themselves to development in several different types of way but they are not amongst those of our housing scheme plans which are sufficiently in existence to be able to say that they Government plans anything. There are no plans in that respect.

ORAL

**NO. 111 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NORTH MOLE ROAD**

Can Government now state how many people have registered their interest on a 'no commitment basis' so far for the flats to be built at North Mole Road, given the answer to Question No 418 of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 112 to 114 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 112 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NORTH MOLE ROAD**

Can Government state at what price it anticipates the flats to be constructed at the site at North Mole Road will be sold and what will be the price per square metre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 111, 113 and 114 of 2004



**NO. 113 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NORTH MOLE ROAD**

Can Government confirm that the site at North Mole Road used by a local company for the storage of vehicles in bond is the same site they intend to use for part of their housing programme in that area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No 111, 112 and 114 of 2004.

**NO. 114 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NORTH MOLE ROAD**

Can Government state what height restrictions apply to their proposed housing project at North Mole Road as a result of its proximity to the airfield and how many floors will the buildings have?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No 111 of 2004**

A total of 1,422 people have registered their interest on a ‘*no commitment*’ basis?

**Answer to Question No 112 of 2004**

Government are not yet in a position to announce information about the sale prices of their homeownership flats to be constructed.

**Answer to Question No 113 of 2004**

As previously announced publicly on several occasions the proposed housing scheme site at North Mole Road is the “Sands Site” currently used for storage of vehicles in bond.

**Answer to Question No 114 of 2004**

The usual MOD airfield height restrictions apply. This has been incorporated into the design of the project, so that the number of floors varies depending on distance from the runway.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 111 TO 114 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No 113 of 2004 given that the local company is a large organisation and a substantial employer in Gibraltar have the Government offered an alternative site where the storage of vehicles can now take place?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, of course, unless the hon Member thought that we would just boot them out so that the economic activity would have to come to an end I think he can safely assume that there are both short term and long term arrangements in place. The company in question is talking to the Government about a permanent development on a new site to accommodate not just their existing business but indeed some expansion plans that they have. In the immediate short term because it is inevitable that the Government will wish access to the existing site which incidentally they only hold on licence before that long term arrangement is likely to be in place the Government will lend them the space to park their vehicles in the forecourt and inside the components factory site as an immediate substitute for the Sands areas but that is only intended as interim because there are other proposals under consideration.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister clarify when he uses the word lend he means licence in real estate terms?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister for Housing confirm when he talks about the usual restrictions on the actual floors of the buildings, can he confirm what actual floors there will be and if there are more than five if the Government intend to put lifts in all of the floors?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I can confirm that the MOD restrictions will apply so that will be taken into account and I can also confirm that the building will have lifts.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But he cannot confirm at this stage how many floors the buildings will have?

**HON J J NETTO:**

It varies from five to eleven, five being the one nearest and eleven the one further away.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I suppose the eleven will be facing the west I am correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Facing north.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That is the west.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

North is the airport, that is where the highest ones are going to be?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The lowest ones the highest ones will be the furthest from the airfield at the back by the road.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No 113 of 2004 and the answer given by the Minister is it the case that this arrangement with the company has now been concluded or is this under discussion?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

A short term arrangement has been concluded, they have agreed to vacate the Sands on seven days notice and the Government have agreed to provide them with immediate alternative parking space. The long term proposal is still under discussion. They have put up a very good scheme which the Government are quite keen on and all else being possible Government would like to facilitate it, it is a good scheme.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm or perhaps he has actually made reference but I did not hear him, whether the flats will be made available on a rental basis or on a 50/50 scheme or both?

**HON J J NETTO:**

They will be sold they will not be on a rental basis on the Sands site. The ones on the Sands site will be for homeownership.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is one development which occupies the whole of the sands site and as I indicated earlier in answer to a question about parking, the extreme western end of the car park just at the end of the coach park beyond the little wall, those are going to be built up too. On that site that is to say on the side across the slip road so to speak attached to the coach park, on that side there will be homes for rental to elderly people and also some homes for sale but all the houses on the sands site are for sale.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

But those which are for sale will be available on a 50/50 basis yes or no that is the issue?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**NO. 115 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING WAITING LIST**

Can Government state on how many occasions has the Housing Waiting List been published in 2003, providing the dates of each publication?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The Housing Waiting List was published four times during the year 2003. The dates of each publication are 4<sup>th</sup> February, 6<sup>th</sup> May, 7<sup>th</sup> August and 19<sup>th</sup> December 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 115 OF 2003**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is there any reason why the publication does not occur with any degree of regularity, for example, at the end of each quarter?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No reason at all. What we try to aim is to have it published four times in the year but .....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

With some regularity, the second month of each quarter.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case perhaps the Chief Minister is telling me that they would have been published with a total degree of regularity in the second month of each quarter except for the election in the fourth quarter of last year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We did not want to obtain an unfair advantage by publishing the much improved housing list.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It was the opposite.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Having to accept as he did after the election that he had a housing crisis on his hands.

**NO. 116 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – LAGUNA ESTATE**

Can Government now confirm that all remedial and beautification work schemes listed by the Minister for Housing in answer to Question No 84 of 2003, had been completed at Laguna Estate by April 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

All works to Laguna Estate were officially completed on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 116 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister confirm that that is a slippage of almost three weeks in respect of the date which he had indicated to the House the works would be finished on, which was the end of April 2003.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If in fact that there is a public procurement contract of this sort which has been subject to a slippage of only three weeks I wish to be the first to congratulate my hon friend.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am sure the Chief Minister will recall that that was already a slippage of some months and that the revised predicted date was April.



**HON J J NETTO:**

The hon Member seems to be forgetting one important factor and that is that there were additions to the contract which obviously had to be taken into account.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In respect of those additions a new predicted date was given which was not met only by three weeks.

**HON J J NETTO:**

Should he not be quite grateful that we have done it in six weeks then?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is not for me to be grateful for anything but I just pointed out the issue?

**NO. 117 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – BISHOP CANILLA HOUSE**

Can Government state whether, as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, there are any vacant flats at Bishop Canilla House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, there were no vacant flats at Bishop Canilla House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

May I just add to that answer so that the hon Member may not be misled, that there are no vacant flats for rental. The hon Member may be aware that one flat is being used as a social club by the tenants association and therefore is not rented out it is unoccupied by a tenant but it has been deployed for some time now for over a year now as a community area for the communal area for all the tenants.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION 117 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The reason for my question is that when I went round Bishop Canilla before the elections to speak to the senior citizens there, I think Hon Dr Joseph Garcia accompanied me, we were told, “there is nobody living there ,” in one floor, “..there is nobody living there anymore...” the impression we got from the tenants themselves maybe they were mistaken .....

**HON J J NETTO:**

I can assure him that there are no vacant flats.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What the hon Gentleman might like to notice is that they did not give us a party when we went to see them.

**NO. 118 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HEAD 101 - HOUSING**

Can Government state how much of the amount provided in Head 101 in respect of housing has been spent in each month of the year 2003 and providing a breakdown of what projects any money has been expended?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I can provide a breakdown of costs per project for the year ending 2003, as similarly provided in the past. The analysis of the amount spent during this period is set out in the attached schedule that I now hand to the hon Member. However, I regret not being able to provide a more detailed monthly breakdown since it is felt that this information would be considered commercially sensitive by the private sector.

## Answer to Question No 118 of 2004

### Head 101 – Housing

|    |                                                   |                   |
|----|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | Major Remedial works and Repairs to Housing Stock |                   |
|    |                                                   | £                 |
|    | Window Replacement                                | 355,204           |
|    | Scaffolding                                       | 252,209           |
|    | Laguna Estate                                     | 251,572           |
|    | St Joseph's Stairs                                | 31,504            |
|    | 16 George's Lane                                  | 50,490            |
|    | Carillion/Estimating Project                      | 44,787            |
|    | Scud Hill House                                   | 290,905           |
|    | Edinburgh House                                   | 28,431            |
|    | Coelho House                                      | 62,896            |
|    | Heathfield House                                  | 35,408            |
|    | Tankerville & Prison Quarters                     | 267,856           |
|    | Government Loans                                  | 64,676            |
|    | Belvedere & Electra Flats                         | 586,214           |
|    | Alameda Estate Lifts                              | 308,796           |
|    | Varyl Begg Estate Phase 1                         | 1,064,206         |
|    | Varyl Begg Estate Phase 2                         | 41,301            |
|    | Rosia and Vineyards House                         | 368,164           |
|    | Miscellaneous Works                               | 162,228           |
|    | Asbestos Cleanup                                  | 7,162             |
|    |                                                   | <hr/>             |
|    |                                                   | £4,274,009        |
| 2. | Consultant Fees                                   | 22,277            |
|    |                                                   | <hr/>             |
|    | <b>Total</b>                                      | <b>£4,296,286</b> |
|    |                                                   | <hr/>             |

ORAL

**NO. 119 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING ALLOCATION COMMITTEE**

Can Government state on how many occasions the Housing Allocation Committee has met in 2003 and providing the dates of each meeting?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 120 and 121 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 120 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Can Government state on how many occasions the Housing Medical Advisory Committee has met in 2003, providing a breakdown of the dates of each meeting?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 119 and 121 of 2004.

**NO. 121 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Can Government state on how many occasions the Social Advisory Committee has met in 2003, giving the dates of each meeting?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No 119 of 2004**

The Housing Allocation Committee met on eight occasions. The dates of each meeting are 29<sup>th</sup> January, 5<sup>th</sup> March, 16<sup>th</sup> April, 11<sup>th</sup> June, 30<sup>th</sup> July, 17<sup>th</sup> September, 29<sup>th</sup> October and 26<sup>th</sup> November 2003.

**Answer to Question No 120 of 2004**

The Medical Advisory Committee met on 10 occasions. The dates of each meeting are 13<sup>th</sup> January, 17<sup>th</sup> February, 7<sup>th</sup> April, 12<sup>th</sup> May, 9<sup>th</sup> June, 6<sup>th</sup> August, 18<sup>th</sup> August, 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 13<sup>th</sup> October, 10<sup>th</sup> November 2003.

**Answer to Question No 121 of 2004**

The Social Advisory Committee met on 10 occasions. The dates of each meeting are 4<sup>th</sup> February, 6<sup>th</sup> March, 9<sup>th</sup> April, 28<sup>th</sup> May, 24<sup>th</sup> June, 4<sup>th</sup> September, 16<sup>th</sup> September, 8<sup>th</sup> October, 19<sup>th</sup> November, 16<sup>th</sup> December 2003.



ORAL

**NO. 122 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state whether the negotiations with the Union regarding the move into a proposed Authority for Buildings and Works department have been resumed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The Government are currently engaged in discussing the proposed Authority with the Unions.

ORAL

**NO. 123 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PENSIONER EXCHANGE LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the Housing Pensioner Exchange List as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, giving a breakdown of those who are Government tenants and private sector tenants, their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 124 to 131 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 124 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants have been in the pre-list for housing on the last day of each month of 2003 giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 123 and 125 to 131 of 2004.

**NO. 125 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants have been in the Housing Waiting Lists on the last day of each month of 2003 giving a breakdown of their flat requirements and the date they became eligible for housing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 123, 124 and 126 to 131 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 126 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NUMBER OF APPLICANTS**

Can Government state what is the number of housing applicants as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 who are socially recommended and how many are classified as homeless, giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 123 to 125 and 127 to 131 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 127 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NUMBER OF APPLICANTS**

Can Government state how many housing applicants as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 are medically recommended providing a breakdown of the category of their medical recommendation, age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 123 to 126 and 128 to 131 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 128 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – POST-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many post-war flats are vacant as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 giving the address, room composition and the date they became vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 123 to 127 and 129 to 131 of 2004.

**NO. 129 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war flats are vacant as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 giving the address of each, room composition and the date they became vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 123 to 128, 130 and 131 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 130 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE/POST-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre and post-war housing units, which have been allocated in each month of 2003, have been on a do-it-yourself basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos 123 to 129 and 131 of 2004.

**NO. 131 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war housing units have been allocated in each month of 2003, broken down by month to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question Nos 123 to 131 of 2004**

The Government remain willing to provide to the Opposition detailed information of this sort which is unprecedented in Gibraltar before 1996. However, given the intense administrative burden of preparing this information within five days, I will forward this information in writing to the hon Member within 10 days.

**NO. 132 OF 2004****THE HON S E LINARES****GHA – SCHOOL OF HEALTH**

Can Government state how many students currently attending courses in the School of Health giving a breakdown by year of intake?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I now hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 132 of 2004**

There are currently 19 students attending courses in the School of Health Studies. The breakdown is as follows:

|                       | <b>Start Date</b> | <b>End Date</b> | <b>Commenced</b> | <b>No Completed</b> |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <b>RGN Diploma</b>    | Sept 2000         | August 2005     | 12               | 1 dropped out       |
| <b>Enrolled Nurse</b> | June 2003         | May 2005        | 8                | -                   |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 132 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

As a matter of interest is it now the responsibility of the Minister of Health, the School of Health which used to be under Bleak House and under the auspices of Training and exclusively although it is conducted most of the time at Bleak House is it completely under Health and not under Training auspices?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I detect a level of confusion in the question asked by the hon Member. There are two separate things. Training is carried out at Bleak House under the auspices of the Training Department and also concurrently and but separately the School of Health provides its own training within Bleak House as well.

**NO. 133 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – POST OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Can Government now confirm whether they have now reached a decision on the new salary for the post of Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 133 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Seeing that this is as the Chief Minister accepted in Question No 261 of 2003, a matter that was long overdue, when is it that the Government intend to bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The matter is now subsumed into the review of the management structure of the Health Authority which is underway as part of the Healthcare reform programme.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can Government confirm that if and when the matter comes to a satisfactory conclusion, because in this House we are now used to the idea of Government for years saying that they are going to look into matters and then it takes them years and years to solve the problem, when it does finally come to a satisfactory conclusion whether they intend to re-advertise the post again or whether it is just a question of increasing the remuneration of the post itself?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If I could answer that question there would have been nothing to subsume into the review. The results of the review would be known and it would just be a question of implementing action. That supplementary ignores the answer I gave the hon Lady to the previous supplementary and that is that the whole matter is subsumed into the review and the Government are still completely undecided about the future of these posts, who will occupy them and at what rate of remuneration.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Am I correct in assuming that the Government cannot give a confirmation that the present incumbent of the post will remain in the post once the decision is taken?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct. On the basis that the post may be redesigned, redeployed, reshaped and therefore it would not look like the past that is today for the other reason which is the one that she interpreted in the answer. All possibilities are open.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

What the Chief Minister is saying is as I have said that there is no guarantee that the present incumbent will remain in that post?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Repeating the question and repeating the answer does not enlighten the debate any further it simply wastes the time of the House. The hon Lady has had the answer to that question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Chief Minister confirm whether I am correct in that assumption?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have answered the hon Lady's question and I do not propose to answer it again.

**NO. 134 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8 as a result of their policy to increase prescription charges, also updating the previous information given in answer to Question No 256 of 2003, which was incomplete?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government do not have a policy of increasing prescription charges.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 134 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have always, in this House, put in this exact question and what I am asking is what revenue the Government have raised as a result of their having increased prescription charges and I have always got an answer from the previous Minister for Health.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

This Minister tends to answer the questions in the Order Paper and if she has asked it in that manner before, I have seen Hansard and she has had an answer before. If she asks a question she gets an answer. If she specifies what she wants to know again I will try to answer the Question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I cannot understand the answer from the Minister I think it could not be clearer. Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods and I specify the periods, as a result of their policy to increase prescription charges and I have also asked him also updating the previous information given in answer to Question No 256 of 2003 which was incomplete. So, the Minister has just said that he has looked at the previous Question No 256 of 2003, I cannot understand why he is not willing to provide that information when it has been provided before?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady cannot be that obtuse. It is true that on one occasion during the last Parliament, Government increased some prescription charges and reduced it for others by exempting from prescription charges some people that have previously been liable to pay them. That does not entitle the hon Lady for the next 50 years continuing to ask questions implying that Government have in the present a policy of increasing prescription charges. So, if years after the event the hon Lady is still asking how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for certain periods as a result of their policy to increase prescription charges the answer is that Government do not currently have a policy of increasing prescription charges. If the hon Lady wants to ask on the other hand how much extra revenue is Government now raising as a result of its decision 'X' years ago to raise prescription charges as against what it would now be raising for those heads had it not increased prescription charges back in that year. That would be a different question that would be entirely valid.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I think that the Chief Minister is trying to confuse the issue because as I have said I put exactly the same question which I refer to , Question No 256 of 2003, and I got the reply. If the Chief Minister is going by the fact that he wants me to rephrase the question to be 100 per cent as he says this is the usual norm of the Chief Minister. He wants me to say differently because as a result of their policy to increase the prescription charges I could have put the year in that is the only difference and the question that I have put in today is precisely the same one I have put in on more than five occasions and I again refer to updating the previous information given in answer to Question No 256 of 2003 which was incomplete. The very least that the Government could have done is to have given me the information which was incomplete to Question No 256 of 2003?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I have said to the hon Lady in answer to supplementaries on the last question, repeating the question does not alter the answer that she got when she asked the question three minutes earlier. If she persists in formulating the question in this way the answer that she will get is the one that she has had namely, *the Government do not have a policy of increasing prescription charges*, if she wants the information that it appears she wants then she has got to ask a question, formulate her question in a way which entitles and calls for that information and that is not the question that is on the Order Paper.



**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see. So, now Government have changed their policy of answering this specific question is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct. The hon Lady got it at last.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will Government then provide the information as soon as possible because they must have it in hand and in any case the information that I am asking?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady has still not formulated the question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am saying that if they are not willing to answer the question in this House any longer can they provide it at a later stage as soon as possible and secondly could the Chief Minister not agree with me that they could at least have provided the latter part of the information to that question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No to the last part, but she appears having given us the glimmer of hope that she had finally grasped the point that the Government are taking a different attitude to her politically mischievous question.....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Mischievous?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

.....yes. To continue to refer four or five or six years after the event to the Government's policy to increase prescription charges is the equivalent of my referring to the hon Lady's policy, for example, of something that they were doing nine years ago and implying that it is still their policy and a number of very graphic examples rush to the front of my mind which I am sorely resisting [INTERRUPTION] No need for the hon Members to get so nervous. So, therefore it is not a question of whether the Government are willing to provide the information not inside the House but later outside the House. Government are entirely willing to provide the information to her inside and outside the House provided she asks a question that calls for that information and the question that the hon Lady has on the Order Paper is not a question that calls for that information and the Government are no longer willing

whether inside or outside the House, whether today or tomorrow to provide her as it has done in the past with information which is not called for strictly on a strict interpretation of the question. That is the Government's position the hon Lady can stand up immediately after me and repeat her question again. No one on this side of the House will rise again to answer it for her. If she really wants the information which she knows, and I am confirming to her, the Government are perfectly willing to give her, she must delete from her question the words that spoil it for her which is asking for information for fee increases raised by an alleged policy which the Government do not have as a policy and therefore the answer must necessarily be zero because if the hon Lady asks me for information about revenue raised by a policy which is not my policy how can the answer be anything other than zero. The answer must necessarily be zero.

**MR SPEAKER:**

One more question, one more answer.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It was never zero before and can the Chief Minister confirm to this House whether in fact Government did increase prescription charges and because this is the only supplementary that Mr Speaker is allowing me, can the Chief Minister also confirm whether the very least that he could have done was to have updated the information that was incomplete to Question No 256 of 2003?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Both of those questions have been answered at least twice each in the last ten minutes. I started my answer to her last supplementary by saying "No" to the last bit. The last bit having been whether at least he could not provide the answer that was not incomplete and secondly of course it is implicit in all of the answers that I have given to the hon Lady that the Government on one occasion increased prescription charges several years ago. So, why must she now stand up to ask me, *"Is the Government at least willing to admit that it increased prescription charges?"* she has had the answer to that question. Of course the Government increased prescription charges in 1990 or whenever it was.

ORAL

**NO. 135 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many long stay elderly care patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital in March, April, May, June, July August, September, October, November, and December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No 136 of 2004.

**NO. 136 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the months of March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December of 2003, of the beds occupied by elderly persons who have been formally discharged, but refused to leave, how many fell into each of the three categories identified by Government:

- (1) Elderly persons living alone;
- (2) Elderly persons needing support;
- (3) Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government remain willing to provide to the Opposition detailed information of this sort which is unprecedented in Gibraltar before 1996. However, given the intense administrative burden of preparing this information within five days, I will forward this information in writing to the hon Member within 10 days.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 136 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am really flabbergasted. Was it not the Chief Minister's decision to call a meeting of the House and have we not had more time on this occasion for Government or exactly the same time which is five days and on previous occasions again I have been given the information that I have sought. Why on this occasion are Government not willing to provide information which they have provided before given the same number of days that they have been given previously to answer? Can the Minister at least confirm that he has a knowledge that there are the same number of

elderly long stay patients at St Bernard's as there were the last time that I asked this same question?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I will forward the information in writing to the hon Lady within 10 days.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Why does the Minister then make public statements to the effect that there are so many patients in the hospital that should not be there, that there are so many numbers of elderly patients blocking beds if he has not got the figures?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

For the third time, the answer to the question is that the information will be made available within 10 days.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But the Minister has not answered my question and he will not. Is he embarrassed to give the information?

**NO. 137 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA- SHORTAGES OF BEDS**

Can Government confirm whether there still continues to be shortages of beds at St Bernard's Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The situation varies from time to time, but shortages are always the result of blockage of acute beds by elderly people whose medical condition does not require their hospitalisation. Without this problem there would never be a bed shortage at St Bernard's Hospital.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 137 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Again I find that to be an extraordinary explanation of the sequence of events that have occurred in this House of Assembly regarding the shortages of beds at St Bernard's with this Government, not with the GSLP, with this Government, can the Minister not confirm that the problems of the shortages of beds were created by the Government for the simple reason that we warned them as far back as 1999 that they were making a huge error in doing away with the original Lewis Stagnetto Ward, can the Minister confirm that or is it the Chief Minister that is going to reply for him?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Neither the Minister nor the Chief Minister can confirm that because it is not true. However, we do recognise the hon Lady's scratched record on this issue, we do recognise that she appears to have nothing to say politically except that and that since we cannot stop her repeating the same line day in day out, then the hon Lady

will repeat the same thing day in day out. Her repetition does not render it any more true now than it was when the hon Lady first uttered it and the answer to the question is that Government do not agree with her.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the Chief Minister cares to look into the records of Hansard which I do not think he does, will he not accept that I asked a question, Question No 6 of 1999 to the then Hon Keith Azopardi and I said, *“Can the Minister confirm whether the kitchen will in fact be staying in what used to be the old Lewis Stagnetto Ward?”* and his answer was, *“The current plan revolves around that scenario.”* Can the Chief Minister not understand that he is not giving this House the correct information when the Chief Minister says, *“No,”* because the old Lewis Stagnetto Ward was in fact a ward until this Government came into power and then they decided to house the kitchen there. May I say that when the GSLP were just about to enter into an election campaign in 1996 the GSLP had already expended £150,000 in refurbishing the original kitchen and the kitchen was housed in the old Lewis Stagnetto Ward as a decanting measure. How can he now tell this House of Assembly that what I am saying is not correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What the hon Lady is saying is not correct. The hon Lady is saying that the current bed shortage in St Bernard's Hospital is due to the fact that the Lewis Stagnetto Ward was not returned to ward status whilst their refurbishment of the kitchen would have taken place. Those facts that the kitchen has moved are incontrovertible facts. The kitchen has been moved it was in one place and now it is in another which is in Lewis Stagnetto Ward what I do not agree with, which is what I said I did not agree with is the hon Lady's argument that that is the reason why there is a bed shortage at St Bernard's Hospital as opposed to the explanation that the Government offers which is that beds are being blocked by a record number of elderly people blocking beds many more than used to be the case in her time and there are sociological reasons that Government understand and accept and that is why it is doing something about providing residential facilities for the elderly. Government do not accept that the reason for the bed blockage is the kitchen business. No it does not because the hon Lady who says that the bed blocking has been created by the GSD Government and it did not happen when she was the Minister then the hon Lady has got to explain why there were no bed shortages whilst she was refurbishing wards, reducing the number of beds if the reason for the bed shortage now is the fact that the kitchen has not been returned to its original place. Put another way the number of beds that there are in St Bernard's Hospital that are operational is a figure around 164 is actually more or less in fact I think it is one or two more than the number of beds that were available to the hon Lady through most of her term of office because of her ward refurbishment programme. Never mind whether the beds were in one ward or in another ward. Whilst the hon Lady was in office, for most of the time that she was in office the number of beds available to the hon Lady are the number of beds that there are available today and if there was not a problem of bed shortage then but there is a number of bed shortage now it cannot be as a matter of mathematical obvious logic it cannot be by reason of the kitchen. It can only be by reference to some other reason which has expanded in size and it is as everybody in Gibraltar accepts and understands hospital administration, medical staff, everybody except her understands and accepts that the reason is a massively increased number of beds being occupied for want of alternative facilities by people who are not

ill in the acute sense requiring to occupy a hospital bed but simply old and who either cannot look after themselves at home and stay in a hospital as a residential home, which is not what hospitals are for or in some cases whose family just do not want to take them back and refuse to take them back from hospital after they are medically discharged. Everybody knows that that is the reason except the hon Lady and therefore for all the reasons that I have just explained the Government have no matter how many times she may want to repeat the yarn the Government have never accepted or agreed with her distorted and analysis and explanation of the problem, does not agree with her distorted analysis of the problem and will never agree with her distorted analysis of the problem or the reasons for it however many times she may repeat it because it is simply not true. It is obviously calculated to serve the hon Lady's political purposes which I accept she has done to great effect and with great skill but nevertheless to serve the hon Lady's political purpose of seeking to find a reason for this problem which is not the real reason but which smacks more of Government fault than the real reason which is the bed blockage problem by elderly people which is the real problem whether the hon Lady wishes to accept it or not.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I think that the Chief Minister's contribution is 100 per cent politically motivated. He has said so many things. Let me take, for example, the statement that he has made about the number of beds that were available when we were in Government. When the GSLP was using the old Lewis Stagnetto Ward we were using it as a decanting ward and we would have actually put the kitchen back to where it was and we would have had an extra ward in the hospital and we would then have gone back to the 182 beds so what the Chief Minister is saying is nonsense. Secondly, when the Chief Minister tries to blame the elderly I have asked time and time again in this House for the Government to actually give me the numbers of the people in the hospital who are the elderly people that they claim are blocking beds. What answers do I get? I get in March 1999 – 56, in November, December January 2002 – 55, in April, May, June, July, August, September, October 2002 I get 54, 42, 44, 38, and 40 and then in February 2003 I get the figure 42, 44, 40, 46 and 46 so the figure is actually decreasing. Now, only minutes ago I have asked Government for the same information and they have denied me that information.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The real reason why we find ourselves in a problem which incidentally is about to be resolved through the Government's enlightened policy of building a much larger and new hospital and in parallel with that significantly increasing the capacity of Mount Alvernia but the real reason and I referred earlier to sociological reasons which the Government understands and has to grapple with is that instead of whilst they were in office having the foresight to understand that as more people in Gibraltar were buying homes, as more people in Gibraltar therefore both husband and wife had to work and therefore would be less able to look after their elderly people and that elderly people were living longer and longer because they failed to foresee that, they invested not a single penny in the eight years that they were in office in increasing the capacity the number of beds available in Gibraltar in residential homes and it is a matter of straightforward mathematical calculation.....



**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Chief Minister give way?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I will not give way until I finish making the point. It is a matter of straightforward mathematical calculation.....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is a shameful reply.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Elderly people are living longer therefore the proportion of elderly people in our community is bigger than it used to be therefore if in the eight years that they were in Office they failed to increase the number of beds even if there was no increase in the percentage demand for residential home beds it only requires a 10 year olds mathematical skills to work out that the number of beds in elderly people's residential homes would be outstripped by the demand for residential homes. That is the point because the GSLP failed to invest in this area of social need in which the Government are now investing to increase not only substantially the capacity of Mount Alvernia but with a manifesto commitment at these last elections which they did not have to build or to establish a second elderly people's home over and above Mount Alvernia. Those are the problems or why if the hon Member thinks that the problem of bed shortage is not related or caused by the bed blocking problem by elderly people who are not ill and who simply need residential care why does the hon Lady think that we are spending millions of pounds in increasing the capacity of Mount Alvernia what does she think we will use them for if there is no demand that needs to be transferred, does the hon Lady think that we are doing it for fun? Why does she think that we have taken on board a commitment to build a second elderly care residential home if there is no need for it because beds are not being blocked by elderly people in need of these homes? Both of these things would have to be aberrations on the part of the Government before her denial as to the real reasons of the bed blockage being elderly people blocking beds in hospital before her denial of that could begin to be true and that is the reality of the matter. The idea, even by her own *[INTERRUPTION]* there is no time limit, I know that the hon Lady is anxious for me to finish because she does not like her distortion of the reasons for this problem to be addressed and shot out of the water which is what they deserve to do and this is not Government saying that this is not a problem. This is the Government saying there is a problem but the cause of the problem is not the one that the hon Lady repeatedly asserts or her stubborn refusal to recognise that the real cause of this problem is bed blocking in St Bernard's Hospital is wholly unrealistic compared to the realities on the ground. Even if the hon Lady, she says that the number of beds being blocked is falling and she says that it is falling now to 30, if those 30 people were not there it does not matter whether the figure is 50, 60, 40, 30 or 25 there are only four people waiting in the Accident and Emergency Ward to be hospitalised on the day in question. So, suffice for there to be only four beds being blocked by elderly people for that to be the cause of the problem because even if there were only 20 beds being blocked and she accepts that there are 30 if those 30 *[INTERRUPTION]* if she accepts that the figure 30 that we have given the hon Lady

demonstrates that the figures are falling she is accepting the figure albeit alleging that they are falling but she is accepting the figure.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Point of order. The Hon Minister for Health has not provided me the figures.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

On this occasion. The Minister for Social Services did give these statistics on bed blockage the hon Lady may not have been in the House to hear it yesterday or the day before. The only point that I am trying to make is that even if there are only 15 people in the hospital and it is much more than that, but even if there were only 15 beds occupied by elderly people who are simply old but not ill then there would never be a bed problem in Gibraltar because there have never been more than 15 people queuing up waiting for a bed. Does she not see that that must be so?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I cannot see that that must be so because we are talking about a situation where, when we were in Government we had more elderly patients in St Bernard's than what there are now and if I were to remind this House that the Chief Minister started off in his budget speech of 2001 when we had already identified that there were bed shortages in St Bernard's by saying, "...*there is no acute shortages of beds...*" like they always do. They start by denying that there is a problem, then they blame other people of the problem and then can the Government not recognise that they have been eight years in Government in which to solve the problem and what are they saying now after the eight years? Like the Hon Mr Britto said in his interview that he expected the problem to be solved at the end of the year

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The problem has been solved now.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister said in his interview two nights ago, I recorded it and I have it here with me, that he would stick his neck out and that the problem would be solved by the end of the year. What does he expect another nine years of inactivity from this Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. Government do not expect anything the sort but the problem with the hon Lady is that she cannot understand the Government's position in this or indeed anybody's position in this because she does not acknowledge the factual realities. The problem which has evolved over the years and each year has become more and more acute is that there are these elderly people living in the hospital. This is using the hospital like a hostel. That situation can only be solved in one of two ways either one boots

them out and whenever anybody is discharged from the hospital who is not happy to be discharged from the hospital even if the doctors have medically discharged the person the hon Lady has a fit in public, press release after press release, the dreadful Government, the ogre Government forcing this poor elderly person out of hospital even if the doctors have discharged.....what a heartless Government. So, the real reason is beds being blocked. The hon Lady accuses the Government of taking too long to solve the problem. The only quick way of solving the problem is to vacate the beds by making people who are not ill enough to be in them go home but if the Government do that we are being terribly heartless and cruel to the elderly. The other way that the problem can be solved which takes a little bit longer is to build a bigger hospital and one expands. A much bigger hospital with many more beds. ....[INTERRUPTION] another distortion made by the hon Lady and one expands Mount Alvernia by opening the top floor. Not the convent behind where the nurses used to live, the top floor of Mount Alvernia itself that the GSLP were too stingy and too unconcerned with the interests of the elderly to be willing to fund with nurses so they were used as storerooms when with a little bit of money and a little bit of commitment they could have been used for rooms for the elderly. One can go beyond opening up the fourth floor of Mount Alvernia to converting the ex-nun's quarters behind Mount Alvernia into even more rooms for the elderly. But from the year 2001 when we started debating this where the problem was much, much smaller than it is today and not acute so my answer to that question was entirely accurate it is not bad between 2001 and 2004 it is three years and in three years to be about to open a new hospital and to be about to open a refurbished and enlarged Mount Alvernia with an extra four beds in three years I think it is very good going the hon Lady should be congratulating us not criticising us.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Let us put the record straight, we never had the problems of the shortages of beds that this Government have. Secondly, it is a shameful situation where today we have had five families ringing up our offices telling us that Government are coercing and harassing their elderly to leave the hospital. It is a shameful situation and the relatives have given us permission to actually name them. The families have said, *"Name us we are happy that the people of Gibraltar know what this Government are doing to the elderly people."* They have transferred them from John Ward to Lady Begg Ward where they have actually squeezed in beds, cramped them from Lathbury Barracks or perhaps from Mount Alvernia, but they have been told that they have to take the relatives home and one of them especially is a sponsored patient himself he is not even a next of kin. His name is Mr Cotrill and the relative concerned is Mr Louis Pizarrello 83 years old who is ill and is suffering from incontinence and he has been told that he has to take him home and there are other patients and I can give their names to the Chief Minister. This morning this Government have already started what they started saying in the election campaigns. In fact, they threatened the nursing staff, they have threatened the doctors and now it is a scandalous situation they are threatening the families and the relatives of those people that are in hospital that they have to leave is that not a shameful situation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What is a shameful situation is that the hon Lady should criticise the Government because there are not enough beds in our hospitals for people that are ill and then describe as shameful the fact the Government invite people that are medically

discharged from leaving a hospital. Hospitals are for people who are ill. They are not for people who are old. For people who are old there are old people's homes. For people that are ill there are hospitals. If the people that are old but not ill occupy the hospital beds when people that are ill but not old go to the hospital there are not enough beds for them hence bed shortages because they are being occupied by people who are old but not ill and the hon Lady by her last intervention has simply confirmed the sheer political dishonesty of on the one hand accusing the Government of bed blocking and refusing to recognise that the problem is elderly people who are old but not ill blocking acute beds whilst at the same time in the same breath acknowledging that there are old people in the hospital who are not ill by reciting the name of one patient at least or five patients who if they had been asked to leave the hospital it is because the doctor has discharged them and therefore by saying that she is admitting what five minutes ago she denied namely that there are people in hospital who have been discharged by their doctors but do not leave and all that she has done far from describing the situation which is of shame to the Government simply exposed herself between one question and the next that in the previous question she was consciously denying something which she knew at the time that she was denying it to be true.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I do accept the fact that the refurbishment of Mount Alvernia will help enormously. At the moment I believe there are only two floors being used by what date does the Chief Minister reckon we shall have the problem solved by the completion of the work in Mount Alvernia?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The current target date is April/May but the hon Member should know that such as the sociological developments in this area in terms genuinely of more and more elderly people happily for us all living longer and needing increasing amount of state support. There is much that the Government have been doing. There is, for example, the domiciliary care pilot scheme supporting as many people as possible to continue to stay in their own homes for as long as possible, installing lifts in Government housing estates so that elderly people can stay at home longer for more years without being imprisoned in their homes for inability to climb up and down the stairs, all of that and the expansion of Mount Alvernia in the Government's judgement will not permanently solve the problem. Mount Alvernia will eliminate the problem of the number of beds being blocked in St Bernard's Hospital today but that is not the end of the problem because there are more numbers coming up into the demand zone. That is why the Government believe that to really make a lasting impact on the problem not only do we have to do all of that but there is also now a need for a second home which will almost double beyond the extended Mount Alvernia the number of beds available, double the capacity in the whole of Gibraltar. Then I think we will have made the sort of impact that the hon Member was hoping for in his question.

**NO. 138 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA NUMBER OF HOUSE CALLS**

Can Government state how many house-calls were attended to by Health Centre Doctors from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to end of December 2003 specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule which I now hand to her.

**Answer to Question No 138 of 2004**

| <b><u>2003</u></b> |              |            |             |             |            |             |            |            |            |
|--------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>March</b>       | <b>April</b> | <b>May</b> | <b>June</b> | <b>July</b> | <b>Aug</b> | <b>Sept</b> | <b>Oct</b> | <b>Nov</b> | <b>Dec</b> |
| 619                | 616          | 508        | 581         | 529         | 541        | 632         | 519        | 651        | 753        |

?? Please note that these figures are house-calls taken at the Primary Care Centre during normal hours. All house-calls received by Doctors after normal working hours have been recorded.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 138 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether these figures proves that the figures are static, decreasing or increasing?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Lady has asked me for the figures from March to December which I have provided. If she wants comparative figures the hon Lady can ask for those and then work out for herself what the comparisons are. I do not have the comparative figures with me.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I do not want the comparative figures I thought the Minister would express an interest in knowing what the totals are for all these months.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The figures are shown on a month by month basis. The hon Lady asked whether they were increasing, static, or decreasing and I have said that those are the figures on a monthly basis and if she wants to know whether they are decreasing, increasing or otherwise then the hon lady should ask for figures for other means?

**NO. 139 OF 2004****THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO****GHA - ELECTIVE OPERATIONS**

Can Government confirm how many routine operations were cancelled at St Bernard's hospital due to the non-availability of beds for March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December of 2003, giving a breakdown for each month?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Elective operations cancelled due to non-availability of beds from March to December 2003 are as follows:

|              |          |           |
|--------------|----------|-----------|
| March        | -        | 6         |
| April        | -        | 0         |
| May          | -        | 0         |
| June         | -        | 0         |
| July         | -        | 0         |
| August       | -        | 2         |
| September    | -        | 5         |
| October      | -        | 2         |
| November     | -        | 3         |
| December     | -        | 0         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>-</b> | <b>18</b> |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 139 OF 2004**

### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will Government not agree that the statistics show in the report that one of the reasons, 20 per cent, of operations have been cancelled because beds are not available?

### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have percentages at hand it still has to be calculated what the figures show is that in this hospital which the hon Lady says that is so chaotic and dreadful and so much inflicted by acute bed shortage, in 10 months 18 operations have had to be cancelled as a result of the non-availability of beds. If we were to take part in the contest that happens in England on this front, I think we would have come top of the league every year with a record as good as this one.

### **HON F R PICARDO:**

I am very concerned that this question raises the same issue that was raised in relation to Question No 137 of 2004 which is a very serious issue and think that on both sides of the House there is unanimity in the view that if there is one bed that is not available for somebody who needs it we should all be very concerned about it and we might disagree about the way that we resolve the problem but I do not think that we go anywhere near the problem by accusing each other of being obtuse or of not having the ability of a 10 year old child to count. I do not think that that advances the debate one jot. I will unfortunately have to adopt exactly the same attitude with the Minister for Health because it appears to me that even on their own figures their arguments do not work. As I understand it the number of beds available in St Bernard's is 177. the number that would have been available if the Lewis Stagnetto Ward had not remained permanently as kitchen would have been 192. The Chief Minister has told us that on the worst day the biggest call for beds is 15 doing the simple mathematics of a 10 year old boy....the Chief Minister said that the greatest pressure for beds was 15. Mr Speaker, 167 plus 15 is 183 therefore without being obtuse it is very clear that if the programme of refurbishment had been seen to a conclusion by the GSD administration 192 beds would have been available instead of 167 and therefore the four people who needed beds today would have had them and there would have been beds to spare and that gives the lie to all the arguments put by the Chief Minister and I use the word lie because the Chief Minister has not hesitated to call the Opposition dishonest and accuse us of lying.

### **HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member, new as he is, should learn to get all his facts and get these right before starting to pontificate.

### **HON F R PICARDO:**

As should the Minister.



**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I have not given the hon Member any facts yet and any that I have given have been correct. The figures that have been given by the hon Member are wrong. When the GSLP came into government in 1988 there were 192 beds in the hospital. Whenever she exposes this argument the hon Lady very conveniently forgets that they lost 12 beds due to the refurbishment that the GSLP carried out. A total of 12 beds were lost in the redesign of the wards and this is not me saying it it is the hospital records. [INTERRUPTION] the hon Lady lost beds when she redesigned the wards and put in partitions with an end result of a loss of 12 beds. The hon Lady may not be aware but that is what the records show and added to that, maybe she should make notes, instead of shaking her head so as not to make erroneous mistakes as she made on television recently when she said, "When I was in power I had 192 beds," she did not have 192 beds she inherited 192 beds when she started, she lost 12 through the refurbishment which was a perfectly good thing because it improved the wards but she lost a further 17 when Private Ward was closed down as part of the refurbishment and was not used. The net result was that when the hon Lady left the figure had been reduced to about 163 to 165 I have been unable to get the exact figure but let us leave it at around 165, when the GSD started, and if one takes into account and this is where it starts to get difficult to show on my feet, in Lewis Stagnetto Ward there were 13 beds and in the Private Corridor there were 17, the GSD Government put people who were in Lewis Stagnetto Ward into Private Corridor so we increased by four because there were 13 when in Lewis Stagnetto and we put them in Private Corridor which was 17 so we increased by four. If we had as the hon Lady is so fond of saying not put the kitchen into Lewis Stagnetto we would have recouped another 13 beds. Today we have put in another eight beds into the hospital so between the eight that have been put in today and the four we gained in between Lewis Stagnetto and Private Corridor it is an increase of 12 so today as I speak on my feet there are the same number of beds in the hospital minus one as if there would have been if we had not put the kitchen into Lewis Stagnetto Ward. So, all her arguments that there are fewer beds are wrong that today there are as many beds as if we had not put the kitchen in and when the hon Members make claims that the new hospital only has an extra 10 beds again they are wrong.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Rubbish.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I beg your pardon?

**HON S E LINARES:**

The refurbished office block.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Members can make all the stupid comments they like. They have not seen the new hospital. When they see it they will eat their words. A new hospital has been built at a considerable cost. The outer shell of the building may be the same

when they go in and see what there is in there they will come into this House and if they have any degree of sense or any degree of shame they will apologise for the stupidity of the comments that they make and have made during their election campaign[*INTERRUPTION*] This is Question Time Mr Speaker and the hon Member should sit down and keep quiet and learn to obey the Standing Orders.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

For the record, when GSLP came into Government we started to refurbish wards and we used Private Corridor for decanting purposes even with the number of beds that we had for the eight years which is about the same that the hon Member says they have now we never ever had shortages of beds. Never, ever, ever had them but what I am saying is that what I did was tell the Minister at the time that if he would have taken heed of our warnings and he did in fact accept that Lewis Stagnetto Ward patients should remain in Private Corridor if he would not have actually put the kitchen in the old Lewis Stagnetto Ward he would have had more beds. That is all that I am saying but Government must understand that with the same number of beds, with the same number of elderly patients, never, ever, in the eight years of a GSLP Government did we have the problems that they have now today.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We understand that and we have acknowledged that the problem is getting worse not because this Government are any less competent than the hon Lady's but because the sociological problem has got worse over the years and perhaps some light is finally being shed on the debate because the hon Lady appears now to be accepting the mathematics and saying, *"Well, whatever the mathematics what I am saying to the Chief Minister is that in our time we did not have the bed shortages that they have got now."* Correct. The question is not whether the bed shortage now is not bigger than it was before, of course the bed shortage problem is bigger than it was before what is in dispute between us the reason why that is so and if I could just say something to the hon Member sitting next to her and ignoring all his slanderous breaches of parliamentary tradition and rules and discipline and his apparent inability to remember that this is not a barrack room and that he is not supposed to be a barrack room lawyer, ignoring all of that when he says that if there were now 196 beds which is what he said there would now be enough available space he is failing to understand one fact, because the problem genuinely is the one that we are saying it is. If there were 196 beds they would have been filled up by elderly people because the demand exists for accommodation for elderly people and whether one had 167 beds or 196 beds we would still have the same problem today because those extra 30 odd beds would simply have been filled by an extra 30 people needing accommodation. That is what the hon Member does not understand. The problem is as we have been describing and until the source of the problem is tackled which is the fact that this community desperately needs more accommodation for elderly people who either can no longer look after themselves at home or whose families cannot look after them both of which categories are increasing in amounts and in numbers, until that core problem cause is addressed it does not matter how many beds one puts in the hospital there will still be full occupancy and therefore there will still be shortages. In one, two three or five days of the year such as happened the other day when there were four people in Casualty, by the way undesirable as that is and deeply regrettable as that is. In England it happens every day of the year in almost every hospital one cares to mention. All I am trying to say is that these problems have to be kept into perspective. The fact that things happen occasionally

in my opinion much more regrettable though the hon Members have not mentioned it today, as far as I am concerned that four people had to wait overnight in the Accident and Emergency Ward waiting for a bed is the need to have to mix the wards with sexes. The Opposition have not mentioned that today and it is symptomatic of the same problem.

**MR SPEAKER:**

No more questions.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

One more please.

**MR SPEAKER:**

No that was the end.

**MR SPEAKER:**

In the last House I gave a ruling that was that there would only be two supplementaries to each question plus one from the Leader of the party and I suspended it later. I am now breaking the suspension, the rule now applies and I do not want to make another rule about cutting short the replies. Two supplementaries plus one from the leader.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

With respect, can I ask why Mr Speaker has chosen to introduce the ruling?

**MR SPEAKER:**

Has the hon Member not been here all the time?

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I have and the problem has not been the number of supplementaries but the length of the answers.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Question and Answers are not debates. Question and Answers is information not debates.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

With respect Mr Speaker the problem has been the length of the answers not the number of supplementaries that we have been asking.

**MR SPEAKER:**

If there is a problem with that I will also cut the length of the answer if necessary.  
Carry on.

**NO. 140 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – LAMBETH PRIMARY CARE TRUST**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm what in answer to Question No 225 of 2003, his predecessor said that Lambeth Primary Care Trust, together with the GHA, are looking at simplifying the payments for our sponsored patient treatments in the UK, which will result in a sum of money rather than the number of people?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

This matter is currently the subject of discussion with the UK Department of Health.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 140 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In the meeting of the House of Assembly of March 2003, his predecessor said that they were quite excited at the prospect of moving from quota patients 120 to 150 even though originally his predecessor the Hon Keith Azopardi had said that they were hoping to get to the figure of 200. The hon Member said, “*..the next year we will probably go above 150 which again is good news for exchequer the idea too is also that they would have to get the relevant information and put it together in some sort of calculation but then the end result will be a sum of money rather than the number of people per quota.*” Does that mean that the sum of money will do away with the quota system?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, implicit in the question is that there will be a sum of money and there will not be a figure or quota in digital terms.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So, now there is no question of actually being happy or having exultations about the number of patients that are going over as regards the quota patients which means that if, for example, there were 500 quota patients last year and 1,000 the following year the figure will be the same is that correct?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Instead of getting excited about the figure of patients jumping from 10 to 12 we are going to get excited about the figure of pounds jumping from 10 to 12.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Now from the Leader. The Leader is entitled to ask a question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But the Leader is not here.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Whoever is the Leader.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Leader of the Opposition is Joe Bossano, he remains in Gibraltar, he is not present in the Chamber.

**MR SPEAKER:**

No. The hon Members do not want to ask another supplementary?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Leader is not here.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Well....

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

With respect, the problem is that we feel that this ruling is curtailing our role as an Opposition to conduct our job and hold the Government to account on behalf of the people.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Yes, you have an opportunity to ask another question.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I would have thought that the person to continue making the question is the Member in Opposition responsible for this area of public policy which happens to be the Hon Miss Marie Montegriffo.

**MR SPEAKER:**

The hon Lady has had two questions.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes but she should be entitled to continue asking questions.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I will not argue if the hon Members do not want to ask another supplementary we go to the next question.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can we request a recess?

**MR SPEAKER:**

The hon Members can but I am not giving it.

**NO. 141 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many patients have been given a choice of being treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as sponsored patients, and have elected to go to Spain since 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to end of December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

All patients are given the choice to be treated either in Spain or in the UK at the time of referral whenever this is considered appropriate by the referring consultant. A total of 217 patients have elected to go to Spain during the period of 1<sup>st</sup> March to the end of December 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 141 OF 2003**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When we are talking about treatment in Spain are we also talking about consultants in Gibraltar referring patients to Spain for surgical interventions?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

We are talking about all referrals.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm that the allowance afforded to these patients is calculated on the same basis that it is for those patients that are sent to the UK?



**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes the subsistence is calculated on the same basis and principles, the travel allowance obviously is different.

**HON S E LINARES**

Is the travelling allowance the same as if they went to Cadiz or to Seville?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes. The travel allowance is based on petrol and mileage so the destination does not matter it is based on the cost of petrol and the distance travelled. The subsistence like when travelling to UK is based on stay and number of nights. In order to be helpful I suggest that the hon Lady writes to me and I will send her a copy of the sponsored patients conditions and she will see all the information for herself.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will, except that I have already written to him about four or five weeks ago and I still have not received replies to any of the letters that I have written to him. I hope I get an answer quickly to all of them and to the one that I will intend to write to the Minister.

**NO. 142 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health state how much money was spent by the Gibraltar Health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for scans in March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority in respect of patients sent to the Malaga Clinic for scans for the period in question was £1,613.50

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 142 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm that once the CT Scans are operational in the Europort Building whether the patients to Malaga and to Algeciras will no longer be required to be sponsored there?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No, the Minister cannot confirm that because most of the patients that go to Malaga go for MRI Scans and these will continue to be necessary.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I was referring to the Algeciras Clinic as well.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

As the hon Lady knows there are different types of scans. Those that go to Malaga are normally CT Scans which is what is going to be done in Gibraltar. It is not possible to give a generic categoric answer to the hon Lady's question, what is true is that by far the majority of patients who need scans will be treated in Gibraltar.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Coming to the conclusion that this is the first time that I have been here in this House for 20 years that there is a Minister answering questions having the Chief Executive or the Head of the Department behind him.

ORAL

**NO. 143 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PATIENT REFERRALS**

Can Government state since the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to the end of December 2003, what was the total number of patient referrals to the UK?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 144 to 145 and 147 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 144 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – QUOTA PATIENTS TREATED IN UK**

Can Government now state what were the costs of the 26 quota patients treated in the UK for the period 1 February to end of March 2002 with the costs being met by the UK Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 143, 145, and 146 and 147.

**NO. 145 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Have the costs for the total number of sponsored patients treated in the UK for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2001 to the end of October 2001 being met by the UK Government now been received?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No 143, 144, 146 and 147 of 2004.

**NO. 146 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state what was the total number of sponsored patients treated in the UK with the costs being met by the UK and what were these costs for the year 2002, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 143 to 145 and 147.

**NO. 147 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state what was the number of sponsored patients treated in the UK from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to the end of December 2003, with the fees being met by the Gibraltar Health Authority and the cost of such fees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

In reference to this question which is purely statistical I would like to put on record that I have offered the hon Lady before this House took place, about two weeks ago and before the meeting of the House was announced, the possibility of requesting this information in writing to be provided on a regular basis and I have offered not this one in particular but all statistical information to be asked of the Minister in writing and I have undertaken if it is asked to provide it at appropriate intervals monthly, quarterly, or six monthly. I say this because the hon Lady has the habit of inserting political points in her question.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Yes quite right. What is wrong with that?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

If Mr Speaker feels that the rule that says that one is not allowed to make political points is right then fine.

**MR SPEAKER:**

What rule?



**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Is there not a rule that says that one cannot make political points and cannot make statements in the preamble to a question?

**MR SPEAKER:**

No, you are inventing it.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I must read the Standing Orders again. Okay. I make the point that that offer has been made and that it is there to be taken or not taken. I in turn was available about four weeks ago and I am also waiting for the hon Lady to give me a reply. The statistical information requested is contained in the schedule which I hand over to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question No 147 of 2004**

143. The total number of patient referrals to the UK for the period 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to the end of December, 2003 was 946.
144. The UK Department of Health has submitted provisional global figures for the year but we do not as yet have individualised details of costs.
145. The UK Department of Health has provided figures for the full year and this is set out in answer to Question No 146 of 2004.
146. The total number of quota patients and latest available related costs made available by the UK Department of Health for the years in question are as follows:

|           |     |          |
|-----------|-----|----------|
| 2001/2002 | 119 | £408,000 |
| 2002/2003 | 150 | £330,000 |

Please note that the amounts quoted are provisional and have been rounded by the DoH to the nearest thousand.

147. The number of sponsored patients treated in the UK from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to the end of December 2003, with fees being met by the Gibraltar Health Authority was 456. the provisional figure of fees recorded to date is £975,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 147 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The figure in answer to Question No 143 of 2004, the total number of patient referrals to the UK for the months of March to December, is it 946 because if so the number has increased dramatically?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, Question No 143 of 2004 asks for patient referrals not to patients and as the hon Lady should know patient referrals are the total number of visits made by patients and therefore not the number of patients.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I understand that the number of patients is different to the number referrals and every time that I put a question in the House I do it because I am going by the notorious formula that we are all in agreement of because this formula takes years for us and I suppose the Government to be able to identify what are the costs involved and I would take this opportunity to tell the Minister whether Government are in fact looking at the possibility of changing this formula. The previous Minister for Health has called it the notorious formula and a formula that takes so long for everybody involved to be able to identify what the actual figures are?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The formula is very easy as long as one knows the values of A, B, C, D, E and F. All one does is multiply A by B add C subtract D and E and divide by F, simple.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is not a question for the Minister to say that A and F and D and everything else is simple. What I have said is that his predecessor has called it the notorious formula because it takes years for everyone concerned in order to be able to identify the actual figures involved.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Minister not realise that when we had this meeting that he has actually made reference to now, would he not accept that there is an attempt from the Chief Minister with the Leader of the Opposition to talk about the procedures of the House and that is the answer that I gave him and if I prefer to ask him questions in this House about a formula am I not entitled to?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not sure I understand what the question is. If it is whether she is entitled to ask questions about the formula then the answer is yes.

**NO. 148 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Subsequent to the published report of the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team, has the Government received any recommendations on action to be taken, and if so, what are the recommendations and in respect of what areas?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 149 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 149 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the First Phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that preferential treatment is being given to Private Patients?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 and 150 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 150 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that the current Private Practice Agreement is a failure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148, 149 and 151 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 151 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the First Phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that the GHA and Consultants pay little regard to Private Practice Arrangements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 150 and 152 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 152 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team, that the staff consider there has been a lack of consultation and involvement in the design and development of the working environment of the new hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 151 and 153 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 153 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that community services are under resourced and therefore are not well provided for?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 152 and 154 to 175 of 2004.



**NO. 154 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the conclusion made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that since the year 2000, admissions to St Bernard's Hospital have declined by almost 10%?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 153 and 155 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 155 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team of September 2003, that Gibraltarians are unhappy about the Primary Care Centre appointments system?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 154 and 156 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 156 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team of September 2003, that the staff expressed dissatisfaction with a number of important aspects of their current jobs and working conditions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 155 and 157 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 157 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do the Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that the staff are dissatisfied with their training and development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 156 and 158 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 158 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the conclusion made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that the growth in the costs of Pharmaceuticals, have resumed at an even faster rate of increase, 18 per cent per year, in the last three years, as compared to 13 per cent from 1990 until 1998?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 157 and 159 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 159 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government now agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that the Complaints Procedure is ineffective from everybody's point of view?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 158 and 160 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 160 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government now agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that there is nearly an hour's wait for patients to be seen at the Accident and Emergency Department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 159 and 161 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 161 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the conclusion made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that one in ten elective operations are cancelled, that over 60 per cent of these are hospital initiated, and that out of this figure 20 per cent is due to the fact that there are no beds available?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 160 and 162 to 175 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 162 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that there is no training needs analysis for staff?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 161 and 163 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 163 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that there is no training for staff when new equipment is introduced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 162 and 164 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 164 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that there is little communication between Primary and Secondary Care Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with question Nos 148 to 163 and 165 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 165 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that there is lack of communication between Doctors and other Health Professionals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 164 and 166 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 166 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that in some specialities additions to the waiting lists exceed admission rates, thus these waiting lists are increasing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 165 and 167 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 167 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that waiting times for admission range from 12 weeks to 80 weeks in those specialities where it is possible to check?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 166 and 168 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 168 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the conclusion made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that there has been an increase in per capita cost with regard to Sponsored Patients from £3,125 to £5,795?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 167 and 169 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 169 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that waiting times are excessive for almost all services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 168 and 170 to 175 of 2004.



**NO. 170 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that the wait for routine tests in the X-ray Department from 2002, is excessive, running from three to six weeks depending on the type of test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 169 and 171 to 175 of 2004.

**NO. 171 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that the Dental Service is understaffed for the demand and both the waiting lists and waiting times for this service are excessive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 170 and 172 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 172 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that demand is increasing for most Laboratory Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 171 and 173 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 173 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that Hospital Consultants are perceived as unwilling to refer for second opinions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 172 and 174 to 175 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 174 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that GP's are unable to refer directly to specialists outside Gibraltar and does the Government consider that they should?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 148 to 173 and 175 of 2004.

**NO. 175 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTH CARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Do Government agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003, by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team that there will be an increase in demand for Health Services for the Elderly?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

During last year, the Gibraltar Government commissioned the UK Clinical Governance Support Team to undertake an extensive assessment of healthcare services. The work has been divided into two phases. Phase I the diagnostic stage, was a process of investigation, assessment and identification of deficiencies. This phase was completed and the Diagnostic Phase Report was received by the Government last September and its contents published extensively.

This very much needed external assessment of our Health Service is not based on, or concerned with “*blame*”. It is an objective assessment of Gibraltar’s Health Service, how we should and could improve and develop it on a very broad range of fronts. Indeed, the vast majority of Management, Staff and the general public have welcomed it and have enthusiastically co-operated with it.

Indeed, the Review Team themselves say this in their report. *“This has been a comprehensive review and are thought to cover all aspects of healthcare in Gibraltar. The work acknowledges that improvements have and are still being made and also does not seek to “blame” - but to focus on finding ways to improve.”*

In September last year, the Government agreed to embark on the second phase of the work programme, the detailed recommendations and implementation stage, and asked the Healthcare Development Team to undertake a wide range of work to develop recommendations for improving the Health Service. Since then, work has been on-going in many areas and large numbers of staff are involved in developing the work streams that will produce the final recommendations.

The Clinical Governance Board Team will submit to Government such recommendations individually or in batches as and when they are ready.

Government will consider each of these recommendations reports when submitted and, if accepted, will ensure that the Gibraltar Health Authority implements them. In this way, recommendations will be made, accepted and implemented progressively and continuously over a period of months. The process of consultation with Management and Staff will continue throughout and will form an integral part of the decision-making process in respect of the design and implementation of any changes made necessary by these recommendations.

Government's intense programme for the radical improvement and modernisation of the Health Service will become apparent as and when remedial actions are taken by Government. However, I am entirely confident that, for all that needs to be done, the Consultants have found our Health Service in much better shape than they would have done between 1988 to 1996 when the Hon Miss Montegriffo was responsible for it but she did not have the courage to have it medically and professionally audited.

In the context of the process that I have outlined above, the Government considers that it would be inappropriate at this stage to enter into a detailed public discussion and analysis of the contents of the First Phase Report.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 148 TO 175**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

How can the Minister say that he is not prepared to enter into a debate when I have asked him all these questions on a report that has been made public and paid for by the Government? How can he have the cheek, the audacity to say that the problems that are now here today are far less than when I was in Government? That is absolute nonsense that is not correct but if Mr Speaker has given a ruling that I am only allowed to ask two questions.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

You have 78.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister say what are the recommendations if any that have been implemented since the report was made public?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As we embark on our 78 supplementary questions which we much look forward to hearing and answering I think that it is important to bear two things in mind. First of all to understand the nature of the answer that the hon Lady has had which is that the report is divided into two stages diagnostic, which does not include any action recommendations and then implementation recommendations which the Government do not yet have and which as the government receives them will consider them, if accept implement and if it does not accept not implement and therefore those of the diagnostic alleged defects that the Government accepts from the phase I report will

become apparent by whether or not the Government takes remedial action to implement them. That is what the answer says as opposed to now debating the relative merits or demerits of each individual recommendation when the Government's position as to whether they are a recommendation that will be acted upon depends on implementation remedies which the Government have not yet received and therefore cannot decide whether given what it takes to fix it the Government accepts or does not accept the recommendation. It is not a question of unwillingness to debate it is a question of a fact that a debate is entirely premature because there is not yet before the Government any recommendation as to what to do and therefore the Government cannot decide. I just wanted to make sure that the hon Lady had understood the nature of the answer. Secondly, although it in no way affects the hon Lady's rights to ask questions in this House I am glad that the hon Lady has managed to find 28 things of interest to her in a report the very existence of which she disapproves of because she has publicly chastised the Government for wasting money in bringing the Consultants to Gibraltar in the first place to conduct this report at all because she believes that the solution to Gibraltar's problem in health does not require experts, does not require reports, it just requires a competent GSP Health Minister. Nevertheless, notwithstanding all of those things she has found 28 things of sufficient interest to her in the report is something which I warmly welcome and in 15 seconds finally although it is not for me to rule on Standing Orders it is for us all in this House to be aware of Standing Orders and there is a Standing Order 6 (17) (VII) which says, "*..a question shall not ask for an expression of opinion and in asking the Government whether it agrees with this or agrees with that...*," which is how all 28 questions start, the hon Lady is asking the Government to express an opinion on each of those items. The Question is on the Order Paper because it is the Speaker that must make a ruling as to the admissibility of the Questions and as they are on the Order Paper the Hon Mr Speaker at least by implication rendered it admissible and that is fine as far as the Government are concerned but this is not a refusal to debate. This to the extent that it asks for the expression of 28 opinions on 28 different issues is not what Question Time is for. What the hon Lady should do and now I sit is to move a motion on the Question of the Healthcare Report and then we shall see if we can debate it.

#### **HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know whether the Standing Orders apply just to the Opposition because it seems that they are all about the constraints of the Opposition without any comparative constraints on the answering party. We have had a lengthy speech which had nothing to do with the supplementary totally irrelevant giving us unsolicited opinions on everything under the sun but it seems we cannot seek opinions but we can receive them. All I have to say to the Chief Minister is, is he telling us that if somebody says in a report, we have looked at the Health Service and we think the building is about to collapse and we say do Government agree with the finding that the building is about to collapse? We cannot ask that because that is an opinion. If I say to the Chief Minister if he thinks that the Input/Output Study is going to be useful that is an opinion so we cannot ask that. By the time the Chief Minister has told us what we can ask and Mr Speaker has told us what we can put in supplementaries we might as well close this place down and go home.

Can the Chief Minister explain to us why it is that they are not able to decide whether they agree with the judgement expressed in the diagnostic phase over a particular issue until the possible correction of that defect has been identified and then decided whether they will apply the cure or they will not apply the cure given that we are talking about medical services I would have thought that if somebody says that



someone is suffering from a certain illness it is perfectly legitimate to ask the Government if they agree that this is the illness affecting the Health Service and the answer we have had is, first of all, we are not entitled to ask whether they agree that that is an illness affecting the Health Service because that is requiring to us to express an opinion and we are not entitled to express an opinion and secondly even if they could express a view on whether they agree with that assessment their position is that until they know what the cure for the illness is and they have decided as a matter of Government policy whether they are going to apply they cannot tell us whether they agree that the illness exists. If the Minister for Medical Services has that approach to diagnosis and cures then I do not think it augurs well for his input into the improvement that the Health Service requires. If they do not want to express a view on whether they agree with the 27 things that have been identified by the Health Care team that they have put, fine, the fact that we have come here to ask them whether they agree does not mean that we support the appointment of the team, the spending of the money, or the alleged things that have been identified but since it is the Government that has taken the policy to go down this route, the Government that have asked the House to vote the money, this is the first fruits of that policy, we are entitled I think to ask the Government what their view is of the results to-date and I would have thought that it was perfectly legitimate for Government to say, “.....we think that there are merits in some of those things that have been identified but we do not agree with others,” because from my reading of the report it seems to me that many if not most of the things there are simply the team saying of what other people have told the team. There is very little there that is a reflection of expertise. They have said people have complained of waiting times and therefore there is a problem of waiting times because people are complaining about it. Do Government agree that there is a problem of waiting times? We know that they agree because they were agreeing with that particular identified problem even before the experts said it. Why is it that it is legitimate for them to tell us that they agree that there is a problem of waiting time, which is expressing an opinion apparently, but not anymore? Not now that an expert has said it. The Chief Minister frankly has said in this House agreeing in opinions about things that need tackling without having any inhibitions about it. He agreed just before I left that priority had to be given to doing something about taxpayers that he had mentioned it in his New Year Message. If that is not an opinion I would like to know what it is.

#### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The first thing that I should say to that is that if the Leader of Opposition first point intended to suggest that the Government are trying to somehow muzzle the Opposition as to the Questions that they can have by suggesting that they should be free to ask whatever they like, what I would say is that in reality that is the de facto rule in the House. I have been in this House since November 1990 and I cannot recall on a single occasion when any Speaker has disallowed any question for any reason whatsoever. So, for all intents and purposes we might as well not have any Standing Orders but the fact of the matter is that it is not I who have decided that the right to ask questions of the Government are curtailed not in the one way that I have said but that in the 15 ways set out in the 15 “*The right to ask questions shall be governed by the following rules.*” And then there are 15 “*do not*”, one may not do this and one may not do that. I am not the author of Standing Orders. I am not particularly familiar with them because we never actually really had to live by them but all I was doing was pointing out to the hon Lady is that in fact there is a Standing Order and in any event since the Speaker is the sole judge as to their interpretation.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

Do not take my name in vain.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not taking your name in vain but it is allowed to refer to the Speaker in this Parliament. I am reading Standing Orders when I say that it says that, “..*the sole interpretation of Standing Orders is the Speaker.*” The mere fact that the Question has got onto the Order Paper for all intents and purposes means that the Speaker has found that they are acceptable, that is indisputable.

**MR SPEAKER:**

The Speaker reads every individual Question before they are sent to Government.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It still does not detract from the fact that all I have done is read two lines of Standing Orders which are there. The fact that a decision goes one way or the other does not make what I have read not there. The fact that the hon Member is not under Standing Orders entitled to ask me questions which call for an expression of opinion does not mean that I am not allowed to express an opinion. The Member is the one that is not allowed to ask the questions. I am free to express opinions if I want the fact that he is not free to ask them does not mean that Government are not at liberty to answer them. The more serious point is that in the Leader of the Opposition’s last point lies the reason why Government are taking this position at this moment in time. In the context of the overall purpose for which Government called for the report the part that has so far been concluded namely the diagnostic phase, as the hon Lady has just said, it is not so much that we needed experts to tell us what was obviously wrong, there are some things which were wrong with our Health Service most of us sitting here let alone local experts could have identified. Many that we could probably agree on immediately the problem comes in firstly, the ones that are not obvious or upon which there is no agreement in Gibraltar as to whether they are wrongly done at the moment, there are some quite a lot that come under that category, and in respect of both categories the ones which are obvious and the ones which are not so much accepted the real issue is in the remedial solution. For example, to identify the problem that there is a problem in Gibraltar of waiting lists leading to abuse of private practice resulting in public patients being encouraged, being led, or resulting in public patients opting to pay fees for receiving the service that they have already paid through their taxes and should be getting for nothing one does not need to be an expert to identify that problem – diagnostic phase – but to design the solution one does need to be an expert and one does have to bring fresh thinking which clearly is not available in Gibraltar because if it were available in Gibraltar it would have happened many years ago even before the Opposition Members were in the House and that is why Government do not want to get drawn in to a debate about what it agrees with and what it does not agree with because that is focusing on the diagnostic phase when what the Government want to do is to concentrate on the implementation phase. The hon Member asked the question, “*Why do the hon Members need to know whether the remedy is available before deciding whether they agree with the original diagnostic assessment?*” A lot of these things are identifying that something should be changed or done differently. If

somebody comes and says that something should be done differently, for example, if I propose to the hon Member that we should change the rules about Question Time. They clearly do not work, too many questions, too many supplementaries, answers are too long, it takes too long, if I were to say, "*We should do Question Time differently,*" the hon Member would say, "*..wait a minute before deciding whether I agree with you that it should be done differently tell me what it is that you think it should be replaced by because the proposed solution maybe such that it alters the decision as to whether what one has got should be changed or not changed.*" Government are not willing to commit themselves to changing any particular practice of today until they know what it will require to change and that is the reason. Government do not want to be drawn into a line by line, recommendation by recommendation debate on individual expressions of view by the experts at this stage of the process. When the experts bring the implementation recommendations Government will accept or reject them. If Government accept them it is at that point that the Government that is accountable inside and outside of this House for the remedial action that it takes or if they do not take remedial action in an area in which the experts have made a recommendation in the diagnostic phase the hon Members may wish to hold Government to account for our failure to take remedial action but we think that it is premature because Government are not yet in a position to have fallen foul of either of those criteria and it is clear from the views that the Opposition has expressed that they do not agree that the position that Government are taking is the correct one but it is the position that Government have taken and we think for good and justifiable reason.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not dispute that there is some logic in what the Chief Minister has said. All I am saying is that would the Chief Minister not agree that that does not apply necessarily to every single one and Government have made a statement of all 27. I might be able to agree with him that in some instances one cannot really say that that needs to be changed without knowing whether that change is going to be for the better or for the worse. I think it is possible to look at those things and say, "*..for a start we do not agree.*" If I say to the Chief Minister, "*..if the experts say people have lost all confidence in the Health Service,*" is the Chief Minister telling me that he cannot say whether he agrees that people have lost all confidence in the Health Service until he has been told what he needs to do to restore confidence in the Health Service. Then, if he does not think that what he is told and not in the diagnostic phase but if the experts say to him, "*...you need to do 'A', 'B', and C to restore confidence,*" and the Chief Minister says, "*I do not agree.*" Then since the Chief Minister does not agree that this is what will restore confidence the Chief Minister concludes that confidence does not need restoring and therefore that confidence has not been lost.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not that it does not need restoring but that we live with a level of confidence that exists at the moment that was the alternative.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I can understand the argument that has been put and I think it is possible to take that argument on its merits and treat it seriously and perhaps agree that there may be some things there without knowing but I do not think that it justifies a blanket

statement for all 27 or suggesting that we are asking for 27 opinions. No, there is a report, the report has been commissioned by Government, it has been paid for by this, that report in our judgement seems to primarily consist of a compilation of things that have been gathered by the team that came out by asking people and we are interested in knowing whether the conclusions that have been reached by the team by listening to what other people say are conclusions with which Government agreed with all of them, with none, or with some yes and with some no. I would have thought that the Government was in a position to say, *"Item so and so we think the Governance Team have voted wrong the assessment based on the information that they have gathered have led them up a garden path and we do not think that there is nothing seriously wrong and that it needs tackling."* I would have thought it was possible to do that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That last point serves to explain why we have such different views about what should be happening now at this stage of the process because Government have not focused on the diagnostic phase in that sense. To Government the diagnostic phase was just a milestone in a process the real purpose of which came in the next milestone so we have not sat down to make a policy decision upon the diagnostic issues one by one, separately and ahead of the implementation recommendations. I would ask the Opposition not to forget the public commitment that Government have both inside and outside of this House which is that we would either act on all of the recommendations or explain why we are not acting. So, it is not that Government are shying away from expressing whether they agree or whether they do not with those that Government do not agree demonstrated by the fact that Government do not act accordingly, the Government are committed to explaining publicly which can be in this House why Government are not acting and why Government do not agree. So, it is not that Government are not going to give this account it is just that the Government do not think it is still too early at this stage to deliver this sort of detailed view on these points and if the Leader of the Opposition recalls we made that commitment in the last House to deal with this report on that basis and the hon Members were asking us whether we would accept what the experts said and implement it and Government said that they could not be sure that they would accept but that if they did not something they would explain why they were not accepting it. So, we are talking timing here and the significance that each side is applying to the diagnostic phase of the report. The Opposition obviously view it as something upon which a view should have been formed by now of each point and a comprehensive report to us. We will consider when we get the workstream implementation report in relation to each of those points the first batch of which are due to reach us in the last week of January. I cannot tell the hon Members exactly which ones they are although there is a list of them but there are a series of recommendations and implementations which are as good as ready and they are coming out to present them to the Government and then Government have to consider them, either accept the recommendations/implementations or some version of them or explain why they are not proposing to deal with that issue.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Did Government not analyse this report before it was made public at the diagnostic phase and then came out with some kind of statement saying that based on the presentation they had had and presumably on the fact that they felt that these people were being successful in identifying what needed to be done they had then

taken a policy decision to commission the second part. The commissioning of the second part was the result of some exercise of judgement having been carried on the results of the first phase?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The reason why Government did not commission both phases at the front end is that Government wanted to be sure on the diagnostic phase that it was being done in the a thorough and comprehensive fashion. That Government were not committing themselves to quite an expensive process which was not being done with the thought of thorough, scientific approach that the Government would have wanted. It became clear to us from looking at the diagnostic report although I have to say that I agree with the remark that the Leader of the Opposition made some time ago which I made as well that a lot of the report is simply a recital of what witnesses said to the expert which seems to be a characteristic of most consultants as far as I can tell but within all that which is unquestionably true I made the same comment internally in Government but within that there is clear evidence that by speaking to people, by observing things themselves, by analysing the situation from their external perspective, by a combination of all three things they satisfied the Government that they had understood the length, depth, and breadth of the sort of exercise that in Government's judgement, perhaps not in theirs, the Health Service needs. That gave Government the confidence to commit to them in a really quite large sum of money to then go on to say , fine now that you have satisfied us that you have shown that .....now do the much more expensive implementation recommendation and that is where we are as from today and as I said to the Leader of the Opposition a meeting has been sought with us yesterday or today to present us with the first batch of these things so we are now at the start of the executory phase of the implementation stage of this two stage process.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That seems to me to suggest that if they came to that conclusion knowing that the origin of the bulk of this list which my hon Colleague has been asking the Minister to comment on were the results of information fed to the team. It is almost saying that they concluded that there was substance in all of them.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not want to be drawn because the problem with this is that once one starts the debate it is very difficult to limit it to this point or that point. I read the report. I could not think of anything that was left out and I could not see anything in it that struck me as odd that it should be in it. I did not read anything saying *goodness why do they think that this is in need of a fix?* That is an overview it is not the result of a detailed consideration with management and policy discussion between Ministers about whether yes or no to this or that recommendation. It is just my layman's reading of the report as a user, as an observer of the health service I said *to me all of this seems to comprehensively encapsulate what if we put everyone's views together are the areas that need looking at in more details more remedial action and I did not see anything in the report that I if I had been the author of the report would not have at least identified as needing looking into.* The Leader of the Opposition can take that if he wants as the government agreeing with everything on the report. I am not saying

that I agree with every detail but I agree that the issues identified are the issues that deserve touching.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Was the engagement and the fees then negotiated on the basis that there was a sum of money for phase I and a different sum of money for phase II and that the phase II might not materialise and therefore might not need to be paid, because as I recall it there was one sum of money from the beginning put in the estimates?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think so. With almost complete certainty I can say no. The sum of money agreed for the implementation workstreams was neither known or agreed or even ball parked at the front end of the process so it was not as if the fees for both phases had been agreed at the front end but they could only access the second amount if it went to the second implementation phase.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The amount that shows in appendix 'C' in the estimates where it says, "*Clinical Governance fees and expenses*" which is £400,000 is this the amount for both phases, phase I or phase II?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a provision. How much of that was actually expended in phase I, I do not know offhand the information will become obvious to the Leader of the Opposition when he gets the figures of expenditure to date in the Health Authority budget where he will see how much has been spent up to November. That would all have presumably been under phase I. I do not know how much phase I cost. That would have been a provision not the agreed price of phase I, it would have just been a provision at that stage of the beginning of the financial year.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I have just asked because that was the impression that one got from this. It was not even known at the beginning that we were talking about two phases we were just told that this was for .....

**MR SPEAKER:**

I knew.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

....but I think that in the House when the estimates were presented and the Opposition voted the money in the budget it was not explained, *this money is the*

*provisional figure and it covers two phases and it is not all for phase I or phase II. I have just asked specifically whether there was a sum of money put which included phase I and phase II in respect of which if Government had not been happy with phase I phase II would not have been triggered off and I have been told 'No'. All that I have to say to the Chief Minister is if there is a figure of £400,000 for the Clinical Governance fees and expenses period then that implies a 'yes' not a 'no' answer unless the Chief Minister is telling me, *that was for phase I and phase I turned out to be less but now we have to vote fresh funds for phase II*, is that the position?*

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is really a combination of both with a third dimension. It is a provision for phase I which was a committed engagement and for phase II if any part of phase II if it took place fell in this financial year. I do not know whether the £400,000 have been used for phase I or whether only £100,000 or £150,000, £200,000 have been used for phase I. How much of that provision has been consumed by phase I, I cannot tell him I have a figure in my mind of how much phase II cost I believe it was published but I can find out as I do not have that information right here and now. If the hon Member wants to know how much did phase I cost and how much has Government agreed for the cost of phase II so that the hon Member can add them both together and know the cost of the entire exercise I am perfectly happy to provide him with that information but I do not have the breakdown available to me right now.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would be grateful of that because what I am telling him is that until today I was under the impression that this was the total cost of the operation.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that it was much more than that.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The hon and Gallant Mr Britto said in a debate on radio during the elections that certain recommendations from the first phase of the report had already been implemented can he say which are those recommendations, he said it in a radio debate with me during the elections?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister cannot recall saying that and if he did say it he cannot recall what he had in mind as he was saying it. The only two aspects of the subject matters touched upon by the phase I report upon which there had been some movement at that time were the Health Centre Appointment system upon which an interim thing was put in place and the very first item of the waiting lists issue, the hon Lady knows the whole cataract thing. I am not saying that that is what he had in mind I am telling the hon Lady that the only two things that might have happened which might

conceivably fall into that category are those two things. I am not aware of anything else that has been implemented of the things that I have seen in the report.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The statements made by one of the Ministers for Health the Hon Mr Britto during the month of November, I was on the television debate in relation to Health and during that debate the video which my mother cherishes and I am happy to make available to him if he wishes he also said the same thing that Government had already commenced the process of implementation of all the recommendations in the report. Just on that point that is something which the Government need to look into. Were they misleading the people then or are they misleading the people now, what is the position ?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

As luck would have it I have with me the notes that I had for the debate we had on television with the hon Member. I have already said that I have no recollection of this but I have come across my notes and what they say is, “...*phase II the development and implementation stage has already started.*” That is what my notes say I am not inventing them. I have no recollection of saying that the recommendations had been implemented because recommendations had not yet been made so there might be a genuine misunderstanding. The other note says, “..*the target completion is towards the end of 2004.*” What I was saying was that phase II the recommendation stage and I quote, “*phase II – development and implementation of reforms – already started.*” It is the work of the team that falls under the heading Governance Support Team and that has already started that is the only answer that I can think of to that question.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the hon and Gallant Gentleman not agree that that is what his notes said but not actually what he himself said during the course of the debate, perhaps by inadvertence?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

We shall check your mother's video.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Regardless whether this is or is not a question of implementation of recommendations what we have all got to understand is that the people's needs are priority. Therefore whether the Government have to take any particular action tomorrow, whether it coincides with the implementation of the report or not surely Government have to do something about it.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Management of the Health Authority carries on on a daily basis. Government having decided to tackle this matter in a holistic comprehensive thorough once and for all way, it is not a question of identifying 20 things and fixing one and leaving the other 19. the Government's preferred way of doing what the hon Member is recommending is to be advised what needs to be done to bring in Gibraltar's health service well and truly into the 21<sup>st</sup> century and then implementing those plans. The hon Member is concerned that this is sort of a long stock gain then that is not what has been announced and it is not what will happen. Government are not waiting for a lengthy report now and implementation that is going to take a year or two and in the meantime nothing is going to happen. No, Government are getting a recommendation on each of the areas that have been identified separately so at the end of this or next week Government may get the recommendations on the appointments system, waiting lists and the complaints procedure from all the many issues that are being investigated. Government will then consider that and implement that at that time Government will not wait for all the recommendations to be in place before implementing so that there will be a progressive, continuous implementation. Starting February the hon Member will get precisely what he is describing and that is that there has to be a continuous process of action and progress and visible signs of improvement it is just that Government have not started because they have not received the first one of these reports but the first one of these reports is about to arrive and once the liquid enters the pipe it continues to flow continuously it is just that the tap has not yet been turned on.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government accept that preferential treatment is being given to private patients over and above public patients?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, but that regardless of the report. That I knew before the report.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore what the Chief Minister is saying today is in complete contrast to what the previous Ministers for Health have said in this House when, for example, the Hon Dr Linares in answer to Question No 301 of 2003 said, "*I can confirm that having received the report the management has firmly and resolutely tackled the areas that were seen to be of none compliance with the private practice agreement and has received the full co-operation of the consultants in respect. Complying with all the aspects of private practice agreement,*" does the Chief Minister not accept that the Government have erred in their judgement?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government do not accept that they have erred in their judgement. Government made a first attempt at dealing with the problem of abuse of private practice by agreeing with the Consultants a new regime that would limit the conduct of private practice to the point where the effect on the availability of public access was for the

first time severely curtailed. Do Government think that that agreement in its implementation had the effect that Government hoped, expected and was seeking at the time that it entered the agreement? I readily accept as I have said publicly on several occasions before today that it did not which is why Government are now approaching the matter from a much more intolerant way. No more self-regulation, no more voluntary agreements and no more *"we will be good boys in future approach to life."* There now has to be a more resilient system in place that is less open to interpretation at the edges and when I said before whether I accepted that there was preferential treatment or not I hope that the hon Lady understood that I meant preferential access to treatment. The actual quality of the medical treatment dispensed is the same to the private as to the public but that the private patient gets access to that treatment sooner because they have paid, because there are public waiting lists which are unnecessary, of that there can be absolutely no doubt whatsoever.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government as well not accept that when we are talking about private practice in relation to waiting lists his previous Ministers have said in this House *"Does the Minister not accept that because of private practice being regulated waiting lists for public patients could rise as a consequence of that?"* and the reply that I got from that was, *"No, I do not accept that they could rise precisely because of that factor."* Are Government still in agreement with what the previous Minister for Health said or do Government now accept in relation to the comments made and our warnings that public waiting lists have shot up precisely because of private practice?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not know which of my previous ministerial colleagues made that remark but he is to be congratulated for the precision and accuracy of his words. Yes, waiting lists have not increased precisely because Government attempted to regulate private practice. It would be absurd for the hon Lady to say that the fact that because an attempt was made to regulate private practice lead to a higher waiting list. What leads to a higher waiting list is not the attempt to regulate it but that the attempt to regulate it was not successful, that is what leads to the higher waiting lists but not the attempt. If the attempt to regulate had been more successful the waiting lists would not be as big as they are today so I think that those words that she has quoted in which the hon Lady was saying that she does not accept that the attempt to regulate private practice precisely is the cause of the increased waiting list is 100 per cent correct and a perfect semantic analysis of the issue.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have just found some information in relation to a statement that the Chief Minister made about private practice and waiting lists. The Chief Minister because of his mannerisms gets upset when we hold him accountable and then we have to put up with everything that he says being repeated all over again. It is the Chief Minister that said that more importantly he was quite satisfied with the new system of the waiting lists as regards private practice and therefore has the Opposition not been correct in our analysis and so Government not accept that even in the report whereby the actual report that they commissioned confirms everything that we have been saying that the public waiting lists have risen because of the private practice

agreement which they have said as we said is a complete failure, does the Chief Minister not accept that, or has the Chief Minister not read the report himself?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Lady has declined to identify the report I do not know what report she is talking about but if there is a report [INTERRUPTION] that was long before the private practice agreement came into existence so the report cannot possibly be referring to that. If there is a report in existence it does not matter which, the one the hon Lady has got in her hand, one that she has not yet seen, the one the other gentleman has got, it does not matter which, which says that waiting lists have increased because of the attempt to regulate private practice and to minimise the number of public hours during which consultants could carry out private practice that that is the cause of an increase in waiting lists then I do not accept the report regardless of its author, its date, and whether the hon Lady has got it in front of her or has not got it in front of her. What I accept is what I have already accepted namely that the first attempt that Government made to curtail the effects of private practice on public waiting lists did not enjoy the measure of success that we had hoped at the time that we made the arrangements, that I readily acknowledge and accept.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The report that I am referring to is the recent report because all these questions refer to the recent report of the development healthcare team of September 2003 and what I am quoting is in page eight for the benefit of the Chief Minister page 15 of the summary which says precisely what I am saying that private practice has been a failure.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I agree.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

You agree. Therefore the logical question for any politician is to ask the Chief Minister is whether all his previous Ministers have been wrong in their analysis and their statements in this House?

**MR SPEAKER:**

That is asking for an opinion I will disallow it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister in view of the explanations that we have been given for the original statement not addressed in the questions put by my hon Colleague, and this is not asking for an opinion, do Government accept as a fact, for example, the figures that are quoted in Question No 168 of 2004 whereby my hon Colleague quotes that the initial report, the diagnostic phase of the report as the Chief Minister

chooses to call it, in respect of the cost of sponsored patients claim that there has been an increase from £3,125 per patient to £5,795 either that is a fact or it is not a fact I do not see why Government do not agree that those figures are correct without knowing whether a solution can be found and a way can be found of reducing the costs so it seems to me that the analysis that we were given by way of explanation would not apply to a question of that nature. There are figures quoted in a report. We are asking the Government if they accept that those figures are correct the answer can only be yes or no?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Or, I do not know.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept it is another answer but I would have thought given the length of time that Government have had this if the Clinical Governance Team have got it wrong on the increased costs of sponsored patients does the Minister accept as correct or incorrect or does not know whether the increase in the cost of pharmaceuticals which is quoted by my hon Colleague in Question No 158 of 2004 have increased by 18 per cent per year in the last three years have they or have they not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Without confirming the precise accuracy of the figure the cost of pharmaceuticals has increased by a figure of that sort of order. That regardless of the report. There has been a very significant interest in the cost even of the generic medicines that the Opposition disapprove so much of.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government accept that in page 219 where the report says, “*..little regard is paid to private practice agreement,*” and with regard to the comments that I have just made in relation to the inconsistent statements that the previous Ministers for Health have made and the Chief Minister has today made, it appears that the agreement has also been a failure because Government have paid little attention to the agreement otherwise had they been on top and asked for statistics when they should have perhaps the waiting lists and the agreement would not have been a failure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government accept neither the accuracy of the premise of the hon Lady's question nor the conclusion to which that inaccuracy leads her.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In that case why is it that Government have been defending private practice for three years in this House and now suddenly they agree that it has not been working can Government not then accept that they have erred in their judgement?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government do not accept the premise of her question. Government have not been defending private practice for three years or any number of years.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Chief Minister then say that he does not accept the factual information that I have quoted from Hansard especially as his previous Minister for Health put his hand up saying yes I am responsible for that statement.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister accepts the content of Hansard but not the abuse to which she subjects it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am not abusing anything I am quoting from Hansard.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The forensic purpose to which the hon Lady puts the comments that she so obviously takes out of context are not accepted by the Government.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not documented in Hansard by previous Ministers for Health defending the position that consultants were actually co-operating that the agreement that they had put in place was actually working and that they were happy with the arrangements and now we have a completely different scenario, is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It may well have been the case I doubt it very much that the Government's unhappiness with the agreement that it entered into set in on day one. It is not as if Government signed the agreement on a Monday and by Tuesday lunchtime was already convinced that the consultants were already abusing it. There may well have been a period after the signing of the agreement during which it may have been working properly. The fact that that situation stopped being so and then clearly was not working is contradicted by the fact that a Minister may have said during the first period that he was then satisfied with the way the agreement was working. The hon Lady takes remarks out of context and then thinks that they prove things that they do not prove at all.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect to Question No 154 of 2004 and one which I would have thought was quite important, do Government accept as factually correct the statement that since the year 2000 admissions have declined by almost 10 per cent because I find that quite an extraordinary conclusion, why do we have declining admissions and increasing shortages? One would have thought one was working in the opposite direction to the other. I would have thought that the Government received a report even if they were taking a global view specific things like this I imagine that they would have checked for accuracy or is it that they are unsure that this is right or that they know that this is right or that they think that it is wrong which of the three is it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We have not done an assessment to see if this is in arrears an empirical exercise they have compared the annual statistics but I can speculate of a logical explanation for it. If beds are being blocked either for the reasons that we allege or for any other reason if the same bed is being occupied permanently by one patient which only counts as one admission there are fewer beds into which to admit patients and therefore there are less numbers of admissions in the year period because if one has a 160 bed hospital and increasingly every year there are more and more beds which are not open for more admissions then there may well be a case of there being few admissions, people that had at some stage in the past might have been admitted to hospital and out-treated on some other basis. I am not offering it as an explanation it is a reason that I am speculating could explain why in a situation in which there is a shortage of beds apparently fewer people less demand. There has got to be an explanation it may not be the one that I have given him but there has to be an explanation especially given the fact that whatever may be our disagreement about how many beds there were when they were in office or how many beds there are now this is three years in which GSD has been in office and the GSD has certainly not reduced the number of beds in those three years. So, the number of beds is static and it said that there is 10 per cent less demand on the beds so it cannot be demand, admissions is different to demand. If one arrives in a hospital and there are beds available the doctor might say , *"...well stay overnight for observation."* Or *"...you look tired have a few days rest in hospital."* If there are no beds then the doctor is going to say to go and rest at home and that is a reduction in admissions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My supplementary really was whether the Government could confirm the accuracy of the 10 per cent reduction. The answer is that Government have not homed in on this.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is that whilst we have no known reason to doubt them nor have they been validated, audited by management so we neither endorse them nor disown them. The process of validation simply has not taken place.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know that all the questions are not like that but this is one question were there is a simple straightforward figure being quoted and Government is asked to say whether they agree with the figure being quoted and notice had been given of the question. It would not take a week this is not an exercise that requires major mobilisation of resources it just requires knowing where to look in the system to get the figure that there was in the year 2000 of admission, the figure that there was in the year 2003 and find out if the admission into 2003 were 10 per cent below 2000 or were not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is one approach to life another is that these statistics are all in the public domain. In each of these three years there has been a Gibraltar Health Authority Report published assuming that it has been published already for the last of the years mentioned which contain the admissions figures. We could all do our calculations. I withdraw I do not think that it has been published in respect of September 2003.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

We would like to know whether the figure is accurate or not and perhaps they could validate it or otherwise let us know and I know that Government have not proffered us the explanation for that apparent on the surface inconsistency the fact that there is bed blocking and therefore less people are being allowed in but all I can say is that in all the time that we have had the concept of bed blocking paraded in the House in answer to questions there have never been any suggestion from the Government of increasing bed blocking. The figure that has been quoted all the time has always been around 30 odd beds. In the year 2000 there were 30 odd beds blocked according to the terminology of the Government and in the year 2003 there are still 30 odd bed blocked. Indeed today in answer to questions I was going to say that the figure was 37. If it has gone from 30 to 37 between 2000 and today that is hardly evidence of producing 10 per cent drop in admissions and the seven that has been used today has not been there all the time. The figures that we have had from Government there has been a very stable figure of around 30 maybe sometimes it has gone a little bit down to 27 or 28 and sometimes it has gone up to 34 or 35 but it has always been around that figure but I accept that in any case that was not being proffered as the definitive explanation but I would think that it would be a worthwhile exercise first of all to see if this figure is accurate and then to try and make sense of it.

**HON S E LINARES**

Without going into figures I would like to know, is it a fact that specialists are unable to refer directly to specialists outside Gibraltar that is another part of the question where the GP's are unable to refer directly to specialists outside Gibraltar, that would be a question that can be answered because it is either yes they can or no they can not, that is a simple answer to a question which has been posed again?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We accept that question because it is a question about the existing health service the position is what it has always been. Since 1966 and since 1988 it has never been the case that referrals abroad could be made by GP's. Referrals abroad have only ever whether it is in our term of office or in the GSLP's term in office referrals abroad have only been made by Consultants and GP's have never been free to make referrals in fact Government have recently introduced an exception to that in respect of cardiography but certainly it would be a complete and utterly financially uncontrollable and unaffordable expense if every GP in Gibraltar at Government expense could refer patients abroad for medical treatment. We might as well close down our own health service and use the £34 million that we have got to send people to whatever corner of the globe this or that GP is sending his patients. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition accepts not only that it has always been so but that it has always been so for very good and necessary reason.

**HON S E LINARES**

I accept the Chief Minister's argument and I am glad that he has taken the trouble to answer it which is the point that I am trying to make because of course GP's should not be sending patients to Timbuktu or wherever, I agree with his argument but at least he has had the decency to stand up and answer the question which is the point that I am making.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister has stood up to answer the question because Government have never suggested that if an hon Member stands up and asks the Government a matter of fact about the existing health service as he has done that Government do not consider that to be a legitimate question. The hon Member has asked whether it is true that GP's are not entitled to refer abroad that is not a question about the report that is a question about existing practice in the existing health service and whether they agree with the stance Government have taken on the question of the report or not I do not think that the hon Members can suggest, insinuate, or imply still less declare as the hon Member has just done that Government have somehow refused to answer questions about the health service.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will Government not accept as a matter of fact that in the last meeting of the House of Assembly which is recorded in Hansard that it was I who actually posed that question to the previous Minister for Health who said that at the moment GP's were able to refer patients to have an echocardiogram and then when I asked the Minister further "*...do government agree that they should look into the possibility of GP's referring patients to other consultants*" the Minister said that he thought there was mileage on that, that he was willing to look at it.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether he said that Government was willing to look at it. If the Minister said that Government were willing to look at it I can tell the hon Lady now what the result of that looking into would be.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In relation to one of the questions that there is here which deals with the staff which to me, independent of what we might think in terms of improving the quality of the service to the users which obviously if people are unhappy they are likely to deliver a less good service than if they are happy at work not just in the health service but in any enterprise that deliver services to users which I think is what the Clinical Governance is all about the question of whether the staff are satisfied with their jobs and working conditions I would have thought is a matter for the Human Resources Department and a matter of industrial relations anyway. If the Opposition asks the Government whether they accept that there is this discontent with working conditions which seems a very broad statement to make. Surely the Government are able to express a view as to whether in their judgement there is this discontent which the report reflects.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not prepared to comment on the specific instances of discontent that the report may or may not identify. I do not remember them and I am not willing to comment on the report. What I am willing to do is to express my view on the issue that he has identified. The Leader of the Opposition well knows that it very much depends how one defines discontent. If by discontent one means that people would always like better terms and conditions of employment, more money, less hours, that there is a view amongst some of the nursing staff that the fact that certain members of staff tend to take quite a lot of sick leave, absenteeism increases, the hours that others have got to cover, if the Leader of the Opposition means all of that then yes. There are always claims to the extent that a pay claim or a re-grading claim is manifestation that one is not happy with what one has then there is always that sort of discontent. There will continue to be even after one has fixed that sort of discontent and anything that needs fixing. That is just in the nature of the cut and thrust of industrial relations but without wishing to spoil the relatively civilised atmosphere in which this general debate of the health services is taking place I also have to say to the Leader of the Opposition that one of the things that I think contributes to the state of low morale of staff in the Health Authority is the incessant attacks to which the nature and quality of the service that they deliver are subjected by the hon Lady. Let me explain why I believe that and then let the hon Lady disagree as I am sure she will but let her articulate her disagreement. The hon Lady thinks in her mind that she can say, *"..the health service is in crisis, the health service is a shambles, the health service is chaotic, such and such a patient has died, such and such a patient has had to spend the night in the corridor, such and such an inquest has shown that such and such a night shift failed to pay such and such attention to such and such a patient..."* And then at the end say, *"..and it is all the fault of the Minister for Health."* She might use that device in order not to be seen by the staff to blame them but as most normal intelligent thinking people understand that quality is about the criticism about the delivery of day-to-day healthcare are not really criticisms of the Minister since he is not there by the bedside, are in reality drip, drip, drip, drip, drip, criticisms of the staff delivering that healthcare however much the hon Lady might say it is not intended to

be such this has an enormously demoralising effect on people who have to work there none of which is to suggest that there are not things wrong with the health service that the hon Lady is entirely right and justified in criticising but the style with which she does it, the intensity with which she does it, the terms in which she does it does not enable this sort of clinical separation of criticism of the Minister and criticism of the staff. The hon Lady may think that that division and separation is possible but the result of the style with which she rightly makes the health service an important political issue, the style with which she does it creates the impression in the community that the health service is terrible that it is unsafe, that it does not deliver any kind of good service, that it is completely unreliable and this is inescapably a criticism of the staff and this is how they perceive it. I know that that is not the hon Lady's intention but it is the inescapable consequence of the way she chooses to go around using the health services for political purposes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Never, ever, have I ever said that it is the fault or implied that anything wrong with the health services is because of the professionals working within it on the contrary I have always commended their professionalism what I have criticised is that Government [INTERRUPTION] have not provided the necessary resources for them to carry out the job properly and not only have I not said this, let me remind the Chief Minister who always tries to confuse the issue that I have not been the only one saying that morale is low. I have said it precisely because of the reasons that I have just given but let me remind the Chief Minister that professionals within the health service have said it in public. The represented of the Users Forum have said it in public, Mr Michael Netto has said it in public and I could go on and on about the different people that have said it in public it has not only been me it has been them it has not been anything that I have said which has made the staff feel that their morale is low on the contrary it has been other members in public that have voiced the same concerns as I have. So, what the Chief Minister is saying is absolute nonsense.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady has made much more articulately than me because I took 15 minutes to say what she has managed to say in a minute and a half but it is exactly the same point. The hon Lady believes, she has just said so now, that in the intense criticism to which she has subjected the health service during the last three years she has neither made not intended to make any single criticism of the healthcare staff that delivers the service the hon Lady has just said so. The problem is not the healthcare staff, the doctors, the nurses, all of whom are magnificent, it is the Minister for Health because she says now that he has failed to provide sufficient resources. Let us just analyse what this failure to provide sufficient resources boils down to. An increase in the health budget from £20 million in 1996 to £36 or £37 million nearly a 100 per cent increase in seven years that is the hon Member's definition of failure by the political Government to provide resources. Many more consultants, senior doctors, GP's, clinics in many more areas, a new ambulance service, spectacular increases in the amount of patients sent under the sponsored patients scheme, increased resources for nurse training, these are the things that the hon Lady believes and asserts with a straight face represent a failure to provide sufficient resources which in her own mind explains the fact that the shambolic state in which she says the health service is , I do not agree, is the fault entirely of the Government that fails to provide sufficient resources and that nobody but nobody in her view of the employees employed to actually deliver the service have any degree of causal responsibility for whatever she

may think are the shortcomings of the health service. Does the hon Lady not realise that not even her staunchest political supporters all of whom have got a brain in their head could possibly accept that ridiculous analysis of the situation.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am not here to answer the Chief Minister's questions but secondly it appears that the Chief Minister whenever a statement is made by other members of the community he ignores them. It was actually the representative of the nursing staff who said that there was a lack of resources and I even remember what he said, that they were waiting for four weeks for a blood pressure machine in John Ward, four weeks. Another thing that I will tell the Chief Minister which is the actual reason why the morale of the Health Service professionals working within it is low is because of the scandalous threat that the Chief Minister has made to the staff. Implicit in their manifesto and in the Chief Minister's New Year message that is explicit, that is why the morale is low because the Chief Minister is saying either one takes it or one leaves it another threat. Another threat like the Chief Minister does to everybody else the elderly, the patients and the people who work there. The style of this Government, threats after threats that is the reason why there is low morale within the Gibraltar Health Authority.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Then the hon Lady thinks that the low morale has only been around since the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2003 which is the date that the GSD published its manifesto. So, what the hon Lady is now saying by her latest ridiculous argument is that the morale was low, yes, because if the hon Lady says that the morale was low because of the threats that the hon Lady says that I had made to the health service staff and the hon Lady thinks that the threat was first made in the manifesto then all that the hon Lady has said before about the morale having been so low for so long is by the hon Lady's mouth untrue. The hon Lady does not have to quote me what other people have said to prove that morale is low as if I were resisting the proposition. I do not resist the proposition that morale is low, I know morale is low. What we are debating again is the reason why the morale is low and as in all other things we have a different view. I am very grateful to the hon Lady's last intervention because she has given me a very small example but an example nevertheless of why my view of life is much more likely to be accurate than hers. Having just said that it is all the Minister's fault and that all the people that work in the health service are great the hon Lady then uses as an example of the low morale the fact that they waited four weeks for a blood pressure machine for John Ward. Who buys the blood pressure machine? Does the Minister? Who decides what the enormously increased budget which leaves the budget that the hon Lady used to provide for new equipment in the hospital looking like a petty cash box, who does the hon Lady think if not the people that the hon Lady thinks are perfect decide which equipment to buy? So, the criticism that in John Ward they waited four weeks for a blood pressure machine is a criticism not of the Minister who the hon Lady says is solely responsible but of the very people that she says are blameless [INTERRUPTION] There is no hospital in the world which has on tap every piece of machine that one might need in case that it is needed. There are such things such as procurement periods but it does not matter we are not discussing the reality we are discussing the abuse to which the hon lady submits perfectly normal occurrences. That somebody should want a new piece of medical equipment which is not available in Gibraltar and has to be purchased abroad and has to wait four weeks for it to arrive does not at first sight appear unreasonable. The suggestion

that I have made threats to the staff of St Bernard's Hospital is frankly not sustainable. What I actually said in my New Year address which I repeat here today which is the Government's policy and which will remain the Government's policy is that (1) we recognise contrary to what the hon Lady is constantly trying to insinuate, that Government recognises that there are a massive number "*the vast majority*" I think that was the language I used in my New Year message, of healthcare workers in Gibraltar who are delivering first class healthcare, who are enormously committed and who for that reason enthusiastically support the Government in its attempt to make sure that everybody in the health service works to the same high standards of commitment and dedication that they do. What I have also said is that Government are determined to deliver the remedy to the problems which the hon Lady is constantly telling me exists in the health service and when I have said that anyone who resists those improvements, who resists those changes cannot carry on working in the health service the hon Lady says that it is a threat. Well, what the hon Lady is thereby insinuating is that having said that there are great problems which render the health service a chaotic shambles that anyone who obstructs the elimination of those terrible things should continue to work in the health service that would be the hon Lady's position. Here one sees another example like the business about the bed blockage but please do not throw any elderly person out of hospital. The hon Lady's case is based on an untenable duplicity and double standards. The hon Lady cannot at one and the same time criticise Government for not fixing what she thinks is broke and at the same time criticise Government for not leaving in place those that prevent the brokenness from being fixed. That is the hon Lady's position. Because, if Government say, "*there are going to be remedies implemented in consultation with the staff and the union leadership,*" they are stake-holders with the Government in the design and implementation of the remedial works. If after that even when reforms are implemented with the support of the union, with the support of the BMA, there are still doctors and other employees who for reasons of their own wish to frustrate that improvement that the hon Lady thinks the people of Gibraltar are entitled to and so do I, the proposition that the Government should just leave them in place to continue to deliver the shambolic health service that the hon Lady thinks that they are presently delivering frankly to use the hon Member's phrase "*...gives the lie to the sincerity*" of her political stance in this matter.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I will not go into questions of the sincerity of the political stance of Ministers. I do not know whether that is expressing an opinion which is not permissible under Standing Orders but can I remind the Chief Minister that the last half hour or three-quarters of an hour is supposed to have been the answer to a supplementary question, which I asked about dissatisfaction with working conditions. Can the Government summarise then and have I understood the Chief Minister correctly in saying that the reason for the dissatisfaction with working conditions in the hospital is that Marie Montegriffo issues too many press releases?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What the Leader of the Opposition can interpret as I have said quite clearly is that there are several reasons for the low level of moral. One of them is the incessant manner in which the hon Lady makes people believe in Gibraltar that everything and everyone about the health service is not working in a reliable and safe fashion and I would have thought that it would be possible to target criticism where criticism is undoubtedly due on the occasion where it might undoubtedly be due without creating

the impression that the health service in Gibraltar is not to be touched with a barge pole. As to the point that other people have said so, I remember a time that other people, very authoritative people said that under the hon Lady's care the health service was in danger of falling to third world standards does the hon Lady say that she accepts the truth of that just because other people were saying it? *[INTERRUPTION]*.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Order!

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Chief Minister has said that people and I suspect that the Chief Minister is referring to the BMA, the Chief Minister jumped on the band wagon and I must answer what he has just said because it is wrong. The BMA were saying that it could go down to third world standards, it could, not that it did, it could and it did not, that is what happened. But now they are right now it has definitely gone down to third world standards. Will the Chief Minister not accept and recall as a matter of fact that after the results of the General Election were announced he himself stood up and accepted the reprimand of the people of Gibraltar, not of Marie Montegriffo but the people of Gibraltar, for the state in which the health services were?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the hon Lady does not have to remind me of what we did. That they have reprimanded us in my judgement amongst other things for failing to be tough and quick enough in resolving some of the outstanding issues with the health service is unquestionably true but they will not be impressed by the hon Lady's obstruction of that process by suggesting that however much somebody is unreasonably an obstacle in removing those difficulties the hon Lady thinks that they should carry on working and delivering healthcare in Gibraltar.

**MR SPEAKER:**

If there are going to be two or three more questions I will stay here otherwise I will adjourn.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government not accept that the Complaints Procedure has been a total fiasco and that here again we have a similar scenario where Government have been defending for years in this House the effectiveness of it where we have had reports from the Ombudsman coinciding with our analysis and now in the last meeting of the House the previous Minister for Health said that he was going to employ somebody completely divorced from the Gibraltar Health Authority and is that not in effect another contradiction of this Government as regards their many failures in their handling of the health services?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government will answer no more supplementary questions in answer to Question No 175 of 2004.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Chief Minister not give a reason why they are not willing to answer is it that he has been very uncomfortable because of the questions that I am asking him? Will the Minister for Health at least answer the questions since the question is being posed to him?

**HON C A BRUZON:**

If this is the attitude of the hon Gentlemen we might as well go home.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In deference to the hon Member I rise to say that he has not been in this House long enough to compare our attitude with the attitudes that have been seen in this House not so long ago perpetrated by the Opposition. I recall particularly not just the fact that we give informative factual answers to every question in sharp contrast to what the Opposition used to do all of them when they were Ministers but if the hon Member thinks that having answered 34 questions on this supplementary shows an attitude problem on my part the hon Member ought to be aware that the Leader of the Party of which he is now a Member used to refuse for years, months and months on end to answers the questions of an elected Member of the Opposition on the simple ground that he disapproved of his political views.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

My attitude in this House I hope, will always be honourable and I will respect the elected Members opinions and point of view but I think that it is very important in my humble view that we stop referring to the faults of previous Governments and concentrate on solving present problems to the best of our ability because two wrongs do not make a right.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The problem to agreeing to forget the faults of the previous Government are that Government are constantly being reminded by them of their previous virtues because what the hon Members cannot do is to constantly be telling the people of Gibraltar how much better they used to run the economy than us but then, they want to go back to history for what they think are the good things but Government are not entitled to remind them of the bad things about their history. We either both play by the same rules or neither of us play at all but going back in time cannot be legitimate for them and illegitimate for us simply because they choose the subjects.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If the Chief Minister feels that in order to refuse to answer any more supplementaries on a particular question which of course he is permitted to do by Standing Orders because the Government do not have to answer, it is not the first time that Government have refused to answer, the Chief Minister needs to legitimise that because the Government of the GSLP adopted a policy decision when he excluded Mr Cummings from his party because Mr Cummings came out and said publicly that Government wanted to do a deal with Spain but that the Opposition at the time were willing to say so inside the party but did not the electorate to know which was what caused Mr Cummings to leave the party and the GSLP took the view that if Mr Cummings was leaving the party on the grounds that the private sympathies that the hon Member had for a deal with Spain, which I am not in a position to judge whether Mr Cummings was telling the truth or not but that was the explanation that he gave, meant that he was now in this House on that ticket the GSLP took the view that he had no right to continue to exercise a role in the Opposition having been elected on one ticket and then having here adopted a different attitude which made the Chief Minister expel him. To say that he refuses to answer supplementary questions on health because I told Mr Cummings that if he wanted the questions answered he should do the thing that was right which was to fight an election on the ticket of a deal with Spain and if he got elected we would answer his questions shows how far he has got to go in scraping the bottom of the barrel to justify, why does the Chief Minister not have the guts to say that he is not going to answer any more questions because he is fed up of answering and he just does not want to do it. Why does the Chief Minister have to go back to 1995 to say because I said no to Mr Cummings in 1995 he has to do the same thing in 2004 does he have no initiative of his own, he has to justify everything that he does in reference to me? I feel sorry for the man.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Firstly, I do not think it is a matter of guts. I know that the Leader of the Opposition sees everything in the language of the street fighter, I do not. I do not think it is a matter of guts but if it is a question of guts I said five minutes ago that I was not willing to answer any more questions on supplementary so if it is a matter of guts I am glad that he agrees that I have got guts. Secondly, I did not say that I was not willing to answer any more questions on health because he had not answered Mr Cumming's questions. That was my answer to his party colleague of the same GSLP that did that to Mr Cumming rising to impugn our attitude and suggesting that saying that 35 supplementaries is enough as far as the Government are concerned somehow suggests an attitude of lack of accountability. So, I think in answer to that not in answer to questions on health, it is perfectly legitimate to put in the balance our respective party doctrines in relation to transparency and accountability. As to the rather weak, feeble and unpersuasive explanation that the Leader of the Opposition has tried to give to his undemocratic treatment of my previous party colleague Mr Cumming, his summary of what is alleged to have been said or done inside the GSD is actually not correct but even if it were correct it is not for the Leader of a party in the House in a democratically elected parliament to decide the circumstances in which a Member of the Opposition should or should not be disqualified from the parliamentary privileges and rights which the electorate have bestowed on him. So, regardless of whether it happened the way he claims to have happened it goes not an iota of the way towards justifying what he did at that time. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition thinks that our approach to questions generally and today is comparable to that incident and many others but that one in particular then as is so many other things we shall just have to agree to differ and it is not important to me to

change his mind just as it appears non-important to him to allow me to do so. He has his views, I have my views, we debate them as is our democratic right and duty and then we both go our merry way but frankly I would have thought that the facts speak for themselves. The Government which has chosen to answer all these questions together not to deprive the hon Member of supplementaries or to submit itself to some mathematical calculation of the number of supplementaries that the hon Member is entitled to, our position in answer to all of these questions is that we were not going to answer any of them for reasons that we have debated at length and hopefully we are not going to re-open. So, Government could have said none of those questions that the Opposition is now asking are raised by our answer they are not just supplementaries to our original answer. We have allowed an hour and a half of supplementaries and we think that an hour and a half of supplementaries is enough even on 28 questions even if they had been asked and answered.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would Government not agree that it is not that we have an hour and a half on supplementaries it is that we have 20 minutes of questions and then one hour and ten minutes predominantly of speeches by the Chief Minister very little of which has got to do with the question the bulk of which is that he likes the sound of his voice and he likes the warm support from the rest of the Government who seem to be here predominantly in order to give him that support because he deals with all the supplementaries on all the subjects. It is very commendable because he spans everything from electricity generating sets to training needs in the hospital department. Fine, but if he chooses to answer for all the eight ministries and he does it at great length then an hour and a half is very little time to deal with the questions in which we are seeking factual answers and I would point him to Question No 163 of 2004 given that the Chief Minister says that none of the supplementaries have got to do with the original explanation. Is it the case that there is, forget whether the thing is contained in the first phase of the report or not contained, no training of staff when new equipment is introduced? That is either factually the case or not factually the case. I would have thought that to say to Government in the light of the explanations that they gave originally why they did not want to make statements on the Governance report, the point that I have made and the point which I thought the Chief Minister had accepted was that whilst I accepted the logic of his argument initially I put it to him that that argument was not equally applicable with the same strength to each and every one of the questions. The Government should know. They cannot blame the staff, the professionals et cetera if there is a question on this on the Order Paper which refers to the training of staff when new equipment is introduced the Government can say, "*..as far as we are concerned there is training of staff,*" or "*as far as we are concerned we agree factually there is no training of staff.*" If there is no training of staff then I would have thought, there might not have been training of staff before 1996 for all I know, there might not have been training of staff before 1988 for all I know, but if Government agrees that there is no training of staff now then the Opposition wants to know and if Government thinks that there should be training of staff having established that there is none we would like to know and those are perfectly legitimate supplementaries on questions related with health. But, if the answer is that what did I say when Mr Cummings was here in 1995 to a question of training of staff then it is hardly surprising that we take so long to go through the supplementaries so do Government have anything to say about whether there is training for staff with new equipment or not or is it that they do not want to tell us?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Leader of the Opposition might be interested in knowing that that was a nine minute speech and it has not persuaded Government to change the answer that we are not answering any more supplementaries on this question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am glad I have just made the Chief Minister answer it shows how vulnerable he is.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

We have had in the region of 36 supplementaries in relation to the number of questions but only .....

**MR SPEAKER:**

You have had 42.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

...42 that helps my argument because of those 42 I have only seen the Minister for Health rise to answer three times and I have seen the Minister for Financial Services, Industrial Relations, the Economy and External Relations, Electricity Authority, Matters of the Environment, some matters of culture, certain aspects of Trade and Industry, most aspects of Social Services et cetera and many aspects of Housing answer to answer most of the others. Would government not agree as a matter of fact that that says a lot about the Chief Minister's style of government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What I think it says is as the hon Member is not aware this is not a supplementary I am willing to defend my style of Government, what it shows is that as the hon Member presumably does not know is that the Chief Minister is ministerially responsible for the overall supervision of all departments and that is stated in the distribution of my ministerial responsibilities. The overall supervision of all Government departments is one of my ministerial responsibilities. The fact that I choose to take my responsibilities more seriously than my immediate predecessor is a comment on him not on me.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Going back to the original answer given to the 27 original questions, one of the Ministers for Health read a statement saying that the report does not intent to apportion blame but to diagnose problems and went on to suggest that if the report had been carried out between 1988 and 1996 it would have found a much worse state of affairs. What Government failed to recognise implicit in that statement is that having been in charge of the health services for eight years the criticisms made now are criticisms for which Government must take full political responsibility although

they accept that as a matter of fact they have been in charge of this health service now for eight years.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Chief Minister not consider or accept that he loses credibility when in his New Year Message he says the following, "*There will be a speedy and effective Complaints Procedure with an independent appeals level,*" when there has been a Complaints Procedure in place for the last six years which has been totally a failure and that therefore he loses credibility because nobody believes him anymore? Do Government not accept that for nearly three years the Opposition has been warning them about the problems at the A and E Department where patients have been subjected to waiting for hours before seeing a senior house officer and that therefore the analysis that we have actually made over these problems actually coincide not only with the report which they commission but also with all the complaints that we have received in our offices over the delays they are subjected to in the A and E Department?

**MR SPEAKER:**

Now I have got to intervene. If the position is that there is not going to be any answer I cannot allow any more supplementaries because they are not going to be answered.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If we have got the right to ask the question the fact that we do not get an answer does not remove the right to ask the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

But it is not a supplementary question.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is to the original answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If it is a particular supplementary then certainly we will make a point of making sure that they are supplementary.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will Government not accept that it is a fact that because the Complaints Procedure has been a failure this is one of the reasons why so many hundreds of people have come to see us with complaints and will the previous Minister for Health not accept that every time that I have contacted him or sent him a letter with the many

complaints that I have received of the patients that have come to see me they have all been legitimate complaints?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government confirm whether it is factually true that demand is increasing for most laboratory services?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Given that there is a finding in the Healthcare Development's Team Report that individuals have been known to wait at Accident and Emergency for over an hour and that on some occasions in the past, I am sure Government are aware that even individuals arriving with chest pain at Accident and Emergency have had to wait for more than an hour is Government not concerned as a matter of fact that fellow Gibraltarians of ours should have to wait for Accident and Emergency treatment for that long and even that they should continue to wait even if the new hospital is going to resolve all those matters miraculously as the Minister for Health has suggested that even today we should not be doing something urgently to ensure that that is not the case because that raises a serious issue of fact that our fellow Gibraltarians are having to wait as the Government's experts have found for over an hour at Accident and Emergency?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

To which of the original questions is that supplementary to?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am quite happy to answer that question of the Chief Minister it is in supplementary to Question No 160 of 2004 which reads as follows, *"Does Government now agree with the comments made in the first phase of the report of September 2003 by the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Team that there is nearly an hour's wait for patients to be seen at the Accident and Emergency Department?"*

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government not accept that in most specialities additions to the waiting lists exceed admission rates, that these waiting lists are increasing and that therefore what we have been saying in this House for the past four years is a correct analysis, that waiting lists have increased and continue to increase and that this is totally unacceptable?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Given the Government's failure to reply to my supplementary question a few moments ago about the wait of at times almost or over an hour by our fellow Gibraltarians at Accident and Emergency for treatment can I ask Government what are they doing to make sure that those waits do not occur because if somebody were

to die as a result of that and the Government had not answered our question I would have to assume that they are doing nothing and that therefore political responsibility for any such demise would be on their hands?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it correct that the waiting time for routine tests in the x-ray department is running at between three to six weeks depending on the type of tests?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are Government in a position to accept that waiting times are excessive for almost all services within the GHA?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have Government established that it is factually correct that the dental service is understaffed for the demand and that therefore waiting times are excessive for this particular service and are they in the process of doing anything to correct the understanding?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What are Government doing to address the problem of there being no training for staff when new equipment is introduced that as a user of the health service myself is something that seriously concerns me and I would ask the Chief Minister to address that question please?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Other comments about the dental service are not a complete contradiction of what the Hon Dr Linares said in relation to the dental department when he denied there were waiting lists in that area?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How do Government reconcile the lengthy speech boasting about the level of resources of the health service and the argument that has been used in the House today that it is not a question of lack of resources with the conclusion that Community Services are under resourced, is it that they deny that Community Services are under resourced, are they going to do anything about it if they accept that they are under resourced?

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Have there been any patient referrals to places other than the UK and Spain?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government recognise that waits for routine tests at the x-ray department from 2002 onwards is excessive running from three to six weeks depending on the type of test?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it true that the staff have not been consulted and involved in the design and development of the new hospital and if so how do they propose to put this right are they going to delay the new hospital so that Government can see whether the staff have got ideas on redesigning it before Government can finalise the work on it?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Given that an answer was not given to my supplementary a few minutes ago will the Chief Minister accept from me that when I resigned my partnership at Hassans to enter politics it was not in order to ask questions of a brick wall and that certainly it does not behold him now to conduct grudge politics and to rely on what may or may not have happened in this House almost a decade ago to avoid serious questions on an issue as serious as the health service that serves us all?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government not accept that there is no training needs analysis for staff and that therefore this can be one of the contributory factors why their moral is also low?

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Who is responsible for promoting communication within the health service?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Who is responsible for promoting communication within this House?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government not accept that Gibraltarians are unhappy about the Primary Care Centre appointment system and that the professionals within it are recommending to the Government that they revert back to the same system, a console one which was similar to the old one in the Health Centre which worked very reliably?

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Who is politically responsible for the health service?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not the case that in common parliamentary procedures especially in the United Kingdom which we tend to follow it is the actual Prime Minister and his Minister for Health that answers questions in the House of Commons because they are totally responsible for that department?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

This is my first session of the House. It is only my third day and it feels as if we have been here for a month but can the Chief Minister take it from me that certainly as a citizen and as a tax payer I am not at all impressed by the Government's discharging of it's functions in this House in answering questions in relation to health and that I hope that in the four years of parliament that we have left to work together before the electorate make another decision we will have another opportunity of having much more fruitful debates than the ones that we are unfortunately having at the moment.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I am standing up hopefully not for the last time in these four years. I believe in God and with the exception of my Colleague I think the rest of us do. So, I refer to the House the prayer we said on Monday where we asked for wisdom to direct and guide us in all our consultations.

**NO. 176 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government state what was the number of nurses in post as at the end of December 2003 with a breakdown by grade giving the full-time equivalent of each grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No 177 and No 178 of 2004.

**NO. 177 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT NURSES**

Can the Government confirm how many contract nurses are employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority, at the end of December 2003, listing the speciality in which they are employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No 176 and No 178 of 2004.



**NO. 178 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can the Minister for Health confirm how many of our local nurses are presently in the UK for specialist training to enable contract nurses to be replaced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

There are two local nurses training in the UK developing their careers in mental health nursing and orthopaedic nursing. The GHA through the School of Health Studies is training nursing staff to specialist level in three ways:

1. Delivery of bespoke modules locally;
2. accessing the distance learning courses;
3. sending local nurses to the UK for further training.

This strategy will ensure that the GHA uses all the methods at its disposal in order to train the maximum number of nurses to specialist level. The information requested by the hon Member in answer to Question Nos 176 and 177 of 2004 is contained in the schedule which I now hand to her.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 176 TO 178 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Minister for Health not agree that two local nurses specialising in the UK is not enough when we consider that in the last meeting of the House I was given a figure of 39 contract nurses, will the Minister also confirm when it was the last time that the Gibraltar Health Authority sent local nurse to specialise as RMNs?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No I do not agree.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister at least accept to pass over the information as regards when it was the last time that the Gibraltar Health Authority sent local nurses to the UK to train in specialist areas?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

If the hon Lady would like to write to me and specify what exactly it is she would like to know I will answer her question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister says that he does not agree but does he not accept that the number of contract nurses is increasing every time I ask this question, 36 in October, 39 in March, and now I see that there are 49 contract nurses?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I have explained in my original answer that the GHA carries out the training in three ways, it is not necessary to send people to UK. I have given out the three ways in which it is done and I am satisfied of what I have seen so far in the GHA that this method is adequate.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister for Health confirm in relation to the actual complement of nurses that it is nowhere near what the nursing review recommended which they commissioned and which they said they would be accepting and that it was in fact the Hon Mr Keith Azopardi who said when we actually got him to publish the report of the nursing review because they were not in agreement at the beginning that this should be published, did he not say that they expected in the next five years which was in 1997 when he said it, will Government not accept that he did say that Government would adhere to the recommendations of the nursing review that there would be 392 people in post and that he hoped that they would reach that figure within the next five years the five years have now elapsed and they have not reached that figure at all, are Government still committed to the nursing review as Mr Keith Azopardi said?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government are committed to providing the Health Service with the number of nurses that it is professionally advised it requires. The hon Lady may be interested to know although I do not agree with it that informally the view has been expressed to the Government that the staff compliment is already enough for the size and number

of beds in the Hospital. So, no, Government are not slavishly committed to a report of six years ago now and as Mr Azopardi has on numerous occasions since explained to the hon Lady in the House that the Government have implemented all those recommendations of that report as it has been accepted for implementation. That there are no accepted recommendations which are not yet implemented.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it still the policy of the Government to use contract nurses temporarily until they can be replaced by locally recruited trained nurses?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is the policy of the Government that the demand for qualified nurses should be satisfied to the greatest possible extent by local resident nursing staff it is cheaper but that requires that there should be sufficiently trained local staff. We have had a debate or discussion recently I cannot remember if it was inside or outside this House about the Government's policy allowing enrolled nurses to qualify and that is in hand and it is a potential source of more qualified nurses.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is not my question. My question is whether the policy still is as we were told it was once that the use of contract nurses was because the qualified nurses could not be produced from local resources overnight and it was to bridge the gap and that the purpose of that exercise was that as new locally entered nurses qualified they would start replacing contract nurses as their contracts came up for renewal is that still the policy or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. In principle it is if the point that he is making is "*.....is the Government using contract nurses as an alternative to permanent and pensionable nurses?*" the answer is no to that extent it is if there were enough nurses available in Gibraltar to recruit on a permanent and pensionable basis of the sort that we would like to recruit permanent and pensionable we would. When we have to import them they are on contract and not permanent and pensionable precisely so that there is more flexibility as to their replacement as and when there are more of the local nurses. The answer is therefore yes that remains the Government's policy on the whole.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not the case that contract nurses are being converted into permanent and pensionable or that contract nurses are actually being sent on courses to the United Kingdom when they were originally recruited so that somebody else could go on course that is not the case.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know if there were already instances of it, I suppose that if there are vacancies for permanent and pensionable nurses contract nurses who may have been here for some time might apply, I do not know if there have been any such incidents, they are not precluded from applying for permanent and pensionable posts but the answer to his original is as it is. Contract nurses are not supposed to serve the same long term need as the permanent and pensionable nurses.

**Answer to Question No 176 of 2004**

The following is a breakdown of Whole Time Equivalent in post as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003:

|                                                   |        |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Director of Nursing Services.....                 | Vacant |
| Deputy Clinical Manager of Nursing Services ..... | 1      |
| Clinical Nurse Manager.....                       | 6      |
| Education Development Officer.....                | 1      |
| Senior Nurse Tutor.....                           | 1      |
| Nurse Tutor.....                                  | 1      |
| Charge Nurse .....                                | 30     |
| Staff Nurse.....                                  | 104    |
| Midwives.....                                     | 12     |
| Senior Enrolled Nurse.....                        | 5      |
| Enrolled Nurse .....                              | 85.5   |
| Nursing Auxiliary .....                           | 13.5   |
| Nursing Assistant.....                            | 95.5   |

**Answer to Question No 177 of 2004**

There were 49 contract nurses employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority. The breakdown by specialities is as follows:

|                                     |    |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Clinical Nurse Managers (Maternity) | 1  |
| Education Development Officer       | 1  |
| Nurse Tutor                         | 1  |
| Nurse Practitioner                  | 2  |
| Registered General Nurse            | 21 |
| Registered Mental Nurse             | 5  |
| Registered Sick Children's Nurse    | 4  |
| Staff Midwife                       | 11 |
| Enrolled Nurse                      | 3  |

**NO. 179 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ENROLLED NURSE**

Can Government state whether any Enrolled Nurses have now applied to be able to train up to the level of Staff Nurse?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 179 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister give the reasons why they have not applied, I know that the previous Minister said that as an entrance requirement they require not GCSE's but registration with the UKCC, is that correct?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The requirement is that they either have to obtain five GCSE's and commence training as a student in order to attain the level of staff nurse or alternatively to be eligible for registration in the UK to undertake the conversion course. The problem was that locally enrolled nurses are not eligible to register in the UK and this meant that they could not take the conversion course unless they had the 5 GCSE's and as we speak Government are working on a solution. The School of Health Studies has made submissions to the Nurses, Midwives and Health Visitors Registration Board and the Board is currently assessing the submission that has been made and I am advised that it is probable that a solution will be found very shortly.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So all the previous information that we have been given in this House is incorrect?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No this is a development since the previous information was given.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In March, in answer to Question No 987 of 2003 we were told by the previous Minister for Health, "*..at the moment we are depending on a course which is issued by IMAP College which is a licensee who delivers such courses but they require as an interest requirement not GCSE's but registration with the UKCC.*"

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes that is what has been said that IMAP are prepared to offer conditional acceptance to enrolled nurses if Gibraltar finds a way to enrol them locally and this is the process that is being worked out at the moment.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I thought you said that members had to have GCSE's.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

You have already exhausted your .....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But I have heard the hon Member say.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

You have exhausted your supplementaries, do not answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are you reinstating your previous ruling?

**MR SPEAKER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I have not finished.

**MR SPEAKER:**

You have asked the question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, I wanted to know whether you are reinstating it for this particular session or as a permanent fixture?

**MR SPEAKER:**

That I cannot tell you it depends how things go.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

On what does it depend on how late we are?

**MR SPEAKER:**

No, no. The hon Member was not here I am not going to give any further information it is on now and it will be on tomorrow.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

And it will be on tomorrow.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

Maybe for the whole of the term.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I will have to put Mr Speaker on notice that in the case of that event we will have to give notice tomorrow that we would like to reintroduce the motion that Mr Speaker advised me to introduce before questioning Mr Speaker's ruling.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Yes, perfectly. Once the Leader of the Opposition has introduced the motion I will vacate the Chair.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is your prerogative Mr Speaker we have been elected here to do a job and I am afraid that the Speaker has been approved by us to do a job and we do not think that the job is to stop us asking questions which is what Mr Speaker is doing.

**MR SPEAKER:**

It is on, it is entirely up to you what you wish to do. I now have to ask the Chief Minister whether it is his intention to stay here until.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes Mr Speaker I was rather meaning to finish these questions today.

**MR SPEAKER:**

The Chief Minister might have to appoint a Speaker before 10 o'clock because I am not going to stay after 11 o'clock I think it is a very unchristian hour. None of the Members have had their dinner neither have I.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Mr Speaker has the power and authority to adjourn the House whenever he wants he is not surely suggesting that I should move the motion on the basis of what he has just said. If Mr Speaker wants to get up and adjourn the House regardless of the views of all the Members then I certainly will differ to Mr Speaker's decision but it is unprecedented according to the history of this House but Mr Speaker you are the Speaker.

**MR SPEAKER:**

All right. All I Have got to know is at what time does the Chief Minister want to start tomorrow 10 o'clock?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will check what is convenient assuming that I want to come tomorrow that that is what I had in mind. I was going to adjourn the House until Friday it is now not possible it now has to be until tomorrow.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Will it be 10 or 3 o'clock?



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a problem of taking the remaining questions in private with the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think that the adjournments in the House should be negotiated. Mr Speaker this is not subject for negotiation surely not everything about the tradition and practices of this House is going to be thrown out of the window in one day's session of the Parliament. I am not prepared to play that ball game. If Mr Speaker decides to adjourn the House today notwithstanding that the Leader of the House has not moved a motion Mr Speaker can do it and then I will say when I would like the House to reconvene to.

**MR SPEAKER:**

All right we adjourn until tomorrow.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No Mr Speaker can adjourn and I will say when the date is.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I adjourn the House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Given that Mr Speaker has indicated that he is not willing to sit beyond 11 o'clock tonight and the Attorney General is not here to take over from him which he most certainly would if he were, then I adjourn the House until 9.15 am tomorrow morning.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Alright adjourned to tomorrow at 9.15 am.

**NO. 180 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS EQUIPMENT**

Can Government state how long the emergency dialysis equipment has been installed at St Bernard's Hospital, what was the cost, and on how many occasions has it been used?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The emergency dialysis equipment was provided by the dialysis unit in La Linea and is on loan. We have not been invoiced for this equipment. Equipment for water purification at a cost of £5,000 was ordered in November 2000 and arrived in 2001. All the equipment was tested and commissioned later that year. The equipment has not as yet been used.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 180 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister say why they have actually gone to the extent of getting this equipment from La Linea and it still has not been used?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I would have thought that the hon Lady's own question would have given her her own answer. It is emergency equipment for use in an emergency not for routine treatment.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister not confirm that there have been emergency situations when patients have had to be taken straight to La Linea and that this machine could have actually been used to save their lives?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I cannot confirm that but if that indeed is what has happened then I have full confidence in the professionals who took the decision and more confidence in them than in the implied criticism of the hon Lady.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Why did the Minister actually say in a debate in television to the Hon Member Mr Picardo that there was when he said that there was a lack still of dialysis facilities in Gibraltar and he said, "*oh, but there is in St Bernard's,*" was he not implying that that equipment was there for some purpose?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

We shall have to rely once more on the Hon Mr Picardo's mother's video. What I do remember saying is that in the new hospital there will be full CT Scans facilities and that all patients needing CT Scans would be catered for in the local hospital. In terms of dialysis if I did not use the word "*emergency*" as the adjective in front of the word dialysis then that was my error but that is what the equipment is. It is an emergency equipment and is there for emergency and not routine use.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I just clarify, if nobody else is asking the third question can the hon Lady continue and ask it herself?

**MR SPEAKER:**

She has already asked the third question.

**NO. 181 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV from 1<sup>st</sup> March to end of December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

There were a total of 12 psycho-geriatric admissions into KGV from 1<sup>st</sup> March to the end of December 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 181 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So this is in fact an increase on the figures that I have been given previously is that correct?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not have in front of me the figures that the hon Lady has been previously given.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the average has been four to five everytime that I have asked this question can the Minister not confirm that this in fact is an increase and I am quoting from information that I have here with me of previous questions that I have asked in this House?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

My two year-old grand-daughter who I have just said goodbye to on her way back home could have answered the question obviously 12 is bigger than two.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So why does the Minister not answer it why does he not have the relevant information available at hand when it is related to the original question?

**NO. 182 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – STAFF/ENROLLED NURSES**

Can Government now confirm what is their position in relation to a letter Staff Nurses and Enrolled Nurses received early this year, from the registration board, requiring them to produce a portfolio of learning when they apply for re-registration, something which they are now required to do every three years?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 208 and 209 of 2004.

**NO. 183 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NURSING PRACTICES**

Is it the position of the Government that the nursing practices and procedures in our Health Services, are currently 50 years out of date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

As in other areas of healthcare, nursing practices and procedures are constantly changing. The Government are pleased that the GHA provides facilities to continue to update its staff as per current best practice in the UK and elsewhere. It also notes the stand adopted by the Nurses Midwives and Health Visitors Registration Board in requiring presentation of portfolios containing professional development as a pre-requisite to re-registration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 183 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I do not think that I have got an answer to my question. I am asking Government whether they believe, in fact they have said so on a couple of occasions, when they say, “...*Gibraltar has to look objectively and critically at the habits, practices and cultures that have become embedded in our health service over forty years or more,*” is that not what the Government are saying that the practices are outdated?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, and I was curious where the hon Lady gets this 50 years out of date and suggesting that we have said that they are 50 years out-of-date. I am grateful in effect for confirming that Government have never said that. Government have never said that nursing practices are either 50 or any shorter or longer number of years out-of-date. What Government have said specifically myself is that whatever are our

medical care services delivery practices whether they be nursing, management, medical, whatever, have developed over 40 years the figure 50 is hers and that it is time to stop to review them to see whether any need to be done differently than what they have been done during the last 40 or 50 years. The process which seems to me to be eminently sensible that something that one has been doing without change for 40 years given that the world changes and moves on around oneself is worth stopping to examine them to see if one is doing them well, in which case one carries on doing them, if one is doing them very badly in which case one changes them all together, or if there are aspects that one is doing well and aspects that one is doing badly in which case one modifies the ones that one is doing badly and carry on doing the aspects that one is doing well that is not either to suggest, still less to state that they are out-of-date by 50 or any other number of years. It simply means that it is sensible and prudent to assess ones practice to see if it is up-to-standard, up-to-date and to see if it requires modifications in the interests of the improvement of the service. That is what Government have said and contrary to the hon Lady's constant public assertions and insinuations falsely to the contrary Government have never suggested that they are out-of-date by 50 or any other specific number of years.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister for Health then explain what Government mean when they say that the habits, practices and cultures that have been embedded in our health service over 40 years or more are out-of-date can he explain which practices?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is precisely what the Health Reform Development Review is about. Sometimes I wonder whether the hon Lady specifies nurses because she thinks there are 250 of them and there is an army of potential people to get on her side and against the Government. Why is she not concerned that what she thinks we have insinuated that doctor's practices might be 50 years out of date or that management practices may be 50 years out-of-date or the system of funding the Health Authority by the Government may be 50 years out-of-date? We have never mentioned nurses specifically, we say there is a thorough review of every aspect of the Health Authority to see whether the practices of the past can be continued, need to be changed, or can continue subject to improvement and modification. That is what Government have said, that is what the review is about and to ask Government in what areas they think past practices need to be changed is simply to ask Government to state here and now what the results of the review is going to be and the Government will not do that.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will Government not accept that these reviews over practices in our health services have been an on-going process and may I remind him that we have had visits from the UKCC and we have had visits from people of Sheffield University when they have visited Gibraltar when GSLP was in Government that have said and I quote, *"...although our visit was brief your officials have planned a comprehensive programme which enables to see the delivery of healthcare in Gibraltar in a wide variety of settings we saw many examples of excellent nursing and midwifery care and we were impressed by the increasing commitment to continue education."* Another letter from the University of Sheffield saying, *"At the same time we provided*



*an overall evaluation of nursing and midwifery education and visited all wards and departments. Our findings indicated that the standard of nursing and midwifery care in Gibraltar was equal to that provided within the UK and that the Commitment of the Government to education and training of nurses was such that we were mostly impressed.” Will the Chief Minister not confirm that in last year’s budget speech the previous Minister for Health said that, “.....in recognition of the achievement by all those engaged in the School of Health Studies please allow me to quote from the report by the validation panel of Sheffield University who visited Gibraltar in January to monitor progress in the school. They were extremely impressed by the progress achieved since the initial validation. The panel was particularly impressed to hear the culture shift that has taken place in nurse education.” Are Government then not accepting the fact that our nursing practices are as good as if not better than those in the UK already?*

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not familiar with the standards of nursing practice in the UK so I could not possibly make a comparison for the benefit of the hon Lady.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But the UKCC has and they are the highest authority in this area will the Chief Minister not agree with the highest authority in this area?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady can ask the UK authority to express the comparison that the hon Lady has stated, ask them, I am not qualified to make comparisons between nursing standards between one territory and another.

**NO. 184 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA - GYNAECOLOGIST CONSULTANT**

Can the Government confirm whether they have now been successful in recruiting the second resident post of Gynaecologist?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The successful candidate will commence duties on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 184 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can Government explain why it has taken them nearly three years in which to recruit the second post of gynaecologist?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

First of all Government should be congratulated for having created a new post and added to the strength of the GHA by providing a second Gynaecologist rather than criticise Government for taking what in the hon Lady's view seems to be too long. Secondly, I am advised that the process has gone through the normal process of interviews and selection. There have been applications and people have not been found suitable and that it has now culminated in someone being chosen. The hon Lady rather than implying criticism should be pleased that the Government if necessary takes longer than necessary in order to make sure that the best candidate is chosen and not just the first applicant.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

How can the Opposition congratulate them when it was a commitment in their manifesto to employ a second gynaecologist and because of the fact that it has taken Government this long there have been patients waiting for more than a year just to have an appointment to see the Gynaecologist, how can one congratulate them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the hon Lady was not so ungenerous in nature she might at least congratulate us for having lived up to our manifesto commitment if for nothing else. Given that the birth rate in Gibraltar is now lower than it was when the hon Lady was in office and therefore there were more pregnancy related demands on the Gynaecologist, I acknowledge that the Gynaecologists do not deal only with pregnancy, if the hon Lady thought for eight years that one Gynaecologist was enough how does the hon Lady now feel justified in criticising Government for taking what the hon Lady thinks is a month or two too long to recruit a second Gynaecologist when the hon Lady was quite content that for eight years the community had to make do with just one and then because she wrongly thinks that a few weeks too many have been taken to employ the second Gynaecologist the hon Lady suddenly becomes the crusader in favour of all those women whom the hon Lady thinks had to wait for the second Gynaecologist to be recruited. Well, it is necessarily the case that all those people that waited three or four extra weeks for our second Gynaecologist waited in vain eight years for the second Gynaecologist whilst the hon Lady was Minister for Health.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have made the comments that I have because we are not talking like the Chief Minister is saying about a matter of weeks and we are not saying that women have had to wait extra few weeks to see the Gynaecologist. I am telling the Chief Minister that we have had to wait for years for the second Gynaecologist and I made the comments that I did because that situation never existed when Opposition was in Government. Nobody was subjected to have to see a Gynaecologist for more than six months.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is disgraceful that people should have to wait six months to see a Gynaecologist. Is that the standards that the hon Lady found acceptable when she was Minister for Health?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I said a maximum and in any case does the Chief Minister not feel that it is disgraceful to have to wait for years with this Government?

**NO. 185 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DR MENA**

Can the Government state what are the terms and conditions of employment of Dr Mena, a general practitioner in the Primary Care Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Dr Mena is filling a vacancy at the Primary Care Centre and is currently engaged as a locum General Practitioner.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 185 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not the case that when Dr Mena applied the first time he was told that he could not apply?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady should not waste any of her three supplementaries in just a point of clarification but when Dr Mena first applied for an established post that had become vacant he was told by the Medical Selection Board that there was a certificate of some sort that he did not possess then. I think it was a certificate of vocational training in general practice. It may not be the right name for it but it was something to show that he had been trained up basically in GP work as opposed to just medical qualifications generally. Nevertheless because of Dr Mena's obvious popularity amongst a large number of Health Centre patients Government decided to keep him on in an extended locum capacity this is why I have drawn the distinction between a vacancy for an established post that had become vacant. Dr Mena is in effect on

extended locum terms. He is now the applicant for a vacancy that was advertised some time ago. There is another applicant short-listed too and I understand that he now possess the certificate that he was missing at the first time of asking. A decision as to how the current vacancy that exists is going to be filled and whether it will be given to Dr Mena or to the other applicant who is a Gibraltarian doctor that has applied from the UK that still remains under consideration.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Irrespective of whether Dr Mena is a locum or has a contract with Government are Government saying that they treat locums differently and that they therefore do not require the paper that the Chief Minister says were waiting to see that he had, if he exercises his duties as General Practitioner surely the Government should be as concerned whether he has it or not irrespective of whether he is a locum or a permanent and pensionable or a contract GP.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government have none of the concerns that the hon Lady describes. I happen to agree entirely with everything that the hon Lady has just said. These are not the Government, these are internal medical board decisions. I personally agree entirely that there is no logic whatsoever in requiring higher standards of permanent post fillers than of locums because the question is that people are either safe in ones hands or they are not and the idea that they are safe in ones hands for three months but not safe in ones hands for three years is no consolation to the people that one has treated during the three months as opposed to the people that are treated during the subsequent two years and nine months. The explanation proffered to the Government by the Management of the Health Authority which I find personally entirely unpersuasive is that whilst one is a locum one is under the supervision of another doctor in the Health Authority that does have, the hon Lady smirks I did more than smirk or smile when I was told I am not adopting these I am reciting them to the hon Lady with a degree of cynicism because I have never frankly been persuaded by that view and I am not of that view. I do not believe that there is anybody actually supervising Dr Mena on a day-to-day basis as he goes about his business in the Health Centre and that therefore the requirement that had been imposed on Dr Mena before which was a requirement established in the Rule Book it was not something that somebody pulled out .....it was a requirement but it always struck me as illogical for the very reason that the hon Lady had said. Namely if this is a requirement for safe GP practice it should have been imposed both on locums and on contract officers and I expressed no view as to whether it is sensible or not sensible to recruit to make that requirement I am not qualified to judge but as a layman I am allowed to transact in logic and my layman's logic is that if this is something that is necessary to practice medicine safely in our Health Centre it should be required of everybody or of nobody but not of some and not of others depending on whether one is a locum or a contract officer or a permanent and pensionable officer on the basis that one is theoretically supervised and the other is not when the practice is that there is no supervision of that sort. So, at last we have alighted on an issue in relation to the Health Service after four or five or six hours of debates masquerading as questions and answers upon which the hon Lady and I appear to be able to agree.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Government therefore not agree that if Dr Mena has been working as a locum for three years that he has an advantage over other people that have not been there practising?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether agreeing with the hon Lady on matters of health is good or bad for my personal health but I agree with her again. I agree entirely with the remark that I have made. The problem is that Government are humstrung by the fact that government Ministers do not exercise these choices personally. There are Boards, Medical Recruitment Boards, Medical Registration Boards and the Government have to have its say by way of representations. Ministers do not personally hand pick any Crown employee even doctors at the Health Service. So, I am explaining to the hon Lady my personal views and political Government's views. We would very much hope that the excellent common sense which must belong to any view which is shared by all the Members of the House will be taken on board by those that have to make the actual recruitment selection.

**NO. 186 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COMMUNITY NURSING MANAGER**

Can Government confirm that no applicants from within the Health Service were found suitable for appointment to fill the vacancy for Community Nursing Manager at the Primary Care Centre in November 2002, and if so, how long has the post been vacant for and how were the responsibilities of the post carried out during this time?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No 187 of 2004.

**NO. 187 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIRECTOR OF NURSING SERVICES**

Can Government confirm why no applicants from within the Health Service were found suitable for appointment to fill the vacancy for Director of Nursing Services last year, and if so, how have the duties of this post been carried out?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government can confirm that six applications were received for the post of Clinical Nurse Manager in Primary Care in November 2002 and that the panel did not find the applicants suitable for the post. The vacancy was re-advertised late last year and an appointment was made in November 2003. While the post was vacant the duties were carried out by another Clinical Manager with the assistance and under the supervision of the Director of Nursing Services and more recently the acting Director of Nursing Services. Government can also confirm that two applications were received for the post of Director of Nursing Services and that the panel did not find the applicants suitable for the post. The duties of this post are currently being carried out by the Deputy Director of Nursing Services.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 186 AND 187 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can Government confirm that the people that applied for the post of Community Nursing Manager actually did so on the basis that their advert included the qualifications that were required?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Just before the Minister answers the hon Lady's supplementary could I just be allowed to say something in the interests of fairness. One officer has been identified



by post. The Deputy Director of Nursing is said to be acting it is also being said that none of the applicants were found to be suitable. Some people may choose to assume that the Deputy Director would apply for the Director's post and therefore deduce from that the Deputy Director who can be identified personally has been found to be not suitable that is not correct he did not apply for the post and therefore there is no insinuation or implication in the answer that the Deputy Director was found unsuitable.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

In answer to the hon Lady's question I did not have responsibility for this in November 2002 but I would assume that if the applications were accepted then the applicants must have had the correct qualifications otherwise the applications would not have been accepted.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Would Government therefore not agree that this is a very peculiar situation where six people apply with the right qualifications and they are not found suitable?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

These matters are either dealt with by an independent board appointed for the purpose or they are interfered with by the Government. Here we have a case where the board has been appointed, they have examined the people and they have decided that none are suitable. The hon Lady raises the matter two years later. If the Minister at the time, management or somebody else at the time had interfered and had come in and said no, no, one is suitable and had employed someone else presumably the hon Lady would now be standing up and in her inimitable style criticising the Government for having changed the decision of the Board. The hon Lady cannot have it both ways an independent Board makes a decision and either the hon Lady should get up and be honest and clear, is she questioning the members of the Board, is the hon lady insinuating that the members of the Board have not acted properly, what does the hon Lady mean that it is strange that none were found suitable? That is what the Board is there for to interview the applicants and they found no one suitable so what is the hon Lady saying that the Board were not doing their job properly? It certainly was not the Minister who made the decision, certainly not the CEO, so if the hon Lady wants to ask the question and make an insinuation let her say so. If the hon Lady is saying that the Board is not doing the job properly the members of the Board are failing in their duties is that what the hon Lady is saying because if that is what the hon Lady is saying then let the hon Lady phrase her question in that way.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I do not want the Minister to put words in my mouth. I have not said that at all, in the previous question the Chief Minister agreed with me in relation to similar situation regarding Dr Mena's position all I am saying is I am not in any way questioning the Board's decision but what I am saying is it is not so that if anyone puts an advert out for a particular position and the advert actually says these are the qualifications

required that six people apply and none of the six are found suitable. All I am saying is do Government not feel or think or believe that that is a peculiar situation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Just to answer her last point first no, because published academic qualifications are just one of the many criteria that apply when determining whether somebody is suitable. A job might require four O'Levels, I might have four O'Levels it does not necessarily mean that I am a suitable candidate for the job. I may have many qualities and characteristics that make me unsuitable for the job and therefore possessing, these are minimum qualifications not that if one has got four O'Levels one can have the job. No, no unless one has got four O'Levels one will not be considered for the job but if one has got five O'Levels and can be considered for the job now let us see whether one is otherwise suitable. That is the main point. The secondary point is that the exchange that one had on the previous question relating to Dr Mena cannot be compared to the exchange that the hon Lady has had with my hon Colleague on the question of a Selection Board judgement as to whether somebody is suitable or not. I have not said that I have agreed or disagreed with the finding of a Board as to whether somebody is suitable by reference to his qualities, what I have said is, given that it is a matter of legislation, that it seems to me illogical that certain minimum requirements of the O'Level sort not of the other type should be required from contract doctors but not from locums that is not an interference with the judgement in a particular case of a Board of Selection it is saying to the Government's recruitment machinery one has to be logical, rational and coherent in the criteria that one applies in the recruitment process. The hon Lady I hope will acknowledge that on this issue of Selection Boards she is in effect asking Ministers to account and to explain and justify or to comment on, or to express opinions about, if she is not doing any of those things then she should not be asking Government questions or rather she is questioning the Government about things that are not the Minister's functions and responsibilities and there is a limit to the extent to which Ministers can be held to account for things that are outside their scope of personal power because at the end of the day even if we were to agree with the judgement in any particular case that a Board has made a peculiar decision. We have discussed one such case in the past but if there were such a case at the end of the day what Government could say is, "*...we are not putting up to the Governor a minute for the employment of that person.*" That is the power that the Government have if we do not like the decision of a Selection Board we can discontinue the recruitment and employ nobody and start again but we cannot impose our own judgements as to suitability on a judgement by the Board that no one is suitable. I do not know if the hon Lady recalls a discussion that we had in the last House about a situation that I personally found peculiar to the point of inexplicability. There was a case of a man whose name I will not mention but who the hon Lady will be able to identify who had been acting Director of Postal Services at SEO level for three and a half years, acting, and when he eventually applied for the post and the grade of SEO some Board decided that he was not suitable and I said to them, "*Wait a minute I do not know whether this man is suitable or not but how can it be said of somebody that has been doing the job for three and a half years and acting in the grade for three and a half years how can it be said of him that he is not suitable?*" That was to me an extraordinary decision it did not mean that I had the power to promote him, I did not have the power to promote him and therefore I could not over-ride the decision of the Board. I am just using it to illustrate the constraints that there are at the political level of Government when Selection Boards make what the hon Lady might regard or in another case not on this one Government might regard as peculiar decisions Government have to live around them. In that case Government allowed him to continue indefinitely as acting

which was the only thing that Government could do to remedy what we regarded as a peculiar decision. I do not think it is fair to hold Ministers to account for things that (a) is not in Government's power but (b) if Government tried to make it our power I am sure that the hon Members would criticise and rightly so because Government would then be in a position where Ministers were personally deciding who should be recruited into the Civil Service and I do not think that that is prudent.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I agree with the Chief Minister I am not in any way suggesting that the should interfere, I was just hoping that they would just express the same opinion that I have, can Government confirm whether if in fact the Deputy Director of Nursing Services has been acting and he has expressed no desire to actually apply for the post and two applications were received and the panel did not find the applicants suitable whether in effect this means that Government will have to recruit somebody from outside?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What it means is that the post will have to be considered in the context of the reviews that are currently taking place in management posts.

**NO. 188 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can the Government state whether the Gibraltar Health Authority allows contract officers that have been recruited whilst local employees are sent for training to the UK, to themselves apply to be sent for training to the UK during their contract period?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No. It is not the policy of the GHA to allow contract officers that been specifically recruited to replace local employees who are sent for training to the UK to themselves apply to be sent for training in the UK during their contract period.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 188 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does that mean that a contract officer did indeed apply and the GHA have said no?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not sure that I understand the question but if the hon Lady is referring to a specific case this has only happened once, there is a specific case where a contract officer was sent to UK for training on one occasion for specific reasons.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the Minister said it is not the policy of the GHA to do it and it has happened on one specific occasion is it not in contradiction to the original answer that I got from the Minister and in view of the fact that I have only got two supplementaries can he confirm why this specific officer was indeed sent when the policy of the GHA as he has just said is in contradiction to the second reply I have got from the Minister?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

It is not in contradiction it is the policy not to do it but it does not mean that it is forbidden from it being done under special circumstances. These were special circumstances this gentleman was promoted within the GHA during the period that he was holding this contract appointment and one of the conditions of the appointment was that it required a period of training in UK, a qualification in order to be able to carry out the work so on this occasion an exception was made to the policy because one could not discriminate against the application under EU law and he applied for the post and he was successful. Having been successful if Government had applied the policy that says that one cannot go to UK for training then the hon Member would be standing up here now and criticising us for having had someone in post without the proper training. So, the exception was made to the policy on this specific occasion exceptionally to allow the person to go to qualify so that he could do the job that he had been accepted for and be properly qualified to do it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does that mean that even if the GHA have a policy they cannot adhere to that policy because under EU law they are unable to and secondly can the Government confirm that if a contract officer applies for further training surely would it not be more logical for Government to offer the training to local nurses rather than have a situation as we seem to be having in answers to questions that I have put in this House whereby we are seeing a trend that more and more contract nurses are being employed by Government and it could end up with a situation that the GHA have more people on contract basis employed than local nurses?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

First of all the hon Lady has lost sight of the answer that she got to the original question. The answer to the original question was and I remind her of it, “...it is not the policy of the GHA to allow contract officers that have been specifically recruited to replace local employees who are sent for training in the UK to themselves apply for training.” In other words, the policy is not that contract officers are not sent for training the policy is which the answer referred that if I have a Member of staff who I sent off for training for a year to the UK and whilst he is away in the UK for a year I bring somebody else on contract for a year to cover for him whilst he is away being trained, I do not send the covering recruit for training as well. That is the policy we referred to in the answer the answer did not say anything about a policy of not sending for training contract officers only those contract officers that had been specifically recruited to cover for local employees who were themselves absent in training. All the supplementaries that the hon Lady has developed since then have failed to take account of that very important nuance in the answer that she received. As to her last supplementary point we can have this exchange on every question to do with recruitment of health service staff, it is the policy of the Government that as much of its staff not just in health but in all areas of public administration should be locally based civilians because it is cheaper. One does not have to provide them with accommodation, travel backwards and forward, one does not have to do a lot of things for locals that one has got to do for contract officers but if there are not enough locally qualified people then one has to recruit them from abroad which is not to say that at the same time Government should not which it does do try to provide as much training opportunities to our local people so that over a period of time there will be

more local people available for the jobs and therefore a reduced need to have recourse abroad. It is not for nothing that the availability of training and training opportunities in the public sector has increased by thousands of percentage points since the GSD Government have been in office since the 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996. the problem is being tackled now when it was not being tackled before, that we have not finished and that there are still a need to recruit people from abroad is absolutely true but Government agree with the hon Lady that the desirable situation is that there should be as many locally qualified people as possible so as to minimise the amount of people that have to be brought in but the gap has not been reduced to zero. In fact, as the hon Lady has correctly pointed out it is still widening, for example, yesterday the hon Lady asked a question about the nursing review I do not remember the date that had recommended many more nurses than we have got today (1996 review) in urging me to employ more nurses yesterday the hon Lady could only have been urging me to bring more from the UK or elsewhere because there certainly are not that number of qualified nurses waiting in a little heap in the unemployment office for us to recruit so yesterday she urged me to employ more nurses which necessarily means importing them, today she criticises the Government for importing the number of nurses that we have imported. The hon Lady has got to be more coherent than that.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not legitimate for the Opposition to hold the Government to commitments that they make in this House about implementing the recommendations of a certain report and may I add is it not illogical for Government to bring over a contract officer that is going to spend time here whilst nurses are training in the UK for himself to be sent for training and that that training should not be offered to local people, in view of the fact more so that this Government have been in power for nearly eight years and they should actually already have information of where those needs lie and if the needs are there why do they have to rely more and more on contract officers and not avail the opportunity to local nurses to go to the UK?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not clear to me whether the hon Lady simply does not understand clear and simple explanations given to her or whether she does understand them but simply wishes to repeat the misconception that she starts with in order to try and mislead listeners on the radio of what the reality of the position is. Has the hon Lady not understood from my pretty clear explanation that the persons that are sent for training are the permanent local employees not the people recruited in order to provide cover for the local people that are being sent to the UK, has the hon Lady not understood that? And if she has understood that why does the hon Lady repeat the premise of the last supplementary which is completely in contrary to the explanation that she has just received. The fact of the matter is that Government have employed an additional 50 nurses over and above the number that Government inherited on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996 from the hon Lady in Opposition. A total of 50 five zero extra nurses which is a very large percentage as the hon Lady knows of the number of nurses that Government inherited and that is the Government's record and as to the one [INTERRUPTION] well, six a year if the hon Lady thinks that it is intelligent to reduce the proposition by dividing the total number by the number of years .....

**MR SPEAKER:**

Order do not interfere.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

.....so that Government gets a rate per annum, six per year is six more per year than they used to employ extra when they were in Government so it does not matter to me whether the hon Members wish me to present the facts on a per annum basis or on an overall basis, our record I still infinitely superior to them by either measure. One case that there has been of a contract officer being sent was not a case of a contract officer who had been recruited as a temporary in fill for somebody that had gone in turn for training so it is not a breach of the policy described in the original answer that the hon Lady solicited. Yes, the gentleman who was revealed as being the one contract officer that has gone for training was not an exception to the policy because the policy is as answered that the contract officers that we do not send for training are the ones that are recruited specifically for cover for local people who themselves have gone for training and this gentleman does not fall into that category. This gentleman if the hon Lady wants to know is a person who originally applied for a post that was advertised as being open only for permanent and pensionable staff and the Health Authority was advised that this was a flagrant breach of European Community Law in that it discriminated unlawfully as between permanent and pensionable staff and contract staff. He then was a contract employee, when the post more senior than the one that he then held on contract came out vacant it was originally advertised as being only open for people on permanent and pensionable terms to aspire to from below. That was decided I do not know by whom to be contrary to EU Law and therefore this gentleman applied even though he was then only on contract and got the job and he got the job only on condition that he agreed to go to the training that he eventually went to. Those are the facts of this one case but in any case it is not the case of a temporary recruit being sent for training.

ORAL

**NO. 189 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA –SOCIAL SECURITY PENSIONERS**

Can Government now state how many Gibraltar Social Security Pensioners, who were not also in receipt of a UK Social Security pension, were resident in UK in 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 190 to 195 of 2004.



**NO. 190 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SOCIAL SECURITY PENSIONERS**

Can Government now state how many Gibraltar Social Security Pensioners, who were not also in receipt of a UK social Security Pension, are resident to date in the UK?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 189 and 191 to 195 of 2004.

**NO. 191 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – UK SOCIAL SECURITY PENSIONERS**

Can Government state how many UK Social Security Pensioners, who were not also in receipt of a Gibraltar Social Security Pension, are resident to date, and registered with the Group Practice Medical Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 189, 190 and 192 to 195 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 192 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF TREATING PENSIONERS IN UK**

Can Government now state what was the latest average annual cost of treating a pensioner in the UK in 2000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 189 to 191 and 193 to 195 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 193 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF TREATING PENSIONERS IN UK**

Can Government now state what was the latest average annual cost of treating a pensioner in the UK in 2001?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 189 to 192, 194 and 195 of 2004.

**NO. 194 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF TREATING TEMPORARY VISITORS IN UK**

Can Government now state what was the latest available cost to the UK of treating temporary visitors from Gibraltar in respect of 2001/2002, as in answer to Question No 258 of 2003, the previous Minister for Health apologised for not being able to reply due to having misplaced the written schedule he was going to hand over?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 189 to 193 and 195 of 2004.

**NO. 195 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF TREATING TEMPORARY VISITORS IN UK**

Can the Minister for Health now state what was the latest available cost to the UK of treating temporary visitors from Gibraltar in respect of 2003, since in answer to Question No 259 of 2003, the previous Minister for Health, apologised for not having the written schedule with him?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

There were 25 Gibraltar Social Security Pensioners resident in UK without UK pensions in 2002. The data for the Gibraltar Social Security Pensioners, who were not also in receipt of a UK Social Security Pensions, and who are resident in the UK as at the end of 2003 is not yet available. The number of UK Social Security Pensioners who are not also in receipt of a Gibraltar Social Security Pension resident to-date and registered with the GPMS is 462. This figure is subject to validation by the Department of Health UK. The annual average cost of providing healthcare to a pensioner in UK for the year 2000 was £1,867. The UK has not yet presented its 2001 average cost paper in treating a pensioner in the UK to the EU Audit Board. The latest figures provided by the UK Department of Health of treating temporary visitors to the UK from Gibraltar in respect of 2001/2002 is approximately £2,400. (This excludes treatment provided in Accident and Emergency and in a primary care setting for which data is not available). The cost of treating temporary visitors from Gibraltar in respect of 2003/2004 are not available to the UK Department of Health. However, the revised latest available figure for 2002/2003 is around £36,000 (this cost excludes treatment provided in Accident and Emergency and in a primary care for which data is not available).

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 189 TO 195 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm when was the last time that the UK had negotiations with the European Union?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Negotiations with the European Union on what?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

On the actual fees that relate to Gibraltar as well.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am advised that the UK have an on-going obligation to be sent figures through the EU Audit Board and on our enquiries the latest figures they have presented are for the year 2000. The figures for the year 2001 have not yet been presented.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So a settlement for the year 2000 has yet not been forthcoming?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

This subject is linked to the answer I gave yesterday in respect of quota patients and the on-going negotiations. The answer to the hon Lady's question is yes but it is part of current discussions that are presently on-going and once we move away from numbers to actual amounts of money then this problem will not arise because the figure in money will be able to be negotiated with numbers differently.

**NO. 196 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA - ALTERNATIVE MEDICINES**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether the GHA will fund the provision of alternative medicines for patients who are suffering from illnesses in respect of which there is no recognised cure, but alternative medicines have been shown to provide relief to those affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Complimentary treatments are infinite in scope and variable in quality. Public funding of health services cannot be provided on this basis. Public funds are reserved for those treatments which are proven to work in internationally validated trials that show effectiveness, efficacy, consistency, reproducibility and value for money. Public funding cannot be guided solely by individuals perceptions of success and patient demand, as such demand is unlimited. While we are all sympathetic to the circumstances of people who have illnesses that cannot be treated by conventional means, there is a limit to what the publicly funded health service can do and should do. Complementary (or alternative) therapies are therefore not routinely funded on the GPMS. The Authority's policy is that the public should have access to the best healthcare that the GPMS can provide but it cannot guarantee a cure or undertake to fund experiments to find a cure, particularly where the research evidence is poor. Many health departments in the UK are currently involved in reviews of various complimentary medicines with government support. As and when a product is found to have therapeutic benefit and is safe, it is incorporated in the British National Formulary which is used by doctors in Gibraltar. One recent example was a herbal treatment for depression.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 196 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So, really what the Minister is saying is that as and when the UK decide to use it we will follow suite?



**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes.

**HON S E LINARES**

As a matter of interest, are one of the professions like chiropractors one of those that the Gibraltar Health Authority feel that there is not enough research done into Chiropractic practices so as not to consider sponsoring patients to be able to attend chiropractic clinics?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a different issue. We are discussing alternative medicines not all alternative invasive treatment or manipulative treatments. I recently opened a Chiropractic Conference in Gibraltar and although I am not knowledgeable in these matters there seem to be a lot of people who take it very seriously so I suppose that this is something that the management of the Health Authority keep under review. I think it is one of these things that is a considered a professional allied to medicine, LAM. It is not really the same category as alternative medications. It is in the field of therapies.

**HON S E LINARES**

I just thought that I would ask the question since it is alternative medicine it is alternative practices as well that is why I thought it was relevant to this question, it is alternative practice rather than alternative medicine I understand that.

**NO. 197 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MAINTENANCE PROGRAMME**

Can the Government provide details of the maintenance programme in place for all the equipment in St Bernard's Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The GHA's Technical Services staff deal with all aspects of maintenance and repairs of the full range of equipment within the Gibraltar Health Authority. The equipment within the GHA may be divided into two main sections.

- A. The Electro-Biomedical Equipment that directly or indirectly is associated with the diagnostic or treatment to the patient's health.
- B. The Non-Medical equipment that supports staff, patients and visitors to the health service.

Training of GHA technicians is on-going and is constantly being reviewed to cater for new technologies and new equipment acquired.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 197 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Minister accept that in the September 2003 report the opposite is said of what he has just told this House, in fact it goes further by saying that the maintenance programme in place for all the equipment in St Bernard's is inadequate does he agree with the comments made in the report?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Even if the report says what the hon Lady says and I have not got it in front of me but accepting for the present that it does it is not contradictory of what the Minister has

said in his answer. The hon Lady has asked the Minister to explain what the present system for maintenance of hospital equipment is and the Minister has given the hon lady a recital which explains what the present system of maintenance is. The fact that the report is critical, if it is critical, does not contradict as if it is the opposite. The Minister has not expressed the view about the present system he has just explained what the present system is.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am asking him whether he will express the view that it is inadequate and whether he will agree with the comments in the report.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The first time the hon Lady asked the supplementary she prefaced it by saying, *"Does the Minister accept that what he has just said is the opposite of what is said in the report?"* It is not the opposite of what is said in the report because the Minister has limited himself to explaining what the system is to the extent that the report is critical of what the present system is the Minister has not agreed or disagreed with what the report says and therefore cannot have said the opposite.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Fine but I have still not got my answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

All right that is a different question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Minister agree or disagree with the comments that the programme for the maintenance of equipment in the hospital is inadequate?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. Mr Speaker, this takes us into the territory of last night. The system is what it is and more or less the same as we inherited with one or two improvements. This is precisely the sort of area that we have called people in to look at to see if the way that we are doing it is good, bad, or indifferent and this is precisely, the hon Lady can pick as many examples as she likes this is an area in which Gibraltar does things in a certain way because it has always done it in a certain way, we have asked people from abroad to come to look to see if the way that we do it is all right or whether we should be doing it differently, the experts according to what the hon Lady has read I am not doubting the accuracy of what the hon Lady is reading out it is just that I do not have it in front of me, the hon Lady reads the report where the experts are critical of what is said and unless the hon Lady thinks that they do not know what they are talking about then the hon Lady ought to welcome the fact that we called these

people out to look at our systems because if we had not, the system which they think is not right would not be changed.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Your questions are exhausted.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Honestly Mr Speaker without being disrespectful I feel I am being gagged. I am here to represent the people of Gibraltar and I am only allowed to make two supplementaries to my questions....

**MR SPEAKER:**

Three supplementaries.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

..or three.

**NO. 198 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GENERIC MEDICINES**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether he intends to change the present appeals procedure for those patients that are unable to take generic medicines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No. The vast majority of GPMS patients are served very well by generic medicines and only about 4-5 persons at most appeal each year seeking a proprietary product to replace the dispensed generic product. The following procedure exists (and has been in practice since 1999) to deal with these few clinical appeals objectively.

A clinical appeal is defined as an appeal to replace a generic product with a proprietary product on the grounds that the generic product is causing or is likely to cause harm to the patient. The harm should not be merely speculative but substantial, either as a clinical observation or from peer reviewed reports. Clinical appeals can be raised by any registered doctor who has examined the patient within the context of a GPMS (not private) consultation and are forwarded to the Chairman of the Gibraltar National Formulary Committee. If a generic trial has not yet been undertaken, the chairman advises the Prescriptions Adviser to arrange for this in co-operation with the doctor. Appeals are considered by the Gibraltar Formulary Committee taking into consideration the generic trial results. The appealing doctor may attend if desired. Decisions of the Gibraltar Formulary Committee are forwarded in writing to the referring doctor within two weeks of the meeting. I must emphasise that these procedures are applied in routine circumstances. Obviously we apply a fast track system if the circumstances so warrant.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 198 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The answer that the Minister has given me proves the point that I am trying to make. By the time the patient hears the result of the appeal in the meantime would it not be

more logical for the doctor to continue to prescribe the proprietary product and I am saying this because I have actually brought such cases to the House before and therefore the patient would not have to wait for weeks or months on end until the actual result of the appeal is known?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Lady seems to miss the point of the last part of the answer which I emphasised. This is the procedure for routine applications where the medicine is of a nature that there is no effect on the patient if it takes one day more or less. If we are talking about a life threatening situation or an emergency drug then fast track procedure kicks in and cases will not arise where a patient is deprived of a medicine that is essential for his well-being and for life threatening circumstances if the generic discussion arises.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will Government not agree that there have been cases that have occurred which I have brought to and continue to bring to this House, I must say not very regularly, but if we are talking about a patient whose life or there is a certain discomfort because of allergies that are created as a result of the generic medicine will Government not agree that the doctor should have the authority whilst the appeal is taking place to continue prescribing the branded medicinal product instead of the generic because there have been instances and there continues to be instances when this is not happening?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government do not agree. Government note that the hon Lady often or sometimes brings names cases to this House but the fact that the hon Lady names them on the basis of a complaint that the hon Lady receives from the patient affected does not mean that there is merit to the case, does not mean that the system as it exists has not worked properly in relation of the case, probably it simply reflects the fact that the person is dissatisfied because they would have liked a different result and therefore somebody who goes to complain to the hon Lady and the hon Lady raises the case in the House does not alter or give more or less credit to the merits of the case than the system itself is capable of identifying and the hon Lady's political constituency office is not a court of appeal for a system. If the hon Lady on the other hand thinks that the system is defective then it is perfectly legitimate for her to seek to persuade Government that the system should be changed [INTERRUPTION] No there is a difference between a discussion about whether the system is right, wrong should be different or better on the one hand and on the other hand once there is a system in place the hon Lady should not think that it can be overridden simply because somebody that is aggrieved with the result produced by that system simply goes to visit her in her political office. That is not a key or doorway or route to circumscribing the system and that is very different to debating whether the system should be different or needs improving or does not need improving which I accept is an entirely legitimate issue for the hon Lady to raise in this House.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I want to clarify what the Chief Minister has said. It is not that the patients that have come to me are aggrieved because they are not being prescribed the branded medicine it is because they have developed allergies to the generic medicine. In some cases and I have not even told Government that the system they have in place is ineffective or incorrect what I am saying is that I am trying to convince them that in the meantime whilst the appeals are being heard if one is talking about a patient who is taking a medicine which is in relation to their blood pressure or in relation to whatever other condition is it not prudent for the doctor to continue with the branded medicinal product until the appeal is heard that is all I am asking, even if there are one or two patients or three is it not logical to take that path rather than put the patient in distress and rather than have the patient suffering the consequences of either not taking the medicine or developing the allergies to the generic medicine?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I have made it my task in preparing the answer to this question to look into it personally and I am satisfied that the system that is in place works. The hon Lady has just mentioned blood pressure, that is what I meant when I said that there was a fast track procedure. The information that I have is that any patient who goes back to his doctor the immediate action that is taken by the GHA is that a generic drug is immediately changed and it is changed more than once if necessary. The hon Member may shake her head but that is what actually happens. What I would advise the hon Lady is if someone comes to her with an allergy or otherwise then she should direct the person to go back to the system and inform those who are responsible for giving her the medicine of the problem but if the hon Lady waits until it is brought up in this House then no doubt there is a delay. The system is one where if a patient as the hon Lady alleges and I have no evidence from the inquiries that I have made that this has happened to anybody for any length of time, if a patient has a problem action is taken immediately without waiting for the complaints procedure to take place and it is taken in consultation with the person's doctor and with the people involved in the GHA. That is what the hon Lady should do she should direct the people to the where the action is being taken.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have, I have told the patients to go back to their doctor and on many occasions the doctors have said that the matter has to be dealt with by the Controller of Medicines and therefore when the Controller of Medicines looks at the situation it has and it is taking a long time for the patients to get an answer and all I am saying like the Chief Minister has just said, instead of the patient having to wait for Controller of Medicines why does the system not do what the Minister has said that in important cases the doctor continue to prescribe. This is different to what the Chief Minister has just said that doctors do not continue prescribing the medicinal product. The doctors say that it has to go to the Controller of Medicines. At least will Government not review the situation in the light of what I am saying?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, Government will not review the situation in the light of what the hon Lady is saying because we think that what she is saying is mistaken. To speak of continuing

with the proprietary medicine ignores the fact that one does not start with the proprietary medicine one starts with the generic medicine because that is what is specified in the formulary and that is what the doctor has to prescribe so any argument based on a mechanical system that allows one to continue with what is happening until there is a decision is in effect to continue with the generic version because that is what is prescribed in the first place. Therefore the factual scenario that the hon Lady is recommending to Government never arises because if somebody is prescribed the proprietary drug which is the only way that the question of continuation with the proprietary drug can arise is because it is permissible under the formulary and there is no issue and no problem so, the scenario upon which the hon Lady bases her recommendations to the Government do not and cannot arise nor is Government willing to allow these decisions to be made even in the hypothetical and impossible situation that the hon Lady has described by the GP's because that would make the system unworkable. There are many reasons why other than the ones that concern the hon Lady why some people may want to prescribe proprietary rather than generic drugs. The system has in-built into it a mechanism to rescue (so to speak) patients that are victims of the generic drug. Government are not aware of any cases in which the system is saying even though there is patient 'a', 'b' and 'c' suffering consequences which she should not suffer never mind carrying on suffering them because we are going to take three weeks to make the decision. That is simply not the case there is a routine procedure when the decision can wait and then there is a fast track procedure to ensure that decisions that need to be made in a timely urgent fashion are made in a timely urgent fashion and the fact that somebody goes to the hon Lady and says, "*Well, I do not think that this drug is working for me,*" is a layman's judgement the people who make these decisions in Government are themselves medical people and pharmacists they are not administrative decisions, these are medical decisions that are being made and therefore the question boils down to, "*Should the decision be made by the formulary people or should it be made by the doctor?*"

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That is right.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is what it all boils down to. Government's policy as it is in other places is that it should be made by the Formulary Committee because the moment that one gives the decision to the doctors in effect one has no system that one can control and that one can deliver and one is just basically saying to the doctors, "*you prescribe whatever you want to prescribe.*" Which will result in a re-version to the prescription unnecessarily of much more expensive branded products when there is no additional medical value for the much higher cost of the proprietary brand over its generic equivalent. That is why Government do not agree that it should be the GP, Government agree that it should be the GP in consultation and liaison with the Government pharmacists and chemists and between them they should make the decision in the interests of the patient and that is the way it works and it does not leave the patient exposed in the way that the hon Lady says that people have come to tell her and she is reciting it in this House.



**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I think it is my responsibility.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

Next question, next question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I think it is my responsibility.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

Next question I am sorry I am sticking to it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

We are talking about patients that .....

**MR SPEAKER:**

There has been a decision that there will be two supplementaries. A supplementary is to the original answer there is no such thing as a supplementary to a supplementary.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So I have only got two?

**MR SPEAKER:**

The hon Lady is already on her fourth.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But Mr Speaker, the substantive answer has only been given now the hon Members have been going round and round in circles and now.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

No I will not allow it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As I said before Mr Speaker I think if I am here asking questions about genuine concerns about people who are ill and everytime I want to ask a supplementary to what the Minister has said I think I am entitled to continue to represent those people that have elected me.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Next question.

**NO. 199 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE**

Given that in the meeting of the House in March 2003, the Minister for Health, Dr Bernard Linares stated that the post for an officer with full-time responsibility for the Complaints Procedure would be shortly advertised, can the Government confirm if it has been advertised, and if so when, and if not, why it has failed to advertise the post as intended?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No 200 of 2004.

**NO. 200 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ORTHOPAEDICS/OPHTHALMOLOGY OPERATIONS**

Can the Minister for Health state that since the number of people in the area of Orthopaedics waiting for routine operations, is more than double, 740, when compared to Ophthalmology 335, what measures he intends to introduce so as to deal with the backlog?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

These issues are now being dealt with in the context of the current general review.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 199 AND 200 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the previous Minister for Health the Hon Dr Linares in March said in answer to Question No 263 of 2003 we will shortly be advertising the post we are now talking about 9 months down the road and the post for the new Complaints Officer has not been advertised?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct. All these matters have now been subsumed into the review to ensure that they all take place in response to a structured cohesive plan for the modernisation reform of the Health Authority.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government not agree that we are talking about a Complaints Procedure that has been a complete failure that people do not know where to go to and that they should now say that they are going to wait for recommendations when the Minister gave details of the actual way that the post was going to deal with complaints, the Hon Dr Linares and the Chief Minister in the last meeting of the House said that they were going to employ an officer full-time and that this was going to be done very quickly so that patients would not be left sort of in cloud 9 without being able to make the necessary complaints?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Entirely correct that is exactly the position. The assessment of the Complaints Procedure and what it might be replaced with is one of the specific work streams, implementation reports that Government are going to receive in the context of this review and we expect it shortly. I agree with everything that the hon Lady has said except her opening words that the existing Complaints procedure has been a complete failure. I do not think that it has been a complete failure although I would agree with the hon Lady that it has been much, much, much less effective than Government would have wished it to be.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am afraid that when we are discussing a matter in the House of Assembly and we get Ministers making statements like, for example, *"We will shortly be advertising to contract a dedicated officer with full-time responsibilities for quality assurance generally in the services and specifically the Complaints Procedure and this will be done very shortly,"* what is very shortly for the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady can focus on the word *"shortly"* if she likes but clearly since *"shortly"* is by any definition a less period of time than has actually elapsed perhaps it might have occurred to the hon Lady that Government have changed their mind, altered course and come to the conclusion that the sensible way to do it is not the way then proposed to do it but by asking the visiting experts to make the recommendations rather than try to invent another homemade Complaints Procedure that does not work. Governments are allowed to change their minds and the fact that Governments change their minds does not entitle the hon Lady to critically remind us of what we said in March because if Government said something differently that we were going to do something in one way in March and in November, December, or January Government are doing it in a different way all it means is that Government have changed their minds which is not a mortal sin. Changing ones mind is something that the hon Members might benefit from time to time themselves.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As did the Chief Minister in relation to his policy on Brussels just before the 1996 election.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In answer to Question No 200 of 2004 have the Government not also changed their mind and that again here we have another example that we cannot even take for a fact what they put in their election manifestos, is it not the case that the Government were saying in the year 2000 that a second Orthopaedic surgeon would be appointed and this has not happened and that is probably why we have come to a stage in the Orthopaedic speciality that the number of patients waiting for an operation now stands at 740 and can he not agree as well that his so called experts have also said that the figure has gone up to 892?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady is entitled to question us on our actions and omissions in Government what she is not entitled to is to examine us as to how we have done in relation to our manifesto. Our manifesto is our offer to the electorate not our contract with the Opposition and in respect to the successes and failures to deliver on our manifesto commitments we account to the electorate at election time not to the hon Members. If we promised in our manifesto or if we committed ourselves in our manifesto in the year 2000 to recruit a surgeon and we have not yet done so then it appears that the electorate have forgiven us for not having done so because since then we have been re-elected on a new manifesto notwithstanding the fact that whatever deficiencies she may now be wishing to identify are omission from our 2000 manifesto. So, I am not going to stand in this House debating with the hon Lady whether we have complied or not complied with a manifesto that has been overtaken by a subsequent manifesto upon which we have been elected. If the hon Lady wants to know whether the Government still intends to recruit a second consultant the answer is that that issue is subsumed into the review and the hon Member might be able to find other examples with which I will also agree with her. It is true, all of the potential issues of this sort that were in the pipeline during the period that we decided to convene the review and the review have been held back where they can be held back to see what the review says because there are issues relating to the Orthopaedic surgery that raise other considerations and not just a simple multiplication of the number of surgeons.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not the case then that this Government whatever they say in their manifesto nobody will ever believe them anymore because we have had more than three and four occasions when we have actually proved to them that what they say in their election manifesto is not adhered to by the Government and is it not a question that in order to be able to reduce the figure of people who are in the waiting list for orthopaedic surgical interventions does not require any expert, does the Government not understand that they can solve that problem like they solved the problem of the Ophthalmology?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No it cannot be done in the same way. I do not know whether it is true that nobody believes the Government manifesto anymore, what I can say to the hon Lady is that if her statement is true then either given that we have just been re-elected and we have been preferred to them, notwithstanding that according to her nobody believes us,

either it is not true that nobody believes us and therefore that people do believe us or secondly another possibility is that people do not care whether the Government complies with its commitments or not which is obviously not the case, or more seriously for them even though people do not believe us they still prefer us to them which is very bad news for them indeed.

**NO. 201 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – WAITING LISTS**

Can Government provide the latest comparable waiting lists for public and private patients covering all specialities for both out-patients and in-patients, which also includes those who require surgical interventions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government remains willing to provide to the Opposition detailed information of this sort which is unprecedented in Gibraltar before 1996. however, given the intense administrative burden of preparing this information within five days, I will forward this information in writing to the hon Member within 10 days.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION 201 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Minister not understand that if it is unprecedented it is because I was not asked this question whilst I was in Government it is as simple as that?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

What is unprecedented is the level of information that this Government have always given as opposed to the level of complete obscurity and lack of information given to us when we were in Opposition, shame on the present Opposition for the lack of information that they gave.



**HON F R PICARDO:**

If the Minister did not have the brains to ask the same questions that my honourable friend has surely it is more of a reflection on their ability to do Opposition than anything else.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer to the supplementary is no it does not reflect that because questions were asked and the lack of transparency came in the unwillingness to approach the answering of the question in the same way as we do. This Government approach answering a question maximising the information that can be given in answer to it. The party of which he is now a Member when it was in Government used to approach it the other way round and give as little information as possible and if the hon Members think that they are presently being gagged in the function of Opposition let me tell them that they get infinitely, infinitely greater margin to ask supplementaries and questions than we ever used to get because when we were in Opposition the position of the Speaker then was, *“Well if Government do not want to answer that is up to them, next question.”*

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That is a matter of opinion.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a matter of fact it is in Hansard.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can Government not confirm that I have asked three questions in this House where they have had five days notice and on previous occasions having had the same five days notice they have provided the information?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct and that is not limited just to health. The fact of the matter is that Government are no longer willing to for the machinery of the public administration to be paralysed in an attempt to produce in a five day period information which is statistical in nature, most of which does not result even in the asking of supplementary questions and where the Members waiting a few more days causes them no inconvenience but enables the Government to function whilst the information is put together. The hon Lady is correct there has been a policy decision by Government to change its position and it is for that reasons that I am just explaining. The answer is five days is no longer enough in accordance with the new policy to provide the information and they will get it within 10 days. This is information of the sort that in most parliaments are not given either in answer to questions or in debates or anything what we are just saying is that before we used to bust the guts to give it in five days, we are longer willing to bust the gut it simply places the administrative machinery under too much strain in too short a period of time so we have extended

the period to 10 days. She is absolutely right, that is a change of policy and I have risen to answer the question because it is not limited to health. Some of the other hon Members will have noticed that they have got similar answers in relation to their other areas of responsibility which are not health.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So now we have a new policy whereby even if we put the question we will not get the answer in the House and then we had a situation yesterday where there were 27 questions on health which Government refused to reply at all and there is a ruling now that we only have two supplementaries to each question that is totally unacceptable to the Opposition.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In her incorrigible and inimitable style the hon Lady seems to be intent on distorting and misrepresenting and simply basing her case on what she has not just been told. It is not the policy of the Government only to give information after 10 days. The vast bulk of the statistical information that they have asked for have been given within the five days some of it, a small amount of it, a minority of it has been extended to 10 days so what I have explained to her I would have thought in language sufficiently clear for the hon Lady to have understood is that some of the information is going to be given in 10 days but she has been sitting in this House and she has seen how many times the poor Gentleman Usher has had to go out of this door and in through that one clutching a piece of paper to hand. All those examples which are 90 odd per cent of the statistical information that the Opposition has asked for has been delivered in the five days so why the hon Lady feels justified in saying , *“Ah, now the new policy is that we do not get information within five days,”* she could if she was interested in being accurate and precise which I have no doubt she has no such interest, but if she were interested in being accurate and precise she might have said we no longer get all of the information within five days we now get most of it within five days and some of it a small part of it within 10 days that would be an accurate representation of what I told the hon Lady.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Chief Minister says things and then qualifies what he has said by saying something totally different, did the Chief Minister not say that this was now new Government policy, will he now say that what he has said is that in his new policy he will decide which statistical information will be provided and which will not is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is quite clear that the Minister has not changed anything of what he has said. The policy is that not all the information can be provided in five days anymore because if the policy were that none of the information would be provided within five days how would the hon Lady explain the fact that they have had 95 per cent of it within five days. The hon Lady does not think that Government made a policy the day before yesterday and have not bothered to carry it out. It is clear both from what I have said and from what she has experienced here in the last three days that the policy relates

to not all the information but as much of it as can reasonably be given within the five days relieving the administration of this wholly excessive administrative burden. Let me say to the Opposition that the normal parliamentary tradition and convention which they in Government used to have recourse to frequently and which we never have recourse to is to say *“that information called by that question requires an undue amount of administrative effort to collate and the hon Members therefore cannot have it”* that is the traditional acceptable parliamentary device. We do not do that as they used to do when they were in Government. We do not say the Opposition cannot have it because it requires too much effort. The Government says it requires too much effort therefore we are going to take 10 instead of five days to give it to the hon Lady. That is the policy it is an infinitely more transparent policy than the Opposition used to deploy and that is what the position is and it is not Ministers who decide it is what the administrative machinery can reasonably produce in those five days and that is the policy and we are sorry that we got the hon Members used over the last eight years to a system which we are now changing and which we should never have allowed them to get used to in the first place.

**NO. 202 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT**

Can the Minister for Health provide the actual figure his predecessor promised to pass on to me, when I reminded him in the last meeting of the House that he had previously given a statement to the effect that in relation to the Reciprocal Agreement with the UK, the Government had received a settlement in 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The amount paid to Government in 1996 in respect of EU Commitments was £101,336 and related to the years 1988 to 1992.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 202 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Since 1992 have there been any more sums that the Government have received?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So we are talking about a situation that there is about a 14 year delay?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will these figures in any way be altered by the new system where quota patients will be taken over by the actual sum of money for the quota patients instead of the number?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am told that both matters are completely unrelated. This is in connection with EU commitments and the other matter is in connection with the reciprocal arrangement with the UK or vice versa.

ORAL

**NO. 203 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

On what date does the Government now expect the hospital at Europort to be fully functional and operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 204, 205 and 206 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 204 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS**

Can the Government now finally confirm what dialysis facilities will be made available in the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 203, 205 and 206 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 205 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Government confirm if there will be any beds earmarked for private patients within the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 203, 204 and 206 of 2004.



**NO. 206 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Can the Government give an up-date as to their negotiations with the developers of Euorplaza for acquiring more parking spaces from them which are required for the new hospital?

**ANSWER**

The exact date for the new hospital to be fully functional and operational is not yet known. The manner in which Dialysis will, for the first time ever, be provided locally is still under consideration with interested parties. It is not appropriate to comment on commercial negotiations about parking until they are complete. The new hospital has been designed with a provision of about 10 beds in a private corridor.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 203 TO 206 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not a fact that the kitchen will not be housed within the hospital and is it not a fact that there will be no geriatric wards in the hospital?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a fact that there are food preparation areas in every floor in the new hospital. It is also true that the food that is prepared in those kitchens in the new hospital has been prepared up to a cook and chill standard in a central kitchen located elsewhere. Those are the facts. If the hon Lady wishes to get technical and facetious there are many more kitchens in the new hospital than there are in the existing hospital. If the hon Lady is simply trying to highlight the fact that the system of providing catering in the hospital is being changed then absolutely correct that is a matter of policy decision by the Government and if the hon Lady wants to highlight the fact that those arrangements mean that the first stage of food preparation takes place in a kitchen which is not located in the same building as the new hospital the answer to that is correct. The hon Lady should also be aware that as a result of this new system the

quality of food and patient choice, and dietary choice will be elevated almost to restaurant standards. As a result of this system that the hon Lady appears neither to understand nor indeed supports because the hon Lady appears to be concerned only about whether the room is physically located in this building or in a different building but she should understand that the result of this policy is that the quality of catering the hospital, the quality of the food, will be not just enormously improved in quality and variety but indeed there will be menu choices for patients on a very wide range much more than the couple of things that they can now choose from when the trolley comes round. Government think that that is a vast improvement and the question of whether the kitchen is or is not in the same building in our view is a complete red herring but completely monumental of the hon Lady's obsession with trying to find mindless criticisms of the new hospital in order to tarnish the entire project without even understanding or asking the Government why there is not a full kitchen in the hospital. If at least the hon Lady bothered to find out the reason and then criticised the reason then at least, but to simply ask is it true that there is no kitchen in the hospital what does the hon Lady think that these architects that have come from the United Kingdom who are specialist hospital architects does she think that they have forgotten to put a kitchen in the hospital, is that what the hon Lady thinks, that we have forgotten that patients need to eat in a hospital? Is that what she thinks? No, well, as it is clearly not what the hon Lady thinks let the hon Lady criticise the difference system of catering rather than simply ask whether there is a kitchen in the new hospital or not. As to the geriatric ward yes it is true that the new hospital contains no wards exclusively for the use of old people who are ill. That is not because the Government or the Government's specialist hospital architects and consultants have suddenly come to the conclusion that either old people will stop getting ill or that if they do get ill they should not be admitted into hospital. I suppose that the hon Lady understands that that is not the reason and therefore that there must be a good reason or at least a reason which the hon Lady at least should enquire what it is before submitting to criticism and the reason is that nowhere in the civilised western world are modern new hospitals designed on the basis of segregating people on an ageism basis. The concept which I accept used to be established practice everywhere that one used to put people that were old and ill in a different ward to people who are young and ill is antiquated, discredited practice when one gets the opportunity to design a brand new hospital and as that is the advice that we have from our hospital design consultants we do not see why the people of Gibraltar should be deprived when they are spending £40 million on a new hospital why they should be stuck in the times of the Victorian principles because the hon Lady thinks that change is bad. Change is good when it results in Gibraltar staying up-to-date with modern western European standards and modern western European standards we are authoritatively and expertly advised are that new hospitals now integrate the elderly infirm in the same wards as the none elderly infirm as opposed to shoving them in a room as if to tell them, "*..there you are this is a special room for people that are ill and who we do not expect to get better very soon.*" That is the modern principle to which the Government fully subscribes, to which Government enthusiastically embraces but which we note and record the hon Lady is opposed.

#### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So, now I am mindless and now I think that the Government have forgotten that they have to have a kitchen, is it not the case that the Government have had to do away with certain facilities that were there before because what the Government have done is try to squeeze a hospital in a building which was not specifically designed for a hospital?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady does not even bother to establish the facts before launching political assault on invented facts. Far from there being a problem of having to squeeze facilities into the new hospital it has rather been a case of the existing and new facilities having so much space that *[INTERRUPTION]* why does the hon Lady giggle, does the hon Lady know, has the hon Lady been to the hospital, has the hon Lady seen the space that is now available for things that are squeezed in a little room in St Bernard's Hospital and that now have an entire floor in the new hospital, why does the hon Lady giggle if she does not know the fact is this a nervous tick or is the hon Lady saying that without knowing the facts the hon Lady is able to discredit what I am saying about the facts? The reality of the matter is that so excessive in size *[INTERRUPTION]* I understand that the Opposition does not enjoy listening to the real answers to their completely *[INTERRUPTION]* I am on my feet. Mr Speaker we cannot completely abandon all semblance of parliamentary discipline the rule is that if I am on my feet and the hon Member wants to say something he either asks me to give way or the hon Member invokes the Speaker on a point of order. No I am not giving way.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order.

**MR SPEAKER:**

No, there is no point of order.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So much is the case the opposite of what the hon Lady has said about squeezing that we actually contemplated not using one of the four buildings that we purchased. We purchased buildings 1, 2, 3 and 4 in Europort and frankly we said let us not use building 4 because already we have provided for all the existing St Bernard's facilities in three or four times. The new Intensive Care Unit has got 13 beds compared to the five beds in the present one. It is six or seven times the size of the one in the present hospital and when the hon Lady talks about squeezing things out does the hon Lady not know that the useable space in St Bernard's Hospital is 9,000 m<sup>2</sup> and that the area of the new hospital is 23,000 m<sup>2</sup> how can Government possibly have difficulty in squeezing what is presently a 9,000 m<sup>2</sup> in an area more than twice the size of the existing area. If the hon Lady bothered or was interested in the facts of the matter rather than invent the facts simply to justify a political attack on the Government the hon Lady would not be doing and saying 95 per cent of the things the hon Lady is doing and saying but Government accept that the hon Lady is motivated by a desperate, desperate obsession with tarnishing the new hospital by whatever means the Opposition can just as the Opposition has tried to tarnish the new bus service by pointing out that they are two inches bigger than the regulations permit, by the way forgetting that all the present buses are bigger than the regulations permit even the little Toyotas that were last seen in New Delhi, so, the point is not to make constructive criticism of the Government the point is to find some meaningless way of tarnishing what are otherwise major, qualitative developments in the facilities of Gibraltar. We accept that, we understand that that is the cut and thrust of politics, we understand why the hon Lady does so but the fact that we understand that the hon

Lady is just playing the political game does not prevent us from pointing out to the hon Lady that she is factually wrong. Having done we have no doubt that the hon Lady will continue playing the political game.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As far as the Opposition is concerned politics is not a game, politics is about making the lives of people in Gibraltar better and what the Chief Minister does is try to ridicule everything that we say in this House. The Chief Minister knows better, everything that the Opposition says in this House the Chief Minister rubbishes with what I would say is language that can only be described as gutter politics, is it not the case that the new hospital will only have nine more beds than St Bernard's had originally which is 192 beds and that it does not even have a kitchen in it? Is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The case is that the hon Lady can do her own mathematics. The case is that the new hospital has 211 beds. That St Bernard's Hospital presently has 167 beds, that is the reality. Actually if the hon Lady is interested the Government have actually been criticised by the consultants because they think that a 211 bed hospital for a community of 28,000 is in their opinion excessive by any standard applicable in the UK to which our reply has been, "*..we try to improve on the standards in the UK and not mimic them where possible.*" Those are the facts the hon Lady can make whatever deductions and calculations of a mathematical and of a non-mathematical nature for herself whichever she pleases.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I think it is a waste of time trying to convince the Chief Minister about factual information as regards the number of beds here and the number of beds there. The Chief Minister simply twists the whole thing around and I honestly believe that this Government will make a complete fiasco of what they are trying to do with the new hospital. Turning now to another supplementary on another question can the Government confirm why they are still unable to give information over dialysis facilities which they promised six years ago in their election manifesto?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady has just said that in my last intervention I had twisted the facts. I only gave her two facts in the last supplementary and I would like her to consider which are the ones that the hon Lady thinks that I have twisted. I have said, "*..there are currently 167 beds in St Bernard's Hospital*" and I have said "*.. that the new hospital has 211 beds*" I have made no judgement, I have invited the hon Lady to draw whatever deductions mathematical or non-mathematical she wishes to draw for herself. In that statement of fact there is currently 167 beds and the new hospital has 211 which of those two facts does the hon Lady think is twisted?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The first one because St Bernard's originally had 192 beds and what the Chief Minister is saying now is that it only has 167. If one takes away the old Lewis Stagnetto Ward what the Chief Minister is doing is that he is not including the number of beds which are today in the new Lewis Stagnetto Ward which used to be the private corridor. If the Chief Minister wishes to go back to one of the reviews he will see that there is definitely a mention of 192 beds and if the Chief Minister cares to look at the Nursing Review they come up with 167 beds and say that they are not counting private corridor because that is presently being housed by Lewis Stagnetto Ward that is why I was telling the Chief Minister that he had got his facts wrong. Secondly, the Chief Minister has not answered the next supplementary that I have made in relation to dialysis facilities. Here we have another typical example of this Government making promises which they then do not fulfil which they then are unable to come with a solution and what do they do? They bring in more experts. Can the Chief Minister confirm why the Government have still not come to a decision when again in this election they have they same commitment that there will be dialysis facilities within the hospital and seeing that Mr Speaker has ruled that I only have two supplementaries will the Chief Minister not agree with me that if the facilities in the hospital that are going to be provided for the general public in Gibraltar, whether these should not be facilities that would not require patients to go for dialysis to Spain?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady has then clarified that it is not I who got facts wrong or twisted them but rather that the hon Lady does not listen to the facts and the words that I give her. If I say that there are currently 167 beds and that the new hospital has 211 beds why does the hon Lady think that that is getting my facts wrong or twisting the facts on the basis that in 1995 there were 193.....I am not referring to the number of beds in 1995, 1996 or when the Lewis Stagnetto Ward existed or when the kitchen existed or did not exist. I am saying there are currently in the hospital 167 beds.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That cannot be.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

According to the Chief Executive Officer who is sitting behind me and has just confirmed it to me even though I knew it before, 167 beds, in fact in an attempt to bed manage seven or eight new beds were added yesterday.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

A point of order.

**MR SPEAKER:**

What is the point of order?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The point of order is that the Chief Minister is quoting the wrong figure because yesterday the Chief Minister said that there were 175 beds in St Bernard's.

**MR SPEAKER:**

That is not a point of order.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I did not say that there were 175 beds. I said that there are currently 167 beds in St Bernard's Hospital and that the new hospital has 211 to which the hon Lady leapt to her feet to say that I was twisting the facts, why was I twisting the facts? Because it is ignoring the fact that in 1995 there were 193 beds but I did not say anything about the number of beds that there were in 1993 so how could I have been twisting the facts? There are currently I said 167 beds and the new hospital contains 211 beds and those are facts and the only thing that is being twisted here is the use and distortion and misrepresentation to which the hon Lady submits the perfectly clear and untwisted facts which I give her because they do not suit her purpose and because it does not suit her purpose the hon Lady moves the goal post, twists what I am saying in order to make a completely different point. On dialysis I understand that after eight years the Opposition are entitled to demand from us higher standards than they presided over when they were in Government and I do not say to them that because they now ask us to do things that they did not think it was necessary to do when they were in Government that this somehow disqualifies them from pressing the Government on the matter, it does not, but it does require I would have thought the hon Lady to at least be careful in the language that she uses to do so because there was a border between Gibraltar and Spain between 1988 and 1996 when the Opposition were in office. Those were the years of the Braña triple filters when it was even more likely than it is today that there will be delay in getting across the border. In all those years they were perfectly content for Gibraltar's dialysis patients to go to have their dialysis in La Linea and apparently this did not amount to insensitivity to the dialysis patients to have to go abroad. It appears that the hon Lady since she has gone from Government to Opposition has become a convert to the view that dialysis should be done in Gibraltar. The hon Lady is converting to our view and abandoning the contrary view which is the one that the hon Lady had and practiced in Government [INTERRUPTION] no, no, there is as the Opposition call it, people's views are tested by what they do and do not do when they are in a position to do it or not do it, not by what they preach when they are not in a position to do something about it. It is a case of "do as I now say and not do as I did when I was in a position to do it." The substantive answer to the hon Lady is that she knows jolly well that there is very close liaison on this issue between the Government and the Dialysis Association but the Government have now announced that the new hospital, so it cannot be available until the new hospital is ready, will contain machines so that the Gibraltar resident patients that require dialysis treatment can have their dialysis in machines located in the new Gibraltar hospital in Gibraltar. Unless the hon Lady wants the Government to install the new machines in non-existent space in St

Bernard's hospital or plug the machines into the building site which the present St Bernard Hospital is the hon Lady will understand the sense of waiting for this brand new first time ever radical break from established practice until the new hospital is open so that it can be provided in the new hospital. Our patients will not have to go to Spain and the arrangements that are under discussion are for the Spanish doctors, technicians and qualified nurses to come to Gibraltar to monitor and supervise the dialysis process rather than our patients going on their machines. So, Gibraltar has the premises, the patients and the machines so that the patients do not have to cross the border. People cross the border for many reasons in Gibraltar including medical reasons not that crossing the border is such an enormous hardship but Government understand and sympathise with the fact which the GSLP apparently did not when they were in Government that one thing is to go for the occasional medical treatment and another is to have to go three times a week as a matter of a systematic part of ones life for two or three hours a day and that there are qualitative differences between that. That is the position it is not going to actually be on-stream until the new hospital opens some time later this year in the meantime between now and then the hon Lady might ask me the same question another 13 times and we can have the same debate between now and then the answer will be that it will happen when the new hospital is ready , not before and not after, when the new hospital is ready.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I must say that the Chief Minister is using the language of Louis XIV the Sun King but definitely he is not a bright shining star, am I not entitled to ask Government that if eight years ago they put in their manifesto that they would be providing dialysis facilities in Gibraltar and then the Chief Minister says that I did not provide it, I did not put it in my manifesto but the Chief Minister did and has not provided it within the eight years that he has been in Government and the Chief Minister keeps on and on talking in a language that appears as if he seems to want to treat us as if we were kids in a nursery school. *[INTERRUPTION]* Why does the Chief Minister not grow up himself and act as a responsible politician in this House, what about the dialysis facilities, when are those dialysis facilities going to be installed? We have heard that they are going to be in the new hospital, the Government during the eight years have brought over another expert Dr Terry Feast have his recommendations been accepted and are Government going to take into account that if they are going to spent money in a dialysis machine is it not logical and prudent for those facilities to be such that our patients will no longer have to go to Spain otherwise why have the dialysis facilities in the first place?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have already confirmed to the hon Lady everything that she appears not to have heard and just repeated.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have not heard whether the Government are going to install facilities that will mean that the patients will no longer have to go to Spain I have not heard that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The reason why the hon Lady does not hear it is not because I did not say it but because the hon Lady was too busy being instructed by the Hon Mr Picardo about Louis XIV that is why the hon Lady did not hear it because everybody else in this House heard me say clearly that the Government will have dialysis machines in the new hospital when the new hospital is ready, not before and not after but when it is ready so that our people do not have to cross the border. Gibraltar has much to be grateful to Louis XIV because it was Louis XIV who after the war of the Spanish succession and in the context of the negotiation of the Treaty of Utrecht refused to allow his grandson the new Bourbon King of Spain to cross French territory to get to the town of Utrecht to participate in the negotiations of the Treaty and it was by that way that the British were able to obtain by negotiations the permanent cession of British sovereignty of Gibraltar. So, three cheers for Louis XIV.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

At least now we know why it is that the Chief Minister models himself on Louis XIV because in the whole of this morning I have had to endure, my fellow parliamentary colleagues have had to endure, his fellow parliamentary colleagues have had to endure, and listeners on radio have had to endure what amounts to answers to questions couched in diatribe and personal insult directed at the Members of the Opposition which does not assist in clarifying what the issues are and it is that which hides what the Chief Minister may or may not be saying about an important policy issue like dialysis which is what the people who are listening, who are interested in issues of that sort want to be able to take out and distil from what amounts to a long lists of insults directed at all of us. Heaven forbid that the Opposition should direct a quip let alone an insult at the Chief Minister because otherwise we get even much more than we give back but that is his parliamentary style. Will the Chief Minister confirm to us that for the next four years we are going to have to put up at every meeting with a raft of insults one after the other even accusing Opposition Members of having ticks and other physical traits?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The only people who could possibly believe a word of what the hon Member has just said namely that I have given any let alone many insults, personal insults to the hon members, the only people of which there is the slightest risk might believe that nonsense are the people who have just turned on the radio 30 seconds ago who have only heard him but have not heard the last three days of questions unless, because I do not believe that I have given a single personal insult to any hon Member, unless the problem is that the hon Members do not distinguish between dealing with the inaccuracies in their statements and insulting them personally. If the hon Members think that it is an insult not to be allowed to get away with the factual distortions, inaccuracies and incorrect statements and analysis that the hon Members persistently make both inside and outside this House in their public statements if that is their definition of personal insults then I regret that the hon Member can certainly look forward to a full four years worth of that. But, if the hon Member means by personal insults what most ordinary people mean by personal insult namely playing the man and not the ball, insulting the person as opposed to dealing with his arguments then I have not made any personal insults. It is not my personal or parliamentary style to do so and therefore he can be certain that he who has only been in this House two days will not get any such insults just as nobody has had any



in the past from me. The masters of personal insults such as they exist in this House are sitting in the Opposition indeed the main master is not here. So, that is the fullest answer that I can give to the hon Member and I know that he thinks that I am an “*ignoramus*” he has reported it on the front page of the newspaper. The hon Member does not believe in personal insults but to suggest that I am an “*ignoramus*” as opposed to saying, “*Chief Minister you are wrong on a particular argument or case,*” that is a personal insult as opposed to dealing with an argument. I do not know how many people the hon Member thinks he can persuade in Gibraltar that I am an “*ignoramus*”. He might be able to persuade people that I make mistakes or that I am wrong on this or that issue but if he has set himself the mission on day two of his two day old parliamentary career that someone that has been in this House and therefore has accrued 12 years of knowledge and information and that has served the people of Gibraltar as Chief Minister for two full terms, and whom the people of Gibraltar think is competent enough to be elected for a third term I do not know [INTERRUPTION] not says he says the electorate, then I do not know how many people he tries to persuade by the personal insult that I am an “*ignoramus*”. What the hon Member will find with me is that I deal with the facts, the arguments and with the issues and I have not said to the hon Lady, because this is what the Opposition does, they invent personal accusations that where never made, for example, in answer to a question a few moments ago the hon Lady started by saying, “*Ah, so the Chief Minister is now saying that I am mindless,*” No, the Chief Minister did not say that she was mindless, the Chief Minister said that it was a mindless policy. It is a very important distinction. I can describe a policy as mindless that is not to say that the person is mindless. I am sure that the hon Members think that lots of our policies are mindless I do not interpret that as the hon Member thinking that I have not got a mind in my head. They get statements that I make, they repackage them, they reformulate them and then misrepresent them as if I had made a personal insult and they do this systematically and I regret that the hon Member does the same and he has only been here two days and has been contaminated already.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

If that is the answer to my question let me assure him that we are going to meet fire with fire for the next four years but if the argument were whether the Chief Minister plays the ball or the man and if this were a playing field he would already have had more than one red card I assure him. As to the front page of the Chronicle I called the Chief Minister an “*ignoramus*” only after he had call me “*ignorant*”. We can have the same debate that we have had already in the past four not two but four days that we have been in this House about who has the shorter or the longer memory but Hansard will show who was first to deploy the gun of insult in this House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is yet another example of the same thing as I have said to the hon Member. I did not say that the hon Member was “*ignorant*” I said that on the subject matter under discussion the hon Member was ignorant of the facts and I added “*and perfectly understandable so given that he has only been in the House for two days.*” To say that somebody is ignorant of the facts on a particular issue and then to add that it is perfectly explicable and understandable that he should be unaware of the facts because he was not around when it was last debated in this House is not to say of somebody that they are an ignorant person but they keep on themselves providing examples of the very thing of which I am complaining.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is not correct for the Chief Minister to have said that Mr Picardo was giving me instructions about Louis XIV. That is not correct at all is it not even a worse situation that we have from Government when the Chief Minister is answering all the questions in relation to health, what is he going to make his second Minister for Health redundant?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister is not going to do that but I am sure that the hon Lady understands that there is a new Government, that there are new Ministers in portfolio, that there are Ministers in portfolio that have only been in their posts for a few weeks and that it is therefore that their knowledge and understanding and familiarity with facts and issues which have been debated and discussed in this House and of which I have been briefed in the past because of my status as Chief Minister and which they are not aware because they were not involved that that requires for a transitional period until Ministers can get intimately familiar with their new briefs, that requires me to provide a degree of transitional cover. Even if that perfectly good and valid reason did not exist the fact of the matter is I am as the hon Lady knows responsible overall for the affairs of the Government and therefore when the hon members rise and say things which to my certain knowledge are not true I am duty bound to defend the honour and the record and the performance of the Government. Unless the hon Members think that I should just sit down and let them get away with what they are obviously trying to get away. I know that they go round restaurants at weekends bragging that they are going to give the Government hell and land running on our feet and they are going to seize the initiative and they are going to be so aggressive, yes, they have been heard saying all these things in restaurants. They are going to be so aggressive with them that half-way through this term they are going to be dead and buried politically and that the Opposition is going to start from day one and really mix it in with them.....well, it is not a bad idea that is what Oppositions should do. If they had asked me for advice obviously I am the last person whose advice they would value, except that I have managed to win three elections in a row so perhaps they ought to take my advice a bit more often but if they had taken my advice I would have said to them, *"It is a jolly good thing that the Opposition should be a little bit more active than what they were last time but please do not start until February or March give the poor old electorate that have just been through a general election a month or two of respite before bashing them again. The Opposition will not loose very much it is a four year marathon not a sprint, you loose nothing by giving poor old GBC viewer and Chronicle reader three weeks to get over the election campaign,"* that would be my only criticism of the Opposition re- invigoration that appears to be under way and which frankly I very much welcome.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Going back to the dialysis, I have understood everything that the Chief Minister has said recognising that they have been in power for eight years and that they realise that it is a commitment. But in answer to the question as to when the machinery will be operational in Gibraltar. If my understanding is correct what the Chief Minister has said is that it will be operational when the new hospital is functioning, for which there is no date yet mentioned. Is that correct?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The Government do not know really, that is the answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is sometime before, during or after the summer. We do not know the exact date but it is going to be either May, June, July or August or September. For the hon Member's own information he keeps on saying the machine, this is not a machine it is a bank of machines in the plural.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Going back on the question of dialysis will the Minister for Health state whether the people running the dialysis unit will be local or people brought from abroad until the local can be trained to run the unit?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

We are back to Louis XIV this is another bit of information that has already been given and the hon Lady has not heard. I suggest they consult for a change the hon Member on the hon Lady's right side who seems to be making copious notes and no doubt will have written down what my learned Colleague said.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It could be that I do not hear him because the Chief Minister gets up talks for 20 minutes and then I forget what the original answer was that is the problem that we have in this House. If the Chief Minister was constructive in the manner in which he answers supplementaries and he would not go on for hours on end then the Opposition would be able to digest what the answer was to the original question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government cannot be more constructive than what we are being. In answer to the hon Members questions they are receiving an exhaustive, extensive, full explanation and analysis of the issue. If she prefers that in the interest of brevity we give her a less full explanation, a less complete explanation and therefore a lesser degree of transparency that can be arranged but if what we are interested is in brevity and not quantity of information then the hon Lady should not complain if she does not get as much information as the hon Lady might otherwise get.

**NO. 207 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Can the Government confirm which employees will be re-generating the meals on each of the floors at Europort Building, once they are transported from the old wine factory area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

It is not appropriate to comment on this issue at this stage.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 207 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Did Government not say in the last meeting of the House that the meals would be prepared by the cooks and that the transportation would be done by other persons?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The answer to that is yes but that is not what this question asks.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are Government intending or have they already sent out included in a Gazette a contract for anybody interested in transporting the meals to the hospital?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Government have advertised what is called the facilities management tender which relates to services which include the catering facility and which the Government are still considering, has not awarded, and that is the position but there has not been any tender for the transportation this is all part of the catering element of the facilities management tender. The hon Lady should understand that her questions asked for who will do the regenerating of the meals. Once the cooked and chilled food is already in the preparation kitchen on each floor of the hospital.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So, I did not really get an answer to my original question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady did get an answer to her original question I was just trying to be helpful perhaps I should not because then they say that I spent too long on my feet. When the hon Lady was talking about preparing meals the word '*preparing*' gives two different parts of an operation because '*preparing*' could mean cooking the meal and it could also mean regenerating the meal. The hon Lady used in her supplementaries the phrase '*preparing*' even though the question relates to regeneration that was all I was trying to say to her. The hon Lady did get an answer to her question about who would regenerate the answer is that it is not appropriate to comment on this issue at this stage.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does it mean that the Government are still not sure how the system is going to work?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What it means is that it is not appropriate to comment on this issue at this stage.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Could we end up in a situation where we have the cooks preparing the meals and other people transporting them and other people regenerating them in the hospital?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not appropriate to comment on this issue at this stage.

**NO. 208 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – ENROLLED NURSES**

Can Government state whether the 89 Enrolled Nurses who were required to renew their registration in the year 2003 have all done so?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 182 and 209 of 2004.

**NO. 209 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – STAFF NURSES**

Can Government state whether the 84 Staff Nurses who were required to renew their registration in the year 2003 have all done so?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government acknowledges that the Nurses, Midwives and Health Visitors Registration Board will require first and second level registered nurses to produce a portfolio of continuing professional development. This is a professional matter and is a requirement introduced by the Board under the provisions of Part III of the Medical and Health Ordinance. The requirements mirror those of the Nursing and Midwifery Council in the United Kingdom. Not all of the Enrolled Nurses and Staff Nurses have applied for re-registration. The process is currently being reviewed by the Nurses, Midwives and Health Visitors Registration Board in the light of representations made to it by the Government on the question of re-registrations fees and the prescription of requirements to be followed by Enrolled Nurses. With regard to these professional requirements, the School of Health Studies has prepared a document for consideration by the Board and the Board will be contacting the persons on the Register in due course.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 182, 208 AND 209 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will Government not accept that this is a matter that we have raised here in the House and in press releases on four occasions, the last time of which was in April 2003, and that the Opposition has heard nothing from Government and that the Opposition have asked Government whether there appears to be a direct contradiction with this new legal requirement and with the contracts of employment which makes these nurses permanent and pensionable. This position as we see it appears to be in breach of their terms of employment as from now on nurses would therefore have their jobs guaranteed only for a period of three years, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not for Government to accept or reject whether the Opposition have issued three or four press statements. Those are matter of facts which remain facts regardless whether or not Government accepts them. As to the substance of the supplementary the hon Lady appears to have prepared supplementaries written out in front of her which she is determined to read notwithstanding the answer that she has given. In the answer that the hon Lady has given there is every acknowledgement of the debate that we have had across the floor of the House on this issue before. The Leader of the Opposition in one of our exchanges on this issue I do not know how many months ago raised with me his interpretation that there seems to be a legal anomaly in the chronology of legal requirements. In the question of whether there had to be a prescription before the obligation arose and following that debate I looked into the matter myself, I concluded that I am not sure whether this was the legal or the precise point that the hon Member he had identified but in any case I formed the view that there was a doubt about whether something which had not been prescribed could be a requirement given that the requirement was termed in context of something having been prescribed and that is what the hon Lady has been told in the answer that the Nurses, Midwives and Health Visitors Registration Board in the light of representations made to it by the Government on the question of re-registration fees and the prescription of requirements to be followed by the enrolled nurses. So, that matter which results from a prompting by the hon Members of Opposition is indeed being looked at and I am not sure where the matter stands but it is certainly something that is on the table as requiring remedy, action or modification of some sort. Similarly, the hon Gentleman brought to my attention a letter that had been received by nurses requiring them to pay I do not remember the exact sum was for re-registration. Something that had been done not by Government but by the Registration Board. Again I asked Health Authority Management and the Minister to look at it and it was something that seemed to me to be worthy of reconsideration. One thing is to ask one's staff to keep up with standards of nursing practice, another is to require to make a payment without which they cannot continue in ones employment. This raises issues as between employer and employee rather than as between nurses and Registration Board. If there is a fee to be paid without which our employees cannot continue to be our employees if anybody should pay it it should be the employer and not the employee and that is my personal view. That is a view being considered at ministerial suggestion by the Nurses and Registration Board but Government are not in a position unless this House were to repeal the Nurses Registration Board Ordinance or the sections relating to that Board. Neither of these issues are matters that Government itself, Government can say "*We will pay for them*" we will pay for them but the Government itself can eliminate the requirement to pay the fee because these are matters which are vested in the authority of the Board and are not matters which lie in the hands of the Government. So, depending on what the Board decides upon its consideration of Government policy or representations, Government will decide whether there is a need or not to amend the legislation. Far from having ignored the points made by the hon Members both have been followed up in a very real way.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That covers much of what we have raised but I do not think that it covers everything because additional points that the Chief Minister has not mentioned Government may have done something about that as well in terms of analysing the problem that this creates. First of all the Chief Minister is right, we said that how could Government introduce conditions affecting people's continued employment which they were not



told about at the time they applied for the job and that is one of the issues. The Board was saying, “...in order to continue to be registered and in order to continue to practice one has to re-register every three years.” As we saw it the conflict arises in that nurses have a contract of employment with Government that does not say, “you are permanent and pensionable for as long as you remain registered and as long as you are able to practice.” Therefore, Government would be required by the terms of employment to continue to employ somebody who according to the Board would not be able to do the job for which they are required. If they wanted to make that a condition of employment in the Opposition’s judgement they would only be able to make it for people from a current date when the advert came out people would be told there is a vacancy for registered nurse in the hospital and one will only be able to continue in employment if one is successful in re-registering every three years so applicants would then entering a lottery because presumably they would not be able to guarantee. The other thing that arises is that if that is the system that is going to operate and it will operate on one basis for existing and another one for new staff we put it to the Government that one certainly cannot require people to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Board that they have been successful in attaining certain levels when nothing has been done to provide.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

To prescribe.....yes the Board has to prescribe what needs to be done and then the facilities to be able to do it have to be provided neither of which has happened. The third thing is that if one is going to have out of 84 staff nurses and 89 enrolled nurses and presumably even more in the future a requirement that they are going to have to spend ‘x’ weeks in the year on courses in order to be able to satisfy the Board at the end of the three years then presumably the manning levels for the hospital would have to factor in something that was not there before just like if tomorrow there is an increase in sick leave entitlement or an increase in holiday entitlement the manning levels are then looked at on the basis that the available working hours have been reduced. Those elements concern Government as an employer independent of what the Board does and that is that there is an inevitable manning level effect and cost to the Government and the Health Service if this is proceeded with. If it is something that is desirable or necessary or good I suppose it will have to be done but I was pointing out to Government that there were all these repercussive effects which did not seem to have been considered and I hope that that further element is looked at as well. If I could make just two points. First of all there is a disagreement of analysis before we get on to the substance and reality on the ground. Government are both the employer and also somebody who has to comply with the law. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about conditions introduced after people were first employed and that how these should only apply to new employees and how this is not a condition of employment of existing nursing staff but these are not things that Government are doing as employer this is the law of the land which applies as much to nurses employed by Government as to nurses employed by private clinics. The law of the land establishes in order to ensure a minimum standard of nursing and patient care throughout Gibraltar the law establishes certain statutory requirements that have to be complied by all nurses not just Government nurses, nurses in the Westminster Clinic and the nurses in this or that private clinic too. That being the law Government are the biggest employer of nurses in Gibraltar and as an employer now has to set about complying with the law in relation to nurse registration and re-registration and the Leader of the Opposition knows that the law often changes the conditions of employment of people both to the benefit and prejudice of the employee and to the benefit and prejudice of the employer. All the employment legislation that we pass in this House, EU directives

and things like that, that is the law being superimposed on private arrangements namely contracts of employment. So, the idea that regulatory standards if one could very loosely call them that imposed by legislation cannot apply to anybody that is already employed in that occupation I do not think is a sustainable analysis. What the Leader of the Opposition says might be true if Government as an employer was in respect of its employee trying to change established rights in the conditions of employment so, for example, if Government were to say, *"we now require that unless all our nurses have 26 'O' Levels they are immediately sacked,"* that is a change of established acquired rights in an employer/employee relationship. In that context the Leader of the Opposition's analysis I believe will be correct but when it is the law of the land that imposes both on the Government and on any other nurse employer this idea of this sort of cut off date would not apply. Secondly, I think that the Leader of the Opposition is misinformed about the nature of this portfolio obligation and the business of re-registration. From listening to the hon Member both today and on previous days in this House I detect that the Leader of the Opposition has formed the view of this that somehow it is some form of examination. The portfolios is little more than presenting a package of a presentational submission that in the ordinary course of their normal duties they have kept up with certain standards of practice and there are facilities available to assist nurses to comply with this. They may want to suggest that there are not enough but that is another issue. There are resources, courses and time-off given for study and or preparation and or access to the nursing school to assist them in getting all this. I am not in possession of detailed information as to what that boils down to in terms of hours and help so there might be a debate about whether or not it might be enough I have no information that it is not enough or that anybody has complained that it is not enough but it would not be true to suggest that this is a matter that has not been thought about, that has not been prepared about and that there are no resources or scheme in place to assist nurses and that is something that Government do as the employer. As employer of nurses that have this legal obligation Government provides time and resources and assistance to its nursing employees to assist them in their compliance with what is a legal requirement and not an employer's requirement.

#### **HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not a legal requirement that they have to re-register and the fact that they letter was sent out by the Board saying for the registration to be successful one has to produce evidence that one has met and successfully completed certain prescribed training modules and nothing had been prescribed so nothing could have been met. So, that is the first issue that has been looked at because it is so obvious but in addition to that it appears that the Board has a free hand on what to prescribe, the law does not say that things have got to be prescribed and therefore the need to re-register which is one thing which is what the law requires is not a handicap. It is quite reasonable quite apart from anything else if somebody comes from outside forget the Government as the Chief Minister has said, in the private sector, if somebody comes along from outside as they do and they register initially in order to be employed in a private clinic I think it is a good thing that they should be required to re-register three years later and that they should not, for example, simply disappear and turn up 20 years later and the registration should be there. The Opposition is not against the re-registration, the Opposition supported that when it was done what is being questioned is whether the additional conditions being attached to re-registration now create a new situation which the House never perceived or intended which is that the failure to register means that one cannot be employed and they are now putting conditions on the registration which were not there before and are now being put by the Board because independent about what

the Chief Minister has said that it is a different issue if one does it as an employer from doing it because it is the law of the land, I accept it is a different situation, I would have thought that as an employer which happens to be the employer that based the laws Government are creating a situation [INTERRUPTION] the laws are made by all of us that is why I am able to make a contribution in helping in this matter. If a law is made and the result of that law which is brought to the House and supported by the Government and the Opposition support it because it seems a good idea and then we find that the operation of that law in the way that it is going to be operated means that one could have people then suing the Government for unfair dismissal because they have been in the Health Service for 20 years and suddenly they find themselves that they are not able to continue in employment because they are not able to carry on doing what they have been doing for 20 years because they have not passed some prescribed thing, quite apart from anything else it is one thing to do these things when people have come straight out of training and another thing is to do them for people who have been all their lives and near retirement. Those are important considerations. On the job training is one thing and another thing is a prescribed portfolio of things that must have been done, the wording of that gave the impression that people would have to do extra courses which the Health Service does make available but they do not make it available on the basis that it affects ones ability to continue the job one is doing. Whenever those course have been made available and I have asked questions in this House about them the answer has been that the reason that the courses are there is to create an incentive because the more courses one does the better the chances are when one goes to a Promotion Board because one has shown (a) an interest and (b) ones breadth of knowledge. It is a very good thing that as an employer Government should give people the opportunity to improve their skills and their prospects of promotion and another thing is to say and if one does not one cannot carry on doing what one was doing before one did the courses and that is a very significant difference. All the courses that are there now, to my knowledge, are not courses which if one is not successful negatively affect the job one is doing now. All the courses that are there now do not have that effect and to my knowledge that has always been the case and has continued to be the case when the Opposition have asked about people being sent for training and I know people who have done it and have come back and expect that when there is a vacancy in a particular area, in fact, people look for the area where vacancies are likely to occur and then apply specifically for the courses that are likely to be useful for that. So, I believe that notwithstanding the argument of the Government which I can understand in distinguishing between the law and the role as an employer it would be a very unusual situation if the state decided that a qualification that was not needed by people who have been years in employment is going to be needed now for them to continue doing the job that they have been doing all the time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

First of all we have to be clear that there is a difference between training courses made available through the School of Nurses for enrolled nurses to be able to get to staff nurses or for enrolled nurses to increase their levels of expertise and therefore promotion prospects. There is a difference between that on the one hand and processes designed to ensure that even within ones existing position one is keeping up with modern practices and that one is keeping up with the standards required. I honestly do not think that the Leader of the Opposition's analysis that he has presented is correct about whether changes which are designed either to improve or maintain standards should not be imposed in areas such as healthcare and others in respect of existing staff, for example, and as to one can or should be affected, if the

Bar Council were suddenly to introduce a new requirement without which lawyers could not continue to practice that would affect the lawyers in the Attorney General's Chambers and they have got permanent and pensionable posts and Government could not continue to use them as lawyers because they would no longer have the rights of audience in the court because the law of the land says that to be a lawyer one now needs to have blue eyes and all the ones that do not have blue eyes therefore can no longer practice and Government would be affected just like anybody else. This does not apply just to nurses it applies to other people like pharmacists and doctors in the Health Authority. When the Leader of the Opposition suggests that this is somehow an unusual or difficult to justify regime. In the United Kingdom they have exactly the same process where nurses who are employees of the Health Authority are required to re-register every three years, they are required to submit portfolios of work, it is exactly the same system no one says there that this raises the sort of structural issues in terms of employment relationships that the Leader of the Opposition has just described, I think that there is an acceptance in certain lines of business, in certain activities in life healthcare being one of them where it is thought legitimate that the authority in this case the Medical Registration Board should have a mechanism whereby they are able to ensure not that one is fit and proper and up to standards on the day that one is employed but that indeed those are maintained. Government cannot exempt itself from that process what I would say and where I would agree with the Leader of the Opposition to this extent and this is something that perhaps ought to have been debated at the time that if the Health Authority is a good employer with proper management and disciplinary control over its staff and able to develop its staff and obtain its staff development, theoretically it ought not to be necessary, for Government to subject to a law before ensuring that all its staff were up to standard. Usually regulatory things are to regulate people that might otherwise try to get away with behaving at a lower standard. It is to be assumed that Governments and Health Authorities do not fall into that category but at the end of the day this is something that regulates a profession without making a distinction whether it is practice in the private sector or published in the public sector but the system almost in the same way exists in the United Kingdom. I suspect that that is exactly where the Medical Registration Board and the proposal to bring standards into line where taken from I do not suppose Gibraltar designed or invented this mechanism. As the hon Lady has said these requirements mirror those of the Nursing and Midwifery Council in the United Kingdom so by all means we can discuss this but this is what the UK thinks is necessary in the interests of nurses and patients. We can debate whether it is necessary here but it is not an extraordinary or unusual or peculiar structure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this available and could it be made available to us what is being mirrored from UK so that we know what we are talking about. In the original answer if I heard the Chief Minister rightly he said that not all the 89 enrolled nurses and not all the 84 staff nurses had actually re-registered?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Independent of the question of the proficiency how can they continue, we are talking about having to re-register without having to meet any specific thin, how can they continue to be practising if they have not re-registered?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

What I said was that not all have applied for re-registration. The process is on-going. The Leader of the Opposition in his previous contribution finished off by talking about achieving a qualification and if that qualification was not achieved was Government going to sack the nurses. That is not the scenario, the scenario we are in and the on-going process is that the Board having said this is what we want, and it is an independent statutory board, the School of Health Studies are now liaising with the Board to see how the on-going work that the School of Health Studies does and the work that it does and the courses that it provides for nurses how that can tailor and fit in to the requirements of the portfolio so that when that portfolio shows the work that is being done through the School of Studies that portfolio will at the end meet the requirements of the Board. So, the work that is being done far from being done from a philosophy of finding ways of avoiding people being able to register the philosophy is exactly the opposite it is one of co-operation between the Board, the school and the GHA in finding ways to help the nurses to be in a position to apply for re-registration. The implications in the Leader of the Opposition's questions of nurses not yet having re-registered is that the process is still on-going until we solve it we will not be able to finish it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just add to that as that answer is not complete to the hon Member's questions which I thought was intended to imply – *are the nurses therefore breaking the law or is Government breaking the law by reason of not having been registered.* No, this raises the question that I put to him in answer to the first supplementary by the hon Lady. It is this problem as to whether there is a doubt which I think is a very real doubt I would personally although it is not my job to advise Government in legal matters that there is much more than just a real doubt as to whether or not there is a legal requirement to submit a portfolio because it has not been prescribed and therefore there is no requirement for portfolios for registration that is presently being considered by the Board so failure to have delivered a portfolio would not be an obstacle legally at the moment because nothing has been prescribed and therefore at the moment it is an empty obligation. When something is put in to that obligation by way of prescription then I suppose that could be used. There are now proposals being considered by the Board to prescribe those requirements but they have not yet emerged and have not yet been prescribed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I understand all that but the point that I am making is being entirely missed. The original letter that was sent which I brought to the attention of the House said that on this occasion the portfolio would not be demanded so everything that we are being told about the portfolio is totally irrelevant. The original letter from the Board to the nurses said, "...because on this occasion we have not put in place the necessary machinery for the portfolio on this occasion you will not be required to submit a

*portfolio.*” That is what the original letter said so everything we have been told in the last 10 minutes is neither here nor there because I am talking about re-registration in the year 2003 which is what the original question is and for the re-registration of 2003 what the letter from the Board that I brought to the House on the last occasion we debated this said was, “...we are putting you on notice that this time round we will re-register you without the portfolio.” So, everything we are being told about the portfolio is for the next time round not for this time round I am asking this time round when the portfolio is not being demanded, was never going to be demanded even before we debated it because the people were put on notice that this was a legal requirement and my question to that was, “How can one send someone a letter saying there is a legal requirement to do this and we are waiving it, is the Board in a position to waive legal requirements?” But independent of that point all the explanations that are being given now are about the portfolio, what the school of nursing is going to be doing with the portfolio, the intention is not to make life difficult but to make it easier and that is not my question. My question is without the portfolio which is not being required one still has the requirement for re-registration and that is a legal requirement as I understand it not a requirement that the Board may waive . If everybody has not applied for re-registration how is it that the people whose registration was due, forget the portfolio, are still there? That was my supplementary.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The whole issue of re-registration is being kept in limbo I am just being reminded that one of the legal niceties that I thought arose when I considered this on prompting from the Leader of the Opposition was a doubt in mind as to whether the registration and re-registration process applied to enrolled nurses at all in the language that the legislation used, not just whether one could demand re-registration but actually whether they were required to have been registered in the first place. So, that is the issue that is being looked at in respect of the enrolled nurse. I apologise to the Leader of the Opposition I forgot to make that point which had been one of the two potential legal objections that I had identified in the middle of last year when I looked at this. As to what the point is, and I understand the hon Members, have they re-registered or not and if they have not is the Health authority in breach of the law? The answer is that that is the answer in respect of enrolled nurses that the question of whether they are required to re-register or to participate in any register is under careful legal scrutiny. As to what the answer to his question is in relation to staff nurses I would have to take advice, my understanding is the same as his that this is a legal requirement. I am not aware that the Board has any powers to waive. The view has been taken in respect of staff nurses too that the obligation to re-register is inextricably linked to the prescription of things that would need to be done before anybody could do that and as they had not been prescribed the view is being taken whether rightly or wrongly by the Board that until the question of the prescription of these requirements are prescribed the process of re-registration is on hold. Whether or not that amounts to the exercise of a discretion that the law does not give the Board or whether it amounts to an exercise of a discretion that the Board in law has I would need notice either to research the point in law myself or to get legal advice on the point. I do not know from my off-hand knowledge of the requirements of those sections whether they have or have not got that discretion.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That last answer means that some people have applied and some have not but no one has been re-registered yet is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Certainly the process of re-registration of people that applied for it stopped after Government raised these issues and placed it on hold. It may be that some people that have applied for re-registration before it was placed on hold may have been re-registered before it was placed on hold but once it was placed on hold re-registration application, I am advised, have been held and not taken forward to the register.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not that Government have asked the Board to put it on hold am I right? This is something that they have done on their initiative and I take that that is the case because something that the Chief Minister has not referred to but I have mentioned in earlier supplementaries that my recollection of the text of the letter was that the registration in the year 2003 would not be affected by the absence of this portfolio. If one sends people a letter saying, *"We are reminding you that you are required by law to apply for re-registration otherwise you are not capable of continuing practising nursing from the first of January. We also need to remind you that there is also going to be a requirement to meet a prescribed portfolio of studies or courses but since we have not produced the prescribed list on this occasion we are not asking you to do it but we are putting you on notice that the next time round in three in years you are going to be able to do it"* which is fine because one is giving people plenty of notice that they cannot argue that it has caught them by surprise but to go on from that and say *"We are now putting the whole process on hold and we are not re-registering anybody,"* certainly it cannot be following UK practice for a start and I would say that as a matter of urgency it needs to be looked into because if there is a law that says that people cannot practice nursing without being registered just imagine that something happens to somebody in the hospital and the patient was dealt with by one of these nurses whose registration has not been done. The original letter in my judgement covered without complications the registration of this year as it was drafted and I remember it and it seems that we are now in a slightly worse situation that we were if they had done what they said they were going to do which was to automatically re-register everybody and then over the next three years put in play something for the next time round.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In answer to the first point, this is not a Government initiative in the sense that Government do not issue instructions or directives in fact it is unable to do so to the Board. The Government makes representations to the Board which the Board choose to take into account or chooses not to take into account that is a matter for the Board, as is the administration of this requirement. The Leader of the Opposition says that the matter appears to have become much more different and complicated than the one that he initially raised that is true but that is because once one starts pulling a thread from a piece of string other threads are pulled out with it, for example, the point about whether this applies to enrolled nurses at all this was an issue that arose. In a sense what has happened? The administration, implementation and operation of this system that did not exist before 1997 is suspended whilst its efficacy, validity and correct application is under review. I accept the Leader of the Opposition's implicit observations that it is not a satisfactory state of affairs that that situation should persist for any longer than strictly necessary and that the process of review should be such that the system is restored to proper

operation as soon as possible. If that is the point I entirely agree with it and I will certainly take it up to ensure that that occurs.



ORAL

**NO. 210 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – FORECAST OUT-TURN**

Can Government confirm what is the latest forecast out-turn for the revenue and expenditure of the Gibraltar Health Authority for the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 211 to 218 of 2004.

**NO. 211 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state how many private patients were seen to or treated at St Bernard's Hospital (a) as out-patients and (b) as in-patients during the months of March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 210 and 212 to 218 of 2004.

**NO. 212 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to the end of December 2003, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 210, 211 and 213 to 218 of 2004.

**NO. 213 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to the end of December 2003, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No 210 to 212 and 214 to 218 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 214 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre from 1<sup>st</sup> March 2003 to the end of December 2003, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 210 to 213 and 215 to 218 of 2004.

**NO. 215 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items, and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting periods 12, 13, 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 and 8 of 2002/2003, in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to dispensing pharmacists and the total value of the medicines so dispensed and the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 210 to 214 and 216 to 218 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 216 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods in respect of 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 210 to 215 and 217 to 218 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 217 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA- NUMBER OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50 for the accounting periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos 210 to 216 and 218 of 2004.



**NO. 218 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – AMOUNTS PAID TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to pharmacists for the months of March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, and December of 2003, and the comparable figure for the same months in the previous year in respect of £1.80 per item prescription in respect of the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government remain willing to provide to the Opposition detailed information of this sort which is unprecedented in Gibraltar before 1996. However given the intense administrative burden of preparing this information within five days I will forward this information in writing to the hon Member within ten days.

**NO. 219 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**EMPLOYMENT – DISABLED PERSONS**

Is it Government policy to ensure that disabled persons are not discriminated against at work or in their ability to access the labour market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The policies of successive Gibraltar Governments are reflected in the provisions of the laws of Gibraltar in this respect mainly in the Disabled Persons Ordinance 1992.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 219 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government keep a record of the number of disabled people that are in employment?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Disability is a very varied concept and there are records in the Employment Service of the number of disabled people at different stages of disability who have employment. In fact, there are some who have been placed, not employed, as trainees with different employers. The records are there but I could not give them to the hon Lady across the floor.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In relation to the answer given a moment ago is the Minister's position then that the provisions of the Equal Opportunities Directive, is he aware that we have the Bill in the House, which will apply also to elderly people and disabled people as from 2006.

In relation to disabled people have already been dealt with in Gibraltar under the Disability Ordinance or that we will have to make specific provisions in the future?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Equal Opportunities Ordinance which will be introduced at this meeting of the House reflects the Directive of the European Union 2000/78 EC which covers areas of discrimination against aged and disabled persons but nevertheless the European Union has actually made allowances to Member States to delay the actual practical implementation of those requirements because of the wide-ranging complexities that it involves affecting employers having to make adjustments to the new requirements in 2006. Nevertheless, the Government are committed to introduce these areas of equal opportunities and anti-discrimination in due course. But we do have time even in England the Disability Discrimination Act will not come into practical implementation until August this year so we do have a time lapse in which we can actually process this legislation.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So in effect the Minister is telling me that we will have to go further in transposition?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, indeed the 1992 Disability Persons Ordinance is very inadequate as it stands and nevertheless we would welcome very much a much more precise and specific elements of a new legislation in the Equal Opportunities Ordinance.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I was hoping to mention this in the discussion that we will be having when we talk about the Equal Opportunities, the Ordinance, but I can assure the Minister that there is no mention to the disabled or the elderly in the green papers that I have received from the Clerk of the House.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will just explain why. The European Union has allowed a time lapse to 2006.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is it possible for the Minister to give us some statistics regarding the present figure of employment of disabled in Gibraltar, how many disabled people are employed?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have answered that before and I have said that I cannot here and now give details because I have not got the.....

**HON S E LINARES:**

I think that the hon Member would like those figures if he can to be passed to him.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Indeed, I did mention that we have records and they will be passed on.

**NO. 220 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – INCLUSION PROGRAMME**

Can Government state how many children are currently in the inclusion programme in mainstream schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There are currently 90 children in the inclusion programme in mainstream schools.

**NO. 221 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CLASSROOM AIDES**

Can the Minister state how many classroom aides are assigned to pupils who are in the inclusion programme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There are 34 classroom aides assigned to pupils who are in the inclusion programme.

**NO. 222 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – INCLUSION PROGRAMME**

Can the Minister of Education state what is the ratio of children in the inclusion programme to teachers giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The ratio of children in the inclusion process to teachers is 1:3. The breakdown is in the schedule that I now hand over to the hon Member.

| School                                                 | No of Children   | No of Teachers                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b><u>First Schools</u></b>                            |                  |                                     |
| Governor's Meadow                                      | 1                | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| Notre Dame & N                                         | 15               | SU Teacher SENCo & C Teacher        |
| St Bernard's F S                                       | 1                | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| St Joseph's & N                                        | 4                | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| St Mary's F S                                          | 1                | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| St Paul's F S & N                                      | 6                | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| Hebrew F S                                             | 1                | C Teacher & SENCo                   |
| <b><u>Middle Schools</u></b>                           |                  |                                     |
| Bishop Fitzgerald                                      | 16               | 2 SU Teachers SENCo C Teacher       |
| Sacred Heart                                           | 1                | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| St Anne's                                              | 6                | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| St Joseph's                                            | 0                |                                     |
| Hebrew                                                 | 0                |                                     |
| <b><u>Secondary Schools</u></b>                        |                  |                                     |
| Bayside                                                | 19               | 1 SU Teacher SENCo C Teacher 1T 1:1 |
| Westside                                               | 5                | 1 SU Teacher SENCo C Teacher        |
| <b><u>Special Schools</u></b>                          |                  |                                     |
| St Martin's                                            | 13 Outreach + CA | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| <b><u>GCFE</u></b>                                     |                  |                                     |
|                                                        | 1                | C Teacher SENCo                     |
| <b>Total No of Children = 90</b><br><b>Ratio = 1:3</b> |                  |                                     |



**NO. 223 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PRIVATE NURSERIES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited private nurseries in the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

All entitled children are assessed at the age of three by the Health Visitor. The assessments are carried out at the Government nurseries or at the Primary Care Centre if the child is not attending Government nursery. No visits are made by the Health Visitor to Private Nurseries.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 223 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is it all private nurseries. 100 per cent of the private nurseries?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not understand the question.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is there not one nursery who does have school nurses visiting them?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Not to my knowledge.

**NO. 224 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PRIVATE NURSERIES**

Can Government state how many times Education Advisers have visited private nurseries in the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Advisory Service conducted a full inspection of all private nurseries in 1997 where the following information was collated:

- ? ? Number of children on roll;
- ? ? How many children are organised;
- ? ? Resources available;
- ? ? Activities planned for a “typical day”;
- ? ? Details of records kept;
- ? ? Fees charged.

In subsequent years, the advisers have held informal regular contacts with nursery owners and staff and they have been available to advise on how these criteria can be implemented effectively. They have also involved themselves in investigating individual parental complaints when such complaints have arisen, which I must say very rarely.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 224 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The Minister has not answered my question because the question is how many times have educational advisers visited private nurseries. I am aware of the inspection that was done in 1997. Since 1997 to date we are six years on nearly seven and therefore it does not relate to my question. My question is how many times have

Educational Advisers visited private nurseries in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003? If they have not visited the answer is none.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not have a statistical answer to the question as put to me but what I have tried to do is actually reassure the hon Member that there is no problem that there is constant attention in informal, in a whole variety of ways by the Educational Advisory Service to the private nurseries and we go beyond the statistical mechanistic answer to his question to reassure him that there is and I have no problem whatsoever that the department is very much monitoring and advising and supporting the private nurseries.

**HON S E LINARES:**

What is the statistical mechanistic answer then?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not have any, that is the point that I am making. I think it is much more important to tell the hon Member how the department operates educationally than telling him just a shopping list of .....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

*(Inaudible)*

**HON S E LINARES:**

Thank you very much.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know I do not have a record but I was pretty serious that there is constant attention, monitoring, advising, helping, encouraging the department, the teachers and the owners of the nurseries who ensure that academic standards, health standards are maintained. I was pretty serious about that and that I think was more important to put before the House than just that shopping list of visits.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister aware that there is a new way in which to deal with nurseries which is the foundation year which has been implemented recently? I am asking the question because I think that it is the responsibility of the department of Education to visit regularly private nurseries to make sure that the foundation year which is now becoming, might well be incorporated as part of the National Curriculum, which is the foundation year .....

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Reception Year.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No foundation year which is pre-school it is no longer the reception years 1 and 2 it is the foundation year which is the pre-school year which might well become in the future part of the National Curriculum and therefore I am asking because these new innovations should be implemented or at least starting to be implemented in private nurseries because this is what is happening in Government nurseries.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In relation to the statement that the Minister made that he said the information that been obtained in 1997 and then he went on to say that the department is engaged constantly in making sure that the criteria are implemented effectively. I could not follow that because he was talking about the criteria being implemented effectively and he did not say anything about any criteria in 1997, he was talking about the number of children, their ages, their sex, the facilities, how much they pay, what is this criteria that he has told us they are ensuring is implemented effectively?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I did not mention the word criteria.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, I wrote it down.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Advisory Service conducted a full inspection of all private nurseries in 1997 where the following information was collated and then I listed the information.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes but at the end.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Perhaps I used the wrong word. I meant all this information, all this data that was collated they now monitor that it is being implemented and that the situation is continuing to be up to scratch.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I really do not understand the nature of the answer we have received to the original question because if he says, for example, in 1997 they found they had so many children of so many ages what is it that is subsequently being implemented, if he has got factual information which gave the Education Department a picture of what was happening in 1997 I would understand it if he were to tell us that at subsequent intervals they have updated that information to find out what has happened since but what I do not understand is what in that information has now become something that the department is monitoring to assure that is implemented effectively?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Advisors were satisfied with the information roughly and globally. Satisfied with the information that they gathered in 1997 about the number of children enrolled the resources available, the activities planned for a typical fruitful day for the children, details of records kept, that was established in a bank of data which satisfied the Advisors that there was no crisis and no serious problems involved in the private nurseries. That is the situation generally which informally without this sort of formal meetings perhaps is being monitored and kept as you mentioned up-dated if necessary by the Advisors through these regular contacts with the owners and with the staff.

**NO. 225 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CHANGE OF SCHOOL HOURS**

Can the Minister of Education state at what stage his department is in relation to the Review of the Change of School Hours?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

No such review is taking place. The Government are content with the present school hours.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 225 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I state the review because it was himself who stated he would be reviewing on an annual basis or at least regularly which can be either an annual , six monthly or ten yearly, that he would be reviewing the whole of the situation in respect of the change of school hours. That is why I put the question and therefore it seems as if there has been no review, is that the case that there has been no review whatsoever?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There is no review here and now, the hon Member asked me whether there is a review currently taking place and I say no review is currently taking place. That does not mean that we do not keep in mind the fact that we also have to in general terms monitor developments in the school. At this stage there is no swell of discontent or of problems coming to us from the implementation of the school hours?

**HON S E LINARES:**

I have not suggested that there is anything negative about the change of school hours at this stage what I am saying is that he was the one that stated about the review and therefore I am just asking at what stage it is. It is obvious that there is no review whatsoever.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Not at this stage.

**NO. 226 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL LUNCHES**

Can Government state whether they are conducting a feasibility study into the possibility of providing food in schools for the lunch break?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Government are not at presently conducting any such study.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 226 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is it Government policy to look into the feeding of children in school via an outside agency?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Member knows the Government have a manifesto commitment to consider the feasibility of providing meals at school and to conduct enquiries. The question asked whether they are conducting a feasibility study meaning is any such feasibility study under way. It is not presently under way hence my Colleague's answer but at some stage in honour of its manifesto commitment the Government have got to address this possibility and enter into a consultation process about it.



**NO. 227 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**PRE-SCHOOL NURSERIES**

Can Government state how many children attend full-time pre-school nursery education this academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A total of 256 children attend pre-school nursery education this academic year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 227 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I insist on the word full-time pre-school nursery education, is it 256 that are in full-time nursery education?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

If the hon Member means by full-time all day, this is not on, it has never been so. We have morning sessions and afternoon sessions.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So there are no children in full-time pre-school nursery education?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

To say that there is no worthy full-time nursery education is really a bit of a myth is it not? There are 256 children receiving nursery education in the traditional and normal acceptable way which actually goes that well it seems with parents morning sessions and afternoon sessions.

**NO. 228 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT**

Can Government state whether it is reviewing its policy in relation to children with challenging behaviour with a view to setting up a Pupil Referral Unit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Government are not reviewing their policy in relation to children with challenging behaviour with a view to setting up a Pupil Referral Unit since they are satisfied that the Pupil Referral Unit, as currently set up is perfectly adequate

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 228 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the minister state when this Pupil Referral Unit was set up?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Pupil Referral Unit was set up a few years ago and I have given details of this in the past to the hon Member. It is a question of what is his concept of a Pupil Referral Unit. If he means a physical location, a place where one actually segregates, a sin bin, type of place which I suspect is what he has in mind that is not so. We have a Pupil Referral Unit made of the Peripatetic Team of highly experienced teachers, three ex-headteachers, one deputy headteacher, who actually attend to pupils with challenging behaviour within the parameters, within the social environment of the school as far as possible. It does not exclude offside attention to these children when necessary, fortunately at this very moment of time there is no pupil who has required that type of exclusion and that is the, the hon Member is asking me for a date I cannot remember the date because it is a number of years ago that we have often debated this matter here and I can give him the date when this was established but it has been there now well established over a number of years.

**HON S E LINARES:**

It is incredible that the definition of the Pupil Referral Unit is now being changed. I have been asking this question since I entered this House about the Pupil Referral Unit always to be told that a Pupil Referral Unit will never be set up by this Government because they do not believe in it. Now, the Minister is trying to give me a definition of a Pupil Referral Unit. I never, ever intended it to be one sin bin and we have gone through this debate before. I have never said that a Pupil Referral Unity is a sin bin institution. It is not a sin bin institution, I think the Minister and I understand or should understand what a Pupil Referral Unit means and therefore to say now that a Pupil Referral Unit has been set up a number of years is beyond comprehension.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The type of Pupil Referral Service that I have described and which no doubt from what he has just said he attends to agree with because if he does not believe in the physical sin bin type of thing then he agrees with this type of .....yes there is a certain type of fundamental contradiction in the mind of the hon Member because on the one hand he is pressing for inclusion and on this case he is pressing for segregation.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I said I did not believe in the institution of the Pupil Referral Unit. I do not have to justify the Government, the Government are accountable to the people of Gibraltar not myself.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

We can pass a motion of censure and prove it.

**NO. 229 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state when the dining hall at St Paul’s School will be completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The extension currently being constructed at St Paul’s School consists of a hall, four classrooms, a nursery, stores and toilet facilities. The expected date of completion is September 2004.

**NO. 230 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state whether a dining hall will also be provided for Bishop Fitzgerald School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There are no concrete plans to build a dining hall at Bishop Fitzgerald School.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 230 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does the Minister not believe that there is a need for a dining hall in Bishop Fitzgerald?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There are many things which are desirable and which can be understood as needed but the Government have to set priorities, there are also logistical problems in the question of building extensions in the context in the geography of Bishop Fitzgerald and I have been honest enough to say that at this stage, it does not mean that we do not recognise that there are problems in Bishop Fitzgerald School with regard to dining, the main problem is that the hall has to be doubled up as a gym and for assemblies and that means tables and chairs have to be moved in and out for dinner but that is not the end of the world although we understand the difficulty and realise that perhaps they are not as fortunate in the provisions as other schools and definitely we will have in mind to see how improvements can be made within a total context of priorities.

**NO. 231 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can the Minister of Education state whether Governor’s Meadow School will be having a dinning hall like that of St Paul’s School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There are no plans to build a dining hall at Governor’s Meadow School.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 231 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister aware that St Paul’s has exactly the same dining hall as Governor’s Meadow and that it was decided that St Paul’s needed another dining hall. Why has it not been decided that St Paul’s needed another dining hall if they are the same?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The hon Member may have missed the point I made when speaking about St Paul’s. I did not say a dining hall, the headteacher there is perfectly happy to continue the use of the present building for lunches and she is perfectly happy to continue using that. The works being carried out in St Paul’s I said was an extension of a hall, a nursery, classrooms, in terms of lunches the present construction will continue to be used because the headteacher is perfectly happy with it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Generally in relation to dining halls can the Minister state whether in fact this question of having to prioritise and not be able to provide one in particular in relation to Bishop Fitzgerald School, for example, relates to having to prioritise financially in what other aspects the department spends money on.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

In what the actual department not the Government but the department?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes. The Minister said that one of the reasons for not providing a dining hall at Bishop Fitzgerald School was because the department had to prioritise does that mean that for financial reasons the department cannot provide a dining hall at Bishop Fitzgerald?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What it means is that there is a finite pot of money and that not everything that might be a good idea can all be done at the same time. As the Government do not want to just build school dining halls in one year it has to share out the monies available to housing, sports, leisure, so that we can get on with building the leisure centre that he is always criticising us for having had in the manifesto since 1996. There are all manner of areas where there is demand on Government finances in public expenditure and the idea that in any area of Government, Government can just do the whole of their wish list is financially unrealistic. There is not just sort of unlimited resources available.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is a financial prioritisation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, one of the factors is financial prioritisation. If money were no object and space were no object and need were no object I suppose we could build buildings around every corner.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Space is a problem as the Chief Minister has mentioned. I did mention it myself when answering that question that the logistics, what I call the geography of the place, presents difficulties. At present we had to build further classrooms and facilities in the school and then in the playground and then we had to move the open playground area to the tennis courts. That would be an open area that could be built upon in order to provide a new hall so that it would not have to double up with the present hall for gymnastics, assemblies et cetera but that encroaches on the



playground area so there are logistical problems. Nevertheless I am open to solutions.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I beg to differ with the Chief Minister and the Minister that it was a financial problem, it was not a financial problem, the Minister knows that it was not a financial problem the fact that Bishop Fitzgerald has not got a dining hall now. The fact is that there was no requisition at the time for a dining hall, is that the case? There was no requisition at the time for a dining hall and therefore Government did not budget for a dining hall at Bishop Fitzgerald's?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know anything about that. It certainly comes to me as new requisitions came from all schools. All the schools had their advises made and assessment of the needs to provide for school lunches and there were no formal requisitions as such it was an inspection of the schools to see how best we could provide facilities for school lunches.

**NO. 232 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NEW SCHOOL IN WESTSIDE AREA**

Can Government state whether a new middle school will be constructed in the Westside area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Government do have such plans for a first/middle school, although no decision has been made about when it may be implemented.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 232 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I am sure that the Minister is aware that Bishop Fitzgerald School is bursting at the seams. Would Government not think that it is a priority to start thinking seriously about building a school down in the Westside area?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

We are thinking about building a school in the West side area.

**HON S E LINARES:**

In 2001 I asked the same question and they were thinking of seriously building a school down in the westside area yet nothing has materialised. The answer to the question then was that they were trying to identify sites around the area to where the school will be. Three years on and still we are at a, "...we would like to do it stage."

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The problem here is in bad urban planning. The problem here is in desirably concentrating or building a large number of houses in a new area of Gibraltar and not making sufficient plans for parking, schools, that is the problem and when one tries to resolve these things after the event it is much more difficult but a properly thought out urban plan of the west side area when it started would have made provisions for the schools that were bound to be necessary by moving thousands of families down there and would have made proper provision for parking for the thousands of people that were going to be down there. Now, a subsequent Government have got to provide where there are no longer any sites available and therefore the question of the timing of demands for schools as I am sure he knows is very much a question of the demographics of generations and these things can be followed from the birth rates and things like that as to how many children of certain school ages we are going to have in Gibraltar in any year in the future because barring people that come into Gibraltar from abroad assuming that the bulk of our school children are the children that are born in Gibraltar one knows from the date of their birth when they are going to need a place in a First and Middle school because of the age bracket and this is something which is kept under review. There was a problem was it Bishop Fitzgerald or was it Governor's Meadow with an excessive number of children wanting to transfer to that school from other catchment areas which was increasing the overcrowding so to speak of the school. That has now been in a sense stopped so to relieve the places available to people on that catchment area. There is going to be a need for a school, there is a plan, we are down to choosing between one site or another site it is now down to two sites on one side of Queensway or another depending on how certain negotiations with other entities goes ahead. The exact timing of the need to make the investment is being kept under careful observation and it is a balance of prioritisation with when will the need really arise in terms of Bishop Fitzgerald and Governor's Meadow really will not be able to cope even without transfers from other areas. It is not just Governor's Meadow and Bishop Fitzgerald the spill over effect is into places like St Anne's and many of these schools, St Paul's, a lot of these schools are bursting at seam point so there is unquestionably a need but it was not that the need existed in 2001 or 2002. The need is there, the timing of the satisfaction of that need is under careful consideration.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I accept his arguments but what I do not accept is that seven years on the demographic move that happened to the Westside is still a problem, not only that, this Government must also bear the responsibility of having all the Edinburgh House being given out therefore it is not a problem that was created before it is a problem that has been created through time so it is therefore not a thing that its demographic move because of all the houses that have been built down there. We are still even developing down there, there is Europlaza, Westview Park, all these developments have been done by this Government. I accept the Chief Minister's argument that there is a need for a school down there all I am asking is to make it more urgent than it is now at present.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is the urgency that the demand requires.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that event will the Chief Minister agree with me that if his argument is that the urgency of the demand is not great then what the planning officer did or did not do 12 or 16 years ago cannot have been so bad after all?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No because the demand is there, for example, we had to move Bishop Fitzgerald down to that area where it was not previously located to immediately meet the demand and literally over a summer the school had to be moved down there to meet the demand. That was the immediate response to the unprovided for demand and now we are in the position of having to prepare for the next wave of demand as young couples have more and more children of their homeownership and that is the reality of the situation. I am afraid that we have all got to learn in Gibraltar that the days when we could take the view where one could build 2,000 flats there and not provide schools because anywhere in Gibraltar is close enough and therefore one does not have to think in terms of the local provision of schools that does not apply and proper planning of new zones, proper zoning of new residential housing has to take and I think should have taken account of future schooling needs and I do not think there is any getting away from that. The hon Members generated the construction of over eight years 2,000 odd more flats. To have done that without making any accommodation for schooling in the area seems to me like an oversight of planning. I regret that the hon Member should not regard the point as so obvious that he wishes to contest it. It seems perfectly obvious to me.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What I am asking the Chief Minister is whether he does not accept that in fact by saying as he has at the moment that there is not at the moment an urgent need to reprovide the school is in fact denying the basis of his own argument that the whole area was so badly planned that there needs to be a school there now even though the Minister for Education moved Bishop Fitzgerald school down there, although we are now three administrations away from the last administration responsible for that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We can repeat the question and the answer as many times as he likes. If he wants the last word I am quite happy to give it to him I have never been of the view that whoever has the last word persuades anybody new, so if he wants to repeat this two or three times let us just agree that the next time he repeats it I will not stand up to answer this question he can have the last word in the hope that everybody will then accept his version of the story. The fact of the matter is :-

- (1) That thousands of families of childbearing age were relocated to a new area of town with no provision made for the education of their children.

- (2) That that situation had to be immediately dealt with by us when we arrived in office.
- (3) That there is now a need to make still further provision in the form of new schools.

The suggestion that because the matter has been managed on an interim basis through the rapid relocation of two schools in Gibraltar and through having to withdraw the freedom of parents from other districts to transfer to that school which always used to be possible, the fact that by extraordinary means we have been able to immediately put out the first fire, does not entitle the hon Member to deduce that there was never a problem to solve, on the contrary the fact that it had to be dealt with in such extraordinary ways is precisely evidence of the lack of urban planning that I have specified. If he wants to get up and argue to the contrary I promise not to contradict him.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will not take the Chief Minister up on his magnanimous offer but I hope from here on that we discuss his administration rather than everybody else's.

**NO. 233 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Can Government state what procedures are taken to make risk assessments in relation to Health and Safety in schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Risk assessments are carried out on an on-going basis by teachers and Headteachers whenever the lessons and other school activities involve an element of risk, for example, laboratory experiments, PE activities, external visits et cetera.

**NO. 234 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – REGISTER OF ASBESTOS**

Can Government state whether all schools have been inspected in order to draw up a register of asbestos in these buildings?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A register of asbestos has been drawn up for Governor's Meadow and Bishop Fitzgerald Schools, where asbestos was detected last year. The other schools have not yet been inspected.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 234 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister aware that there is a need to have a register of asbestos specially in schools?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is wrong and because he is wrong he is constantly giving, by the questions that he asks, the impression that somehow it is essential to find out immediately where there is asbestos. The law of Gibraltar in transposition of a European Union directive which is perfectly well implemented and respected says that wherever asbestos is detected its location has to be recorded so that one has a register. But asbestos as the hon Member must by now surely know given the number of times that we have debated this in relation to Mount Alvernia and schools, asbestos is not per se unsafe. Asbestos is not per se something that has got to be tracked down, located and marked. Asbestos is only unsafe if it is disturbed. The Directives which have been implemented in Gibraltar then require you to do certain things when asbestos is disturbed and when asbestos is located but it does not require one to go hunting for it as if its mere presence was a problem. There is

bound to be asbestos in every building, in every town in western Europe built between roughly 1950 and 1975. It is almost inconceivable that there should be any building built between these two periods or refurbished during these two periods which does not contain asbestos and therefore the idea that it has got to be identified and subjected to a register is not what we are advised is required for health and safety purposes but I can assure the hon Member that when asbestos is stumbled across in some repair as he has seen for himself the matter is taken very seriously. The Directive is immediately implemented, specialist contractors in asbestos handling are brought in and immediate resources are diverted to that to make sure that the school is able to operate safely and I hope that I have drawn a reasonable distinction for the hon Member between what is required of Government namely dealing with asbestos when it is come across on the one hand and hunting down asbestos in the ordinary course of business which is not required and frankly it would be terribly impractical to try and do.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I do not usually give credit to Government but in this case I must give credit to Government and all the workers that dealt with Governor's Meadow and Bishop Fitzgerald's asbestos. The only thing that worried me most was the lack of information at the time and the way they handled things but quite frankly they did a good job in covering up the asbestos and dealing with the *[Interruption]* covering up yes, it was covered up.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It was encapsulated.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Encapsulated fine which is covered up the same thing. Covering up the asbestos was done properly it was the cover up of having identified the asbestos that was not done properly?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am grateful to the hon Member for the complimentary part of his words but he has this idea that somehow there was lack of information. There was not, the Committee of the Parents Association I am sure was completely in the know and consulted. If the hon Member means that the Government did not immediately put out a press statement saying, "*Asbestos has been found everybody put masks on your children and do not send them to school,*" the answer is that such alarmist reactions are neither desirable nor necessary so there may be a difference in perception between the hon Members and those who advise ministers on these issues, the technicians, about what degree of publicity is necessary for these purposes and I can assure the hon Member that when publicity is necessary in order to safely deal with the problem, for example, in Mount Alvernia then the necessary publicity is given. When we are advised that the situation does not require that degree of publicity to simply start saying things in public is simply to worry people unnecessarily and all I am saying to the hon Member is please accept if he can that the level of publicity is not determined by any desire on Government to shelter or hide or conceal but rather that the matter



should receive a proper safe and balanced treatment and neither be exaggerated nor underestimated as to the danger or the seriousness of the situation involved. Grateful as we are for his comments about how that particular incident was otherwise dealt with, I do not think that his criticism of the publicity aspect is justified either.

**HON S E LINARES:**

It is not a question of putting a press release out or publishing all this to alarm the people it is just to inform. It was just a question of informing the parents at the time and saying that the Parents Association was informed is not good enough because the Parents Association is a committee who probably comprises five or six parents of which one was informed at the time and therefore all Government are doing is informing one parent, two or even at the most three from the association and that justifies informing all parents. I can tell the Chief Minister that nearly 90 per cent of those parents were not aware that asbestos had been identified. There was a lack of communication with parents, with staff who were not aware at the time that asbestos had been identified. It is not only a question of putting a press release out it is a question of informing first the staff that work there and two the parents and that is where they went wrong

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I do not agree the hon Member's statement are based on the premise which we consider to be erroneous that there is a need to inform all and sundry about the mere fact that asbestos has been detected and frankly I think that that is completely misconceived. There is a need to advise everybody if they face any degree of danger or risk, of course there is a need of that, but when the situation does not involve any danger or risk there is frankly no need as he appears to be presupposing, there is no need to advise them of it and what I am saying to the hon Member is because the hon Member attaches an inherent danger to asbestos he believes that whenever asbestos is found there has to be information. Whereas the Government says that information and communication is related to whether or not a danger or a risk to health exists and if no risk to health exists the fact that there is asbestos detected does not ring any alarm bell of a need to communicate information. Why would information need to be communicated to 90 per cent of parents or the percentage that he believes were not informed, of something that represented absolutely no risk to the health of their children, what would be the point of communicating this information to them? I just do not understand why the hon Member links the need for communication with the mere facts of asbestos having been detected regardless of whether it represents a risk to public health or not.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I am glad that the Chief Minister thinks that the members of staff are, "*all and sundry*".

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The first answer that the Chief Minister gave he drew the useful distinction between what is needed and what is required under the legislation in relation to asbestos but the original question which talks about the register of asbestos in schools and

because we are dealing with a school environment even though it is not needed under the legislation would either the Chief Minister or the Minister for Education agree with me that it might be prudent if at all possible perhaps during a school holiday to try and undertake an exercise such as that in relation to the school establishment and the Chief Minister has already indicated that we only have to do it in relation to buildings fitted out between a particular date just because a child might pull a panel or something and there might be asbestos behind?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. It is completely impractical without dismantling all the schools, completely unnecessary. To detect whether there is asbestos in pipe lagging, roof lagging, most floor tiling contains asbestos, asbestos is not dangerous unless the solid matter contains asbestos fibres and it is grated or sanded. The need to create a register relates to asbestos which is identified, for example, if the Government are undergoing routine maintenance or building works in a school and comes across materials that it considers to be asbestos then it is required to keep a record of that as opposed to going to every single floor tile, every brick, every panel, every roof tile and trying to find out whether it has got asbestos in it or not.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am sorry if I did not express my question appropriately at least in relation to areas which are easily accessible to the children, where the children could interfere with a tile or something which could then release the asbestos.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We are advised that there are no things that children could do that could immediately expose to them to asbestos and the advice that we have is that the search for asbestos is likely to create more danger than leaving it intact. Bear in mind that depending on the kind of asbestos that it is, one incident is unlikely itself to generate any great threat to public health. I hope that the hon Member can understand and accept that these are not things which ministers at political level make judgements these are things upon which ministers make decisions on the basis of technical advice by people who specialise in these areas.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The planning of schools and every other decision.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**NO. 235 of 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MANDATORY GRANTS**

Can the Minister for Education state how many mandatory grants have been awarded this academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A total of 171 mandatory scholarships have been awarded for studies commencing in or around September 2003.

**NO. 236 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISCRETIONARY GRANTS**

Can the Minister for Education state how many discretionary grants have been awarded this academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A total of 64 discretionary scholarships have been awarded for studies commencing in or around September 2003. These include distance learning support subsidies.

**NO. 237 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISCRETIONARY POST-GRADUATE GRANTS**

Can the Minister for Education state what were the number of applicants for discretionary post-graduate grants and the number granted and the number rejected in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A total of 35 persons applied for discretionary post-graduate grants for courses commencing on or around September 2003. Thirty-three of these applications were successful and two were unsuccessful.

**NO. 238 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISCRETIONARY GRANTS**

Do Government expect the expenditure on discretionary grants to be the £120,000 provided for in this year's budget?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The quoted figure of £120,000 relates to the expected expenditure for students starting a discretionary scholarship in the 2003/2004 academic year. The actual expenditure is now expected to be £143,960.

**NO. 239 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MAINTENANCE GRANTS**

Can the Minister for Education state what are the number of students on full grants and those on less than the full grant in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There are currently 559 scholarship holders studying abroad. Of these, 170 are receiving a maximum grant. The remaining 389 students have an element of parental contribution to the maintenance element of their scholarships.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 239 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister thinking of abolishing the parental contribution in the next academic year?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes. This is a manifesto commitment.

**NO. 240 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**SCHOOL OF TOURISM**

Can Government state how many students are currently in the School of Tourism giving a breakdown by year of intake?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Intake 11 of the School of Tourism commenced in June 2003 with six trainees. However four of them dropped out early on in the scheme so the decision was taken to merge this group with the next intake which is due to commence in the spring of 2004. In the meantime the two remaining trainees continue to gain work experience, which is part of their training course, with training providers within the Tourism Industry.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 240 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Has the Minister got any indication of how many will take the offer of going into the School of Tourism for this year so that they can join in with the rest of the seven that are left?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No I have no indication whatsoever because the recruitment process has still not been advertised and processed.



**HON S E LINARES:**

Is this the first time that the Minister has had to join in two intakes because of low number of roles?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes it is the first time.

**NO. 241 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CONSTRUCTION AND TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state how many Trainees are currently in the Construction and Training Centre giving a breakdown by year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

As at December 2003 there were 47 trainees at the Gibraltar Training Centre, eight were enrolled in September 2001, 15 in September 2002 and 24 in September 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 241 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Out of the eight in 2001 can the Minister state how many completed the course?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

They have not completed the course they are still there in training. They are part of the 47 trainees which I have stated are presently in training at the Gibraltar Training Centre.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Government state what qualifications they will end up after they complete their course?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

They will end up with NVQ qualifications Level 2 and some go on to Level 3.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Out of the 47 there are none at present doing a Level 3, obviously, because if one has .....

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

NVQ level.

**HON S E LINARES:**

NVQ Level how many of the 47 students are currently doing the Level 3?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am sure there are some but I do not have the information with me.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Could the Minister pass it on?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Certainly.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the eight who entered in 2001 due to finish their training in the summer of this year would they be in a position to take up employment?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes it is a three year span so if they came into training in September 2001 they should be finishing towards the end of this academic year which is in June.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

At that level they would be what at NVQ2?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Not necessarily, most of them will be in Level 2 but some do Advance, remember that the NVQ is a very much on-hand type of training with work experience and I think some of them may be actually going into Level 3 progress, I am not too sure of that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But it would not be that they could have done Level 3 within the three years it would be that they had already commenced a Level 3 before the end of the three years is that right?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

They can do Level 3 in the three years.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister satisfied that Level 2 is being accepted by most employers as a good qualification for them to obtain employment?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There has been considerable negotiations and discussions with employers at the private sector certainly in the public sector and Level 2 is now considered as a craftsman qualification.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is this the case with the Government owned companies as well because I have had representations from certain students or trainees that have come to me saying that after doing their Level 2 they have tried to seek employment say in GJBS or other Government entities and they are Government companies and they have not been accepted, could the Minister investigate and try to find out whether these companies do accept Level 2 as an adequate qualification for them to obtain employment?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is an issue here, NVQ Level 2 is predominantly theory based and the tuition is delivered mainly in the centre whereas NVQ Level 3 which is what I think these training centres should be increasingly gearing up to has a much higher element of in the field placement work experience input. There are issues there, there are many who speculate that the Construction Training Centre should gear much more to NVQ Level 3 than 2. I am not aware that there is any Government company that is taking the view that he has just described I am not saying that there is not, I am not aware of any Government company, but certainly these trainees would be much more useful immediately to employers if they had studied to Level 3 than to Level 2. So, there is an element in effect with an NVQ2 of a prospective employer in effect having to continue the training curve into the first period of employment whereas somebody trained up to NVQ Level 3 would be much more immediately and comprehensively useful to his employer and in the private sector they are much less willing to continue that training than in the quasi public sector so I am surprised to hear.

**NO. 242 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CAMMELL LAIRD TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state how many Trainees are currently in the Cammell Laird Training Centre giving a breakdown by year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

|                       |   |   |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Intake Year 2000/2001 | - | 9 |
| Intake year 2001/2002 | - | 7 |
| Intake year 2002/2003 | - | 8 |

A total of 24 trainees who are currently in the Cammell Laird Training Centre.

**NO. 243 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CAMMELL LAIRD TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state what percentage of Trainees who complete Training courses in the Cammell Laird Training Centre are in employment with the said company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

1<sup>st</sup> Intake (1998) - 50 per cent

2<sup>nd</sup> Intake (1999) - 80 per cent

Intakes 3, 4 and 5 are still in training and are due to complete their apprenticeships in October 2004, 2005, and 2006 respectively.

**NO. 244 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION - EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT**

Can Government state whether one of the criteria for applying of Headteacher or Deputy Head is that candidates obtain qualifications on the Management of Education courses offered by the Department of Education?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Public Service Commission circular advertising posts at Headteacher and Deputy Headteacher level states that “relevant qualifications/experience in educational administration and management would be advantageous, for example, the Sheffield Hallam Educational Management Course”.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 244 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister satisfied that there are candidates that obtain these qualifications and are successful as Headteachers and Deputy Heads following on from what the Minister has just said about its advantageous, is the Minister satisfied that this is happening across the board because there are certain managerial posts which have been lately given which are high managerial posts in education of candidates who have not even gone through the first year of the Management of Education Course which seems to be advantageous is the Minister satisfied with this?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The management course is one of the elements involved in selection there are many aspects and criteria like track record, report references from superiors, experience, performance at interview in presenting for themselves a verified competence, there are a whole variety of factors that have to be taken into account by the Public Service Commission when making the best assessment and selection that they can make but certainly it is established in principal that pursuing a course in educational

management is a very important factor that will be taken into account by the Public Service Commission.



**NO. 245 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PROMOTION CRITERIA**

Can Government state whether the candidates within the teaching profession are now given feedback as to why they have not obtained a promotion post?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Candidates within the teaching profession who are unsuccessful in obtaining promotion can seek an appointment with their respective Headteachers and/or the Director to obtain feedback, always within the parameters and the constraints of the Public Service Commission Regulations.

**NO. 246 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SUPPLY TEACHERS**

Can the Minister for Education state how many teachers are on permanent supply at present?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There are currently 25 teachers on full-time supply in our schools.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 246 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister satisfied that these 25 full-time supply teachers are on a full-time basis which is a contradiction in terms when it is a supply teacher and should not the Government not be looking at actually giving them a contract rather than on a supply basis. The supply basis brings with it conditions on the person who is on a full-time supply that it is not normal when one is either on a contract or on a permanent basis.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is a bit confusing the way the hon Member has put the question, I can tell him that all these teachers are filling vacancies which are temporary, for instance the hon Member's unpaid leave precisely in his position has to be filled in by someone on a temporary basis not on a permanent and pensionable basis there are the five peripatetic experienced teachers that we mentioned before in the pupil referral service they are over 50 precisely because they are retired and experienced and therefore they cannot obtain a permanent and pensionable. There are some covering for teachers in maternity leave. It is not a question of having them on

casual supply it is that they cannot come in to the permanent and pensionable cadre precisely because of the circumstances.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I have not said that they should be put into the permanent and pensionable role or list what I am saying is that if a teacher on a supply basis is going to cover for me, for example, which the Minister has mentioned, the department knows full well that I could well go back in 2007 when there might be another election and then I do not stand and I go back but then there is a three year period in which somebody is covering for me and therefore it is a contradiction in terms to have somebody to be stated on the supply list going to cover for me when that person should be on a contract to cover for me for three years.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are terms to this supply work. It is a sort of employment not a contract of employment but the terms upon which the supply is engaged. There are now laws and European Union Directives about the consequences of continuously renewed contracts of employment and as an employer the Government do no longer have the amount of flexibility that the hon Member thinks the Government might have to employ people on contracts in the way that he is describing and then discontinue their employment when the vacancy no longer exists. I accept that there are some situations that lend themselves more than others to the likelihood that for one reason or another a particular post has in effect become permanent and should be supplied on that basis but it is actually very difficult to identify what these posts are and the difference between supply and contract is not as inconsequential in terms of ability to terminate as it was just a few years ago. The hon Member will recall a Bill that we recently considered in this House on that subject so, what we are actually focusing on is on other sorts of supply workers rather than teachers who genuinely are on the sort of permanent conditions that the hon Member is describing. There have been quite a few that have been made permanent and pensionable not just going on contracts. When we are satisfied that somebody is in so-called supply but are in effect filling a post which has de facto become a permanent requirement of the establishment then we make them permanent and pensionable. It is not right that the Government should use supply terms to avoid employing permanent and pensionable staff to posts that have in effect become permanent and pensionable. At the other extreme there are genuine supply situations and then inbetween there are shades of grey and it is not always easy to draw scientifically a line as to where areas people fall clearly into one side or another but it is an area of the public employment policy and it is constantly under review and whole groups of workers are concerned particularly in the classroom aide area of line and that sort of area of line and quite a few officers have been made permanent and pensionable. The choice as far as we are concerned is permanent and pensionable supply as opposed to the option that the hon Member is suggesting as a half-way house which is supply and contract which I am advised is fraught with difficulty.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I agree with the Chief Minister on that point but we do not have to have a half-way house what we can have is the three, the permanent and pensionable, contract teachers and supply teachers and what I am stating is ,for example, the Chief

Minister has just stated the fact that when they identify posts to be permanent that they are made permanent well, the Minister seems to be quite satisfied that the peripatetic teachers who are dealing with challenging behaviour are very successful they are doing so well. Why are then these teachers not given a full-time job permanent and pensionable job? Or if the Minister is not satisfied because I understand again that there might be one year when one needs five peripatetic teachers because there are more children with challenging behaviour and therefore one increases the numbers but surely there must be within that department one or two who should be made permanent and pensionable and that is only giving an example.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have given an answer to the peripatetic teachers, I have told the hon Member that all of them are over 50 and I believe that under General Orders or whatever they are not eligible for a permanent and pensionable employment.

**NO. 247 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – POST 16 ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Can Government state how many times the Post 16 Advisory Committee has met in 2001, 2002, 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Post-16 Advisory Committee has met on six occasions, three times during 2001 and three times during 2002. In 2003, interim recommendations were made to the Minister by the Advisory Committee and I decided that this should be expanded into a consultation process with the NAS/UWT who were invited to contribute their views on Post-16 issues. The Department is awaiting an input and a response from the NAS/UWT, but I do not blame them for not being too prompt about this because as we all know the situation in UK over the 14-19 green paper is fraught with controversy, it is a very fluid situation and therefore both the union and the department feel that things should be monitored more carefully before jumping to problems that may arise in UK and we can avoid at this stage

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 247 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I agree we should not refer to Post-16 but to Post –14 actually but nonetheless should Government or the department not be looking at places like Scotland which have a different approach to Post-16 Education and other jurisdictions which have a Post-16 Education policy which I have been looking through and are quite interesting. We should not always follow England and Wales policy because of what the Minister had just said that because of political interference in the UK in the Education system they tend to fail in their presentation. That happened with the National Curriculum as the Minister well knows.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There is a point in that, that we should look further afield and not just within the confines of England and Wales but nevertheless there are other factors involved because of our close link to the examination boards in UK.....

**HON S E LINARES:**

.....and so have these jurisdictions.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes. What I mean by tradition, we have actually fitted within the framework of reference of England and Wales in many respects to breakaway from that would be a bit dicey.

**NO. 248 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

Can Government state why it has not published the unemployment figures for the months of June, July and September (that is the third quarter of 2003) in October 2003 or subsequently in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

This has been due to an administrative oversight. The figures will be published in the next day or two with the December 2003 figures for the last quarter.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 248 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister agree with me that an administrative oversight is something that might have been relevant before the Opposition called for the publication of the figures in the first week of December 2003 but surely the Minister and the administrators will have noted that the figures were not published then and if there was only an administrative oversight then they would have been published immediately thereafter.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Government do not accept that, in fact, the administrative oversight was in No 6 Convent Place. Having had the oversight pointed out to us given that there was only a month left until the next set was due to be published we thought it appropriate to wait given that it was mainly the Christmas period intervening and publish them together. The hon Member if I could just mention it to him although he has not been in the House until yesterday is quite right to hold us to our extraordinary high

standards of publication of information and statistics which have never been known in Gibraltar before 1996 and on the one occasion when we slip through an advertence from those very high standards I believe the hon Member is entirely justified in pointing it out to us. What I do not think he is entitled to do is on that first occasion to impugn the motives for that given that he sits with a party who when they were in Government used not to publish unemployment statistics at all. In order for us to get unemployment statistics during all the years that we were in Opposition and they were in Government we had to ask questions in this House, there was no automatic publication of Employment Statistics by the Opposition, that is not a reason why he can not hold us to our different and very high and much more acceptable standards but I think on one occasion when there is an oversight and there is not publication history would at least require that the Opposition moderate the exact nature of the imputations that they cast.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister not agree with me that history is sometimes down in writing and cannot be disputed and that in a Hansard of the 15<sup>th</sup> March 1993 when the learned Member was talking on a Motion dealing with the Employment Survey he recognised himself that Employment Statistics were published but they were published annually therefore giving the lie and I use that word advisably to what he has just said now about Employment Statistics not being published during the GSLP administrations and that in any event during the course of the same debate he himself said that the statistics should be published monthly or quarterly at the very least and that not to do so would represent a further attempt he then said to further delay the publication of information of public interest and that therefore the Opposition which he led at the time would be against it and that his party's failure to publish the statistics this time round can only be seen in exactly the same light?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think there is any advised way of using the word '*lie*' and when somebody who knows what they are talking about uses the word lie they get away with it when they are at least right but when somebody who has been in this House for two days starts using the word '*lies*' from a position of complete ignorance then I think there is absolutely no justification from it. The figures that were published annually to which he has referred are Employment Statistics published in the Employment Survey. The figures that we are discussing as not having been published and that which he complains are unemployment statistics which they never used to publish weekly, monthly, quarterly or annually. So, before he starts calling me a liar across the floor of the House he should at least bother to know the difference between Employment Statistics and Unemployment Statistics and then he may not make a fool of himself.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister agree with me that it is very clear that what he was talking about at the time "*ignoramus*" though he may be was that statistics should be published monthly if we are going to have an accurate picture of unemployment and that his party is not doing that but then he relied also on them being published quarterly and I that his party has not done that.



**NO. 249 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in each month of 2003 were registered with the Employment Agency giving a breakdown for each month by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 250 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 250 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state of the Spanish nationals employed in each month of the year 2003 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 and 251 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 251 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state what was the total number of employment contracts for Spanish nationals registered with the Employment Agency as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 250, 252 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 252 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NON EEC NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals employed in each of the months of 2003 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title, for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 251, 253 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 253 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – DETACHED WORKERS**

Can Government state the number of workers that were registered with the Employment Agency as “Detached Workers” in each month from January to December 2003, giving a breakdown for each month, their trade and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 252, 254 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 254 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – MOROCCAN NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many Moroccan nationals employed in each month of the year 2003 were new entrants to the local labour market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 253, 255 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 255 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – OTHER BRITISH**

Can Government state of the “Other British” employed each month of the year 2003 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

I will answer this question together with Question Nos 249 to 254, 256 to 266 and 270 to 272.

**NO. 256 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SELF-EMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many persons were registered as self-employed with the Employment Agency at the end of each month of 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quarters of 2003 giving a breakdown for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answer together with Question Nos 249 to 255, 257 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.



**NO. 257 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – VACANCIES FILLED**

Can Government state of the vacancies filled in each month of the year 2003 how many were for part-time employment giving a breakdown by sex for each month as follows:

- (a) Gibraltarians; and
- (b) Other nationals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 256, 258 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 258 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT**

Can Government state how many Terms of Engagements were registered with the Employment Agency for each month from January to December 2003

- (a) Including directors; and
- (b) Excluding directors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 257, 259 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 259 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

What was the number of employment contracts registered with the Employment Agency in respect of private employers excluding Government-owned and joint venture companies as at the 1<sup>st</sup> day of each month from January to December 2003 giving a breakdown by nationality of employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 258, 260 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 260 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

Can Government state how many employment contracts were registered with the Employment Agency for frontier workers on 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quarters of 2003 giving a breakdown for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 259, 261 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 261 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – CONTRACTS TERMINATED**

Can Government give details of the number of employment contracts terminated in each month of the year 2003, giving a monthly breakdown by nationality and industry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 260, 262 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 262 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYMENT REGISTER**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during each month of 2003 giving a monthly breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answer to Question Nos 249 to 261, 263 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 263 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYMENT REGISTER**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during each month from January to December of 2003 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 262, 264 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 264 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYED GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over for each of the months of January to December 2003 receiving:

- (a) Unemployment Benefit;
- (b) Social Assistance;
- (c) No payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 263, 265 to 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.



**NO. 265 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the months of January to December 2003 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 264, 266 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 266 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in each month of year 2003 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 265 and 270 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 267 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – ILLEGAL LABOUR**

Can Government say whether as a result of inspections carried out on the site where the Europort buildings are being converted to house the hospital the ETB inspectors have found contractors using illegal labour and if so can they say when the inspections took place, the numbers that have been found and the action taken against the offending employers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Following a labour inspection conducted on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2003, at the site of the new hospital at Europort, three contractors were found to be using illegal labour as a result of which 80 Fixed Penalty Notices were then issued.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 267 OF 2004.**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Could the Minister just give me the dates of the inspection again?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2003.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have there been any inspections since then?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have no information to that effect.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister will no doubt agree with us that if the information that he has been provided with by his department relates to the 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2003 and we ask generally, there is an indication that there had been no inspection since then and that the one he refers to is the one inspection?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, by implication when this figure has been given to me in relation to the 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2003 I take it that it is implying that no further inspections or at least no further detection of illegal labour has been found since then.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Other than the fixed penalty notices in respect of illegal labour what happened was the illegal labour terminated or registered?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The illegal labour has been registered but the penalties remain.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am aware of that. In respect of the registration of the illegal labour did this involve non-EU nationals who would require work permits?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have not got that information at hand it was not in the original question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Because the original question was whether anybody had been found and we did not know whether anybody had been found until the answer was produced but given that there have been consistent reports from people in the area of a whole variety of nationalities suddenly disappearing when an inspector appeared over the horizon, would the Minister look into the fact that if it involves non-EU labour presumably they could not simply be registered because of the requirement to obtain work permits so it would not be just a question of registering people on the basis that they were thought to be working if amongst the illegal labour there were non-EU nationals.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The enforcement of the registration of labour laws is not carried out on the basis of nationalities. It is carried out on the basis that every worker of whatever nationality including Gibraltar British are required to be registered for the purposes of social insurance, PAYE, and that is the basis on which the law is enforced and monitored and the law is applied with equal measure to all employees regardless of their nationality or problems.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is not my question and therefore it is quite obvious that the Chief Minister did not hear me or did not understand me when he has volunteered the information. I am perfectly aware what the law is. My question is if I am told that there are 80 people found to be working illegally in Gibraltar and a proportion of those 80 are non-EU nationals then it must follow that one cannot simply register the non-EU nationals, one can register the EU nationals but the non-EU nationals require work permits, that is my question and therefore what I have asked the Minister if he does not have that information will he look into that aspect of it that in the case of non-EU nationals found to be working illegally unlike Gibraltarians and EU nationals the registration cannot be automatic because they require a work permit and there are other people who apply for work permits for non-EU nationals and they do not get them.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In the first instance, although employment permits is the trigger, the hon Member's supplementary raises issues of Immigration Control. These would be illegal immigrants in Gibraltar their presence in Gibraltar regardless of their employment status would itself be illegal and that is a matter for the Immigration Authorities. What we can certainly tell the hon Member I am not sure the Minister will have that information with him now is whether work permits and therefore residence permits have been issued for any non-EU labour that was found to be legal. My understanding is that no such permits have been issued but the Minister may have to find that out for him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I believe that this illegal non-EU labour was not residing in Gibraltar. They were frontier workers from various parts of Eastern Europe and South America living in La Linea so I do not see why they would require residence permits because they have got work permits, it does not follow but if they have been registered rather than requiring their employment to be terminated then we have a situation were, and that is the whole point that I would like the Minister to take into consideration, if we automatically allow the registration of people found to be illegal here whereas we deny work permits to people who go through the proper procedure it seems to me that there is a risk of encouraging the employment of illegal labour on the basis that it will be subsequently legalised whereas if one does the proper thing and ask for permission to employ a non-EU national one is likely to be denied it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It would certainly be the case if facts were as the hon Member is hypothecating but I do not believe that they are like that. If one asked for work permits so that a residence permit can then be issued in respect of non-EU labour and it is denied and then one brings them in illegally and the moment they are discovered they are regularised, then it is not a backdoor but a large side-door into the labour market. That cannot be the position. If, which I do not think it is the case, if there has been any situation involving a non-EU labour in this case it is because a specialist sub-contract in respect of the new hospital I seem to remember that non-EU labour were bought out to do the electricity or pipes sub-contract for the new hospital that might be true but certainly I do not think that the position could possibly be, I do not believe it is, and if it were the Government would not sanction it that the regularisation of illegal labour gave one better results than a proper application for legal labour made at the appropriate time and accordance with the appropriate legislation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not saying that that is what has happened. I am saying on the basis of the answer that we have been given that as far as the Government knows the 80 people that were found to be there illegally were regularised rather than sacked. I am pointing out to the Minister since he is not able to give me the information because it is not available to him that on the information that is available to me from people working in the hospital on the site who happen to be Gibraltarians there were quite a number of people working there illegally who were non-EU nationals and therefore I am asking him to look at that aspect precisely to avoid running the risk of the situation developing which the Chief Minister has said he does not believe has, can or should develop but I do not believe it should but I believe it can and I believe it is avoidable and therefore I am asking the Minister to look at that.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will certainly look at that but the information I have is that the concept of illegality was related to non-registration rather than to a lack of work permits in the cases where it is needed but I will find out whether it covered work permits aspect as well.

**NO. 268 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE**

Can Government state how many fixed penalties have been imposed on employers and in respect of how many employees for each of the months from January to December 2003 (giving a breakdown for each month) under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance, under which sections of the Ordinance, each penalty has been imposed and whether the penalties have been paid or the matter is being pursued through further prosecution?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 268 of 2004**

**January 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 10.  
0 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
1 Fixed Penalty Notice were paid.  
2 pending cases with the Attorney General.

**February 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 22.  
2 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
1 Fixed Penalty Notice was paid.  
2 pending cases with the Attorney General.

### **March 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 8.  
1 Fixed Penalty Notices was issued.  
2 Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
2 pending cases with the Attorney General.

### **April 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 12.  
2 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
No Fixed Penalty Notice was paid.  
1 pending case with the Attorney General.

### **May 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 23.  
1 Fixed Penalty Notice was issued.  
1 Fixed Penalty Notice was paid.  
1 pending case with the Attorney General.

### **June 2003**

No Inspections.  
No Fixed Penalty Notice was issued.  
No Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
1 pending case with the Attorney General.

### **July 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 11.  
82 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
3 Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
2 pending cases with the Attorney General.

### **August 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 20.  
No Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
No Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
2 pending cases with the Attorney General.

### **September 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 16.  
2 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
0 Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
5 pending cases with the Attorney General.



### **October 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 7.  
14 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
3 Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
5 pending cases with the Attorney General.

### **November 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 7.  
No Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
No Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
7 pending cases with the Attorney General.

### **December 2003**

Number of inspections carried out was 0.  
No Fixed Penalty Notice was issued.  
No Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
6 pending cases with the Attorney General.

The provisions are as follows:

- (1) Regulation 8(2A) of the Income Tax (Pay As You Earn) Regulations 1989 (Duty to Register).
- (2) Regulation 3 of the Employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations (Duty to Register).
- (3) Regulation 3 of the employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations as applied by Regulation 4(1) of the Social Security (Contributions) Regulations (Duty to Register).
- (4) Regulation 3 of the Employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations as applied by Regulation 3(1) of the Social Security (Open Long Term Benefits) (Contributions) Regulations 1997 (Duty to Register).
- (5) Regulation 4 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty of notify Director of vacancy).
- (6) Regulation 6 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to notify Director of intention to engage an entitled worker).
- (7) Regulation 7 of the employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to apply to the Director for a permit in relation to a non-entitled worker).
- (8) Regulation 13 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to notify Director of termination).
- (9) Regulation 15A(4) of the Employment Regulations 1994 (amended by LN 100/94) (Duty to notify Director of temporary employment of Detached workers).

- (10) Section 3 of the Business Trades and Professions (Registration) Ordinance 1989 (Duty to Register).
- (11) Section 57(2) of the Income Tax Ordinance (duty to give notice to the Commissioner that a person is chargeable for tax purposes).

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 268 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister clarify whether in relation to the part of my question where I ask whether matters being pursued through further prosecution I shall be looking at the final line in the breakdown for each month which relates to matters pending with the Attorney General?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, I think so, if the matter is pending with the Attorney General it is in the context of considering possible prosecution.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case can the Minister further clarify because we have the statistics here for the whole year given that there have been no meetings for Questions since March of last year almost a year ago, what the current state of play in respect of each of the pending cases with the Attorney General is if he has that information or if he can provide that information after this House?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Minister cannot and it will be quite improper for him to do so or to be in a position to be able to do so even. Ministers of the Government at least in this Government do not concern themselves with the exercise by the Attorney General of his wholly independent institutional role as Prosecuting Authority.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do not think that the Chief Minister understood my question. It may be because he is still upset about the ding dong we had earlier but all I was asking was whether I could have the information. I did not ask the Minister to interfere with the Attorney General's decisions on those pending cases simply whether he could provide the information whether those cases had come forward.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, and it is still the same answer that is involvement by Ministers in the prosecution process it is wholly improper for Ministers to account in this House for the status of prosecution decisions.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I hate to be a Tom chasing the Chief Minister's Jerry around this House but all I am asking for is statistical information about prosecutions that have gone forward, how can that be characterised as interference with the prosecution process I fail to understand?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is now not asking for statistical information. He asked for statistical information in his original question and got it namely two pending cases with the Attorney General for him now to argue that he is now still only asking for statistical information in his supplementaries is completely disingenuous and dishonest on his part. He is asking the Minister for an account of the status of the current consideration by the Attorney General of the cases, the statistical information relating to which he has already had so he cannot now be asking for that statistical information. The hon Member either does not hear the words that he utters, does not understand what they mean, or when it no longer suits him tries to deny the words that he has uttered. He cannot get away with it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is good that the allegations of dishonesty are flowing both ways in this House this morning because at least in that case the Chief Minister might realise that he is the lucky one not to hear what he is saying. I am simply asking whether we could have further statistical information on what the present state of play is in relation to these pending cases, have a number of them gone forward to prosecution or not I am not asking that anyone interfere with the Attorney General I am simply asking a further supplementary statistical question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The distinction that the hon Member tries to draw between statistics and substance is wholly unreal.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Should the Attorney General be here then to answer the question as to what is happening with the pending case in relation to breaches of the law in the Employment Service or is it that the House is not entitled to know whether something that is gone to the Attorney General for action involving breaking the law in the Employment Service actually materialises into a decision that there should be a prosecution or not, how many times in the past have we had information as to action being taken without the Chief Minister getting so worked up is it that he got out of the wrong side of the bed this morning?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No the hon Member has never had information of the type sought by the supplementary, the hon Member has always had the statistical information of the

number of cases that the administration has referred to the Attorney General for prosecution decisions. That is the information that he has had and I am not here to give the hon Member legal advice.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not want his advice.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

...but as he has asked me my personal view is the second of his options, that the House is not entitled to question the Attorney General even if he were present about his prosecuting role because the Attorney General does not sit in this House in his capacity as Prosecuting Authority and it would be quite wrong and wholly unprecedented for the Attorney General to give an account in this House of where lies his consideration of particular cases before him for consideration as to prosecution and whether he is going to proceed or not and if not why not, I have never heard a debate in this House, I realise that the hon Member has been in this House longer than me but certainly in the 10 odd years or more that I have been in this House I have never heard such a debate.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Nobody is starting a debate on anything except the Chief Minister that converts every single question in this House into a debate. We are not asking if he has done it why he has done it and if he has not done it why he has not done it. We are asking has the Attorney General in the pending cases taken a decision or not? If the Chief Minister tells us that there is a case pending with the Attorney General it is perfectly legitimate it seems to me to ask whether the Attorney General has now taken a decision on the pending case we are not challenging his right to take a decision we are not saying that the elected Government should take over the role, heaven forbid that the Chief Minister should now decide who gets prosecuted and who does not we would all have to show our party card not to get prosecuted in Gibraltar if he did that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I know that the hon Member is not saying any of that rubbish.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I have not sat down.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

..... but what he is saying ,

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am in the process of asking a question and the Chief Minister chooses to answer the questions of all his Ministers which does not reflect very much in his confidence of their abilities so to do. If the Minister is willing to tell us whether something that is pending with the Attorney General has come back or not because he thinks that he is interfering with the course of justice that is the most incredible statement I have heard in 30 years. If that is the position perhaps he will confirm it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The extent of my confidence in getting up to participate in a question posed to my Honourable friend the Minister for Education cannot be any more or less than his in the Hon Mr Picardo by his intervention in the Hon Mr Picardo's supplementary and at least the Hon Mr Picardo has the advantage that he is a lawyer which the Minister does not since we are discussing legal matters. The fact of the matter is that the hon Member can go off at a tangent and again impute to the Government so that he can then deny it in a mocking style things that I have not suggested namely that I have accused him of wanting the Government to take over the Prosecution no one has said anything of the sort and the hon Member in his typical parliamentary style can invent facts to put into people's mouths so that then he can theatrically deny their veracity. That is his parliamentary style, it has always been his parliamentary style, I do not suppose one can teach an old dog new tricks, it is unlikely to change and I am not going to try but the fact of the matter is that regardless of all that red herring on the point which is seriously at issue across the floor between us and which we have both said the Government seriously disagrees with his view of whether he is entitled to that information or not we believe that he is not entitled to put to the Government questions relating to the exercise by the Attorney General of his role as Prosecuting Officer and he can ask questions as many times as he likes. We have a view as the Government, he clearly has a different view on whatever basis he holds it and so be it he is not going to change mine and we are not going to change his.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister perhaps indicate in succinct terms without the soliloquy how seeking statistics from the Attorney General can be seen to amount to trying to interfere with his prosecutorial rights or determine whether to proceed against someone or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member has not sought statistical information he has sought a report about the status of the prosecution decision.

**NO. 269 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE**

Can Government state how many prosecutions have been commenced under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance since September 2002, the date of filing of any such prosecutions and the penalties, if any, imposed by the courts in respect of any prosecutions which may have been completed?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information sought by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 269 of 2004**

| <b>Date</b>    | <b>No of Prosecutions</b> | <b>Date Filed</b>                            | <b>Penalties Imposed</b>                           |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Sept 02</b> | 0                         |                                              |                                                    |
| <b>Oct 02</b>  | 3                         | 1 No – 7 Oct<br>1 No – 7 Oct<br>1 No – 8 Oct | £2,000.00 – 30 April 03<br>£2,000.00 – 30 April 03 |
| <b>Nov 02</b>  | 0                         |                                              |                                                    |
| <b>Dec 02</b>  | 0                         |                                              |                                                    |
| <b>Jan 03</b>  | 0                         |                                              |                                                    |
| <b>Feb 03</b>  | 0                         |                                              |                                                    |

|                 |    |                                    |  |
|-----------------|----|------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Mar 03</b>   | 0  |                                    |  |
| <b>April 03</b> | 0  |                                    |  |
| <b>May 03</b>   | 0  |                                    |  |
| <b>June 03</b>  | 0  |                                    |  |
| <b>July 03</b>  | 1  | 1 No – 9 July                      |  |
| <b>Aug 03</b>   | 1  | 1 No – 5 Aug                       |  |
| <b>Sept 03</b>  | 79 | 12 No – 17 Sept<br>67 No – 22 Sept |  |
| <b>Oct 03</b>   | 0  |                                    |  |
| <b>Nov 03</b>   | 0  |                                    |  |
| <b>Dec 03</b>   | 0  |                                    |  |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 269 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful to the Minister, will he agree with me that despite the dispute that we have had across the floor of this House a moment ago this amounts to the information we were being told we could not have?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not think so. We were talking about pending cases with the Attorney General these are cases which have already been processed so there is a difference between consideration given by the Attorney General in respect of possible prosecution which is the question that the Chief Minister said was out of order and information as to cases which have already gone through the process of prosecution or possible prosecution in the past.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister not agree with me that in fact all we had to do was simple mathematical exercise as a result of saying if so many are pending and so many have gone forward this number is still pending which is exactly the statistic that we wanted to have so to an extent I am very grateful to the hon Gentleman for this further answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The hon Member cannot resort to his little disingenuous tricks and try and pull it off.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Why not the Chief Minister does?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Because on every occasion that he does it we will have to point it out to him. At least point it out to him that he is doing it we cannot stop him doing it but we can point out to him that he is doing it. The hon Member cannot now pretend that what he was seeking all along and what has been denied is the number of pending cases for consideration by the Attorney General. Why not? Because that information was given to him in the original answer to his original question and it was in response to that answer – *How many questions are pending with the Attorney....., two, -* and then he asks for clarification – *does that mean that that is the number of cases pending before the Attorney General for consideration, yes* – so if he can no longer thereafter be asking questions designed to illicit information - *how many cases are pending before the Attorney General for consideration* - so the answer to his last intervention is no, it is not as the hon Member says and therefore we cannot agree with him.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do not think that the Chief Minister has understood the point so I will not labour it any further.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the answer to Question No 269 of 2004 given that there is this gap between October and July of a number of prosecutions is there a particular significance to this given that the inspections are taking place every month does the Government or the ETB have a system where the moving to a prosecution follows prior steps?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes indeed before the matter is put before the Attorney General for possible prosecution the Employment Service does take a number of steps in respect of their inspections and detection of illegal labour. The fact that none of these cases have been followed up could mean a measure of the success of the legislation and the fixed penalties have been accepted and paid and in any case that a deterrent is provided by the present legislation so that actually no illegal labour was detected in the course of those inspections but to some extent I speculate.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In June 2003 we have no inspections, no fixed penalties issued and no fixed penalties paid obviously if one does not inspect anybody in a month one does not expect to find any illegal labour in a month. Is there a particular reason for some months showing zero inspections?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are zero inspections in June and December from the answer to Question No 268 of 2004. I think we have had this discussion in the House before in the last session, the answer that I recall being given to him by the previous Minister was that it sometimes coincided with absences on annual holidays by the inspectors. Just looking down the list there were no inspections in June 2003, no inspections in December 2003, they are months where people take their summer holidays and that could be the explanation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If the hon Member checks up it was December the last time and we were told that it was a combination of holidays plus being engaged on other duties but this time I do not think we have had June before that is why I am asking about June and not December.

**NO. 270 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians employed each month of the year 2003 were registered with the Employment Agency as unemployed giving a breakdown for each month by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 266 and 271 to 272 of 2004.

**NO. 271 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency for each month of the year 2003 were registered as looking for part-time jobs giving a breakdown by sex and age for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos 249 to 266 and 270 and 272 of 2004.

**NO. 272 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state what was the expenditure by the Employment Agency on wage subsidy in each month of the year 2003 and the number of people and of employers involved in each of these months?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Government remains willing to provide to the Opposition detailed information of this sort which is unprecedented in Gibraltar before 1996. However, given the intense administrative burden of preparing such wide-ranging statistical information within 5 days, I will be pleased to forward this information in writing to the hon Member within the next 10 days.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION 249 TO 266 AND 270 TO 272 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I can accept what the Minister has said except for the preambular paragraph that one has to put up with everytime they answer questions on statistics but would he not agree with me that in relation to his earlier answer about the unemployment statistics not having been published as a result of mere oversight and given that really in Question Nos 262, 263, and 264 of 2004 I am only asking about a derivation of that, at least those could have been provided today or sooner.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have already stated that those statistics will be published within the next few days.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Very well, I will look forward to receiving the Minister's letter.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the explanation by the Minister is the considerable administrative burden is it not the case that when the system in the ETB was computerised a number of years ago it was on the basis that this kind of statistics could be produced once the computer system had been working and which it has now been doing for a number of years. It is not a manual thing anymore this is just a question that the statistics are readily available in the form that they are being asked because they have been produced before?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am still not entirely familiar with the operational employment service but even if it is machine lead information there is still work to be done on it and compilation and collation of statistics and anyway that is the information that I have that it is too short a time to present the package of information that the hon Member has asked for.

**NO. 273 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****EMPLOYMENT – JOB CLUB**

Can Government state how many persons have used the facilities provided at the Job Club in each of the months of the year 2003, giving a breakdown for each month by sex and age?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.

**January 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 5           | 2             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 11          | 8             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 10          | 15            |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>26</b>   | <b>25</b>     |

**February 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 9           | 2             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 12          | 5             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 12          | 9             |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>33</b>   | <b>16</b>     |

**March 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 10          | 4             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 17          | 6             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 9           | 14            |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>36</b>   | <b>24</b>     |

**April 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 4           | 4             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 17          | 3             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 14          | 15            |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>35</b>   | <b>22</b>     |

**May 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 11          | 7             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 15          | 7             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 11          | 8             |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>37</b>   | <b>22</b>     |

**June 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 10          | 5             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 8           | 4             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 6           | 5             |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>24</b>   | <b>14</b>     |

**July 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 9           | 3             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 6           | 0             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 10          | 6             |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>25</b>   | <b>9</b>      |

**August 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 1           | 3             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 8           | 11            |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 16          | 18            |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>25</b>   | <b>32</b>     |

**September 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 5           | 5             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 9           | 4             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 15          | 15            |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>29</b>   | <b>24</b>     |

**October 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 3           | 5             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 7           | 7             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 12          | 17            |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>22</b>   | <b>29</b>     |

**November 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 3           | 3             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 7           | 2             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 12          | 12            |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>22</b>   | <b>17</b>     |

**December 2003**

| <b>Age Group</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 0           | 2             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 7           | 1             |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 5           | 3             |
|                      |             |               |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>12</b>   | <b>6</b>      |



**NO. 274 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****EMPLOYMENT – CASUAL WORKERS**

Can Government give a monthly breakdown of vacancies for casual workers opened with the Employment Agency by Cammell Laird or alternatively in the shipping industry for each month of 2003 giving a breakdown of how many of these have been filled by Gibraltarians?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.

| Months                 | Jan | Feb | Mar | April | May | June | July | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| <b>Total Vacancies</b> | 38  | 4   | 11  | 20    | 8   | 11   | 31   | 6   | 24   | 2   | 25  | 17  |
| <b>Gibraltarians</b>   | 3   | 3   | 0   | 7     | 3   | 2    | 15   | 2   | 9    | 1   | 10  | 11  |

**NO. 275 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – VOCATIONAL CADETS**

Can Government state what is the latest estimate for the expenditure that will be incurred in the current financial year in respect of the items for Vocational Cadets (a) EU Projects; and (b) other?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The latest estimate for the expenditure that will be incurred in the current financial year in respect of Vocational Cadets is (a) £1,077,500 for EU Projects and (b) £15,000 for Other.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 275 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the subsidy on EU Projects is the amount spent the part contributed from EU Funding or does that involve the EU and Gibraltar Government?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Are you talking about wage subsidies?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes that is right.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

This question is not on wage subsidies.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The same argument applies I am just looking at the wrong question. In terms of the amount that you are spending on the EU Project is that just what the EU contributes or does that include both the EU part and the Gibraltar Government part, the figure that we have been given?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The figure includes 45 per cent of EU Funds and the rest is made up of local funding.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister indicate on what the excess of in the region of £700,000 has been from the estimate of £960,000?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am afraid I could not here and now I would have to study that one more closely than I have done. I have not had the opportunity to do so up to now.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister undertake to provide a note in that respect?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the additional amount of money that has been spent on this particular sub-head in the Gibraltar Development Corporation does the Minister know whether that means that in fact the contribution from the Corporation is higher because presumably when we had the estimates at the beginning of the financial year and there was an amount on the expenditure side that was matched by the £560,000 contribution from the ESF does he know whether in fact we have achieved a higher contribution from the ESF?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am afraid I have to honestly admit that I do not know the answer to that one at this stage.

**NO. 276 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CONSTRUCTION TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state what is the latest estimate for the expenditure that will be incurred in the current financial year in respect of the items for Construction Training Centre (a) EU Projects; and (b) Other?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The latest estimate for the expenditure that will be incurred in the current financial year in respect of the Construction Training Centre is (a) £71,150 for EU Projects and (b) £204,400 for Other.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 276 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister if not today subsequently provide in relation to the Head Other a note as to how the difference of in the region £108,000 over spend has been incurred?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Certainly not today but certainly at a later stage.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Obliged.

**NO. 277 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TRAINING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS**

Can Government state what is the latest estimate for the expenditure that will be incurred in the current financial year in respect of the items for Training Development Projects (a) EU Projects; and (b) other?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The latest estimate for the expenditure that will be incurred in the current financial year in respect of Training Development Projects is (a) £211,150.00 for EU Projects and (b) £1,271,200 for Other.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 277 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister in relation to the Other aspect which has seen an overspend of in the region of £300,000 undertake to provide a note explaining how the difference is incurred?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am sure I can at a later stage.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Obliged.

**NO. 278 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state what is the latest estimate for the expenditure that will be incurred in the current financial year in respect of the items for Wage Subsidy (a) EU Projects; and (b) other?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The latest estimate for expenditure that will be incurred in the current financial year in respect of items for Wage Subsidy is:

|     |             |   |         |
|-----|-------------|---|---------|
| (a) | EU Projects | - | £82,700 |
| (b) | Other       | - | £25,700 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 278 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In relation to both Heads can the Minister if not today subsequently provide a breakdown of how the further cost has been incurred as previously estimated?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Obliged.

**NO. 279 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**HAMILTON SPIRITS MANAGEMENT LIMITED**

Will the Hon Dr Bernard Linares make a statement to the House of Assembly as to his involvement as a director of Hamilton Spirits Management Limited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

No. I have not been a director of that Company during the time that I have been a Member of this House and in any case my involvement has been entirely proper.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 279 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister accept that although I do not call into question what he has said in the latter part of his statement nonetheless it should be in the public interest that he should provide some statement given that the three other co-directors were sentenced to sentences of imprisonment in the United Kingdom as a result of their involvement with that Company?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The only thing that is a surprise is that no other Member of the Opposition during the last eight years in this House has thought it necessary, appropriate or proper to ask that question and the fact that it is asked now eight years after the event when no Opposition before the hon Member has entered this House has felt that the public interest of Gibraltar requires that question to be asked I think says more about the hon Member than it does about the failure of his predecessors during the last eight years to have done their public duty, frankly that is what I think is extraordinary.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister at least indicate whether he was interviewed in relation to these matters by the Authorities that were investigating the issues that arose in that case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. On guidance provided to the Minister by me he will answer no questions on this subject to the hon Member.



**NO. 280 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SCHOOL OF TOURISM**

How many of those trainees from the tenth intake who completed the School of Tourism course are now employed in the hotel industry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Eight trainees successfully completed the School of Tourism course in intake 10. Upon completion of the course, six were employed in the hotel industry, one found employment elsewhere and one changed training avenue.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 280 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Will information in relation to Question No 281 of 2004 be given separately to Question No 280?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes.

**NO. 281 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SCHOOL OF TOURISM**

How many trainees started the tenth training course offered by the School of Tourism and how many completed the course?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A total of 12 trainees commenced the School of Tourism training course in Intake 10 in October 2002. Of these, eight successfully completed the course. Perhaps the hon Member will be interested to know that of the four who did not complete one left before the end of the course to take up employment actually within the tourism industry itself.

**NO. 282 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government give a breakdown of a full and part-time employment in respect of Table 11 of the 2001 and 2002 Employment Survey Reports showing employment in the Gibraltar Government and the MOD separately?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.

Breakdown of Table 11 ( Full-Time Gibraltar Government Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2001 ) HOA Question 282 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS        | ALL   |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|--------------------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                    | MALE  | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|                    |       |        |             |        |      |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |       |        |
| Shipbuilding       | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.       | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply    | 94    | 4      | 89          | 4      | 2    | 0      | 1        | 0      | 2       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction       | 258   | 14     | 226         | 14     | 4    | 0      | 27       | 0      | 0       | 0      | 1        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Whsie/Retail Tr.   | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Hotels/Restmnts.   | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Trans/Comm.        | 81    | 20     | 81          | 20     | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.     | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac.  | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Public Admin.      | 674   | 266    | 609         | 256    | 48   | 10     | 9        | 0      | 1       | 0      | 6        | 0      | 1     | 0      |
| Education          | 182   | 261    | 173         | 255    | 7    | 6      | 2        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrk. | 200   | 455    | 159         | 380    | 25   | 65     | 3        | 3      | 2       | 1      | 2        | 5      | 9     | 1      |
| Other Services     | 34    | 13     | 32          | 12     | 1    | 1      | 1        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL              | 1,523 | 1,033  | 1,369       | 941    | 87   | 82     | 43       | 3      | 5       | 1      | 9        | 5      | 10    | 1      |

/

cont...

Breakdown of Table 11 ( Part -Time Gibraltar Government Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2001 ) HOA Question 282 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS         | ALL  |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|---------------------|------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                     | MALE | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|                     |      |        |             |        |      |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |       |        |
| Shipbuilding        | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.        | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply     | 0    | 2      | 0           | 2      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction        | 2    | 2      | 1           | 2      | 1    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.    | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Hotels/Restrmts.    | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Trans/Comm.         | 0    | 5      | 0           | 5      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.      | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac.   | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Public Admin.       | 1    | 31     | 1           | 31     | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education           | 0    | 147    | 0           | 146    | 0    | 1      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrik. | 1    | 59     | 1           | 58     | 0    | 1      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Services      | 0    | 3      | 0           | 3      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL               | 4    | 249    | 3           | 247    | 1    | 2      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |

Breakdown of Table 11 ( Full-Time Gibraltar Government Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2002 ) HOA Question 282 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS        | ALL   |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|--------------------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                    | MALE  | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Shipbuilding       | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.       | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply    | 92    | 4      | 85          | 4      | 3    | 0      | 1        | 0      | 3       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction       | 258   | 15     | 226         | 15     | 7    | 0      | 24       | 0      | 0       | 0      | 1        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.   | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Hotels/Restrnts.   | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Trans/Comm.        | 77    | 21     | 77          | 21     | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.     | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac.  | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Public Admin.      | 686   | 252    | 648         | 243    | 23   | 9      | 8        | 0      | 1       | 0      | 6        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education          | 181   | 269    | 174         | 265    | 4    | 4      | 3        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrk. | 210   | 435    | 160         | 356    | 30   | 65     | 4        | 2      | 6       | 5      | 2        | 6      | 8     | 1      |
| Other Services     | 34    | 16     | 32          | 15     | 1    | 1      | 1        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL              | 1,538 | 1,012  | 1,402       | 919    | 68   | 79     | 41       | 2      | 10      | 5      | 9        | 6      | 8     | 1      |

Breakdown of Table 11 ( Full-Time MOD Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2001 ) HOA Question 282 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS   | ALL  |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|---------------|------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|               | MALE | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Public Admin. | 685  | 274    | 608         | 254    | 7    | 14     | 63       | 2      | 7       | 4      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL         | 685  | 274    | 608         | 254    | 7    | 14     | 63       | 2      | 7       | 4      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |

Breakdown of Table 11 ( Part-Time MOD Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2001 ) HOA Question 282 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS   | ALL  |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|---------------|------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|               | MALE | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Public Admin. | 2    | 62     | 2           | 49     | 0    | 12     | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 1      |
| TOTAL         | 2    | 62     | 2           | 49     | 0    | 12     | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 1      |

Breakdown of Table 11 ( Part -Time Gibraltar Government Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2002 ) HOA Question 282 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS        | ALL  |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|--------------------|------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                    | MALE | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|                    |      |        |             |        |      |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |       |        |
| Shipbuilding       | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.       | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply    | 0    | 2      | 0           | 2      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction       | 0    | 2      | 0           | 2      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.   | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Hotels/Restrntrts. | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Trans/Comm.        | 3    | 5      | 3           | 5      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.     | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac.  | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Public Admin.      | 2    | 31     | 2           | 31     | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education          | 1    | 178    | 1           | 175    | 0    | 2      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 1     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrk. | 3    | 66     | 3           | 61     | 0    | 4      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 1      |
| Other Services     | 0    | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL              | 9    | 284    | 9           | 276    | 0    | 6      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 1     | 1      |



Breakdown of Table 11 ( Full-Time MOD Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2002 ) HOA Question 282 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS | ALL  |        | GIBRALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|-------------|------|--------|--------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|             | MALE | FEMALE | MALE         | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|             | 717  | 270    | 657          | 259    | 1    | 1      | 50       | 3      | 3       | 3      | 0        | 0      | 6     | 4      |
| TOTAL       | 717  | 270    | 657          | 259    | 1    | 1      | 50       | 3      | 3       | 3      | 0        | 0      | 6     | 4      |

Breakdown of Table 11 ( Part-Time MOD Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2002 ) HOA Question 282 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS | ALL  |        | GIBRALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|-------------|------|--------|--------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|             | MALE | FEMALE | MALE         | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|             | 10   | 59     | 10           | 48     | 0    | 10     | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL       | 10   | 59     | 10           | 48     | 0    | 10     | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 1      |

**NO. 283 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government give a breakdown of full-time and part-time employment in respect of Table 12 of the October 2001 and October 2002 Employment Survey Report with respect to employment in the Private Sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.

Breakdown of Table 12 ( Full-Time Private Sector Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2001 ) HOA Question 283 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS        | ALL   |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|--------------------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                    | MALE  | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|                    |       |        |             |        |      |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |       |        |
| Shipbuilding       | 268   | 13     | 130         | 7      | 18   | 0      | 17       | 3      | 80      | 3      | 22       | 0      | 1     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.       | 84    | 35     | 35          | 27     | 11   | 4      | 23       | 1      | 11      | 3      | 1        | 0      | 3     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply    | 125   | 13     | 105         | 13     | 7    | 0      | 8        | 0      | 2       | 0      | 2        | 0      | 1     | 0      |
| Construction       | 1,273 | 55     | 511         | 37     | 283  | 12     | 154      | 0      | 305     | 6      | 14       | 0      | 6     | 0      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.   | 1,310 | 697    | 670         | 424    | 147  | 88     | 171      | 10     | 234     | 155    | 21       | 12     | 67    | 8      |
| Hotels/Restmnts.   | 364   | 272    | 68          | 51     | 47   | 59     | 119      | 34     | 95      | 111    | 17       | 14     | 18    | 3      |
| Trans/Comm.        | 509   | 163    | 372         | 138    | 48   | 14     | 37       | 1      | 45      | 8      | 7        | 2      | 0     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.     | 445   | 633    | 262         | 394    | 91   | 178    | 1        | 0      | 27      | 27     | 36       | 25     | 28    | 9      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac.  | 478   | 433    | 289         | 296    | 93   | 79     | 20       | 9      | 45      | 32     | 23       | 11     | 8     | 6      |
| Public Admin.      | 108   | 79     | 96          | 77     | 4    | 1      | 5        | 0      | 2       | 1      | 1        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education          | 5     | 28     | 3           | 20     | 2    | 6      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 1      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrk. | 42    | 172    | 31          | 129    | 5    | 23     | 1        | 2      | 5       | 15     | 0        | 1      | 0     | 2      |
| Other Services     | 451   | 251    | 185         | 103    | 166  | 75     | 19       | 5      | 44      | 34     | 11       | 10     | 26    | 24     |
| TOTAL              | 5,462 | 2,844  | 2,757       | 1,716  | 922  | 539    | 575      | 65     | 895     | 396    | 155      | 76     | 158   | 52     |

1

cont...

Breakdown of Table 12 (Part-Time Private Sector Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2001) HOA Question 283 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS       | ALL  |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|-------------------|------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                   | MALE | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|                   |      |        |             |        |      |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |       |        |
| Shipbuilding      | 11   | 3      | 1           | 2      | 5    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 2       | 1      | 3        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.      | 6    | 18     | 1           | 14     | 3    | 1      | 1        | 0      | 1       | 3      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply   | 0    | 1      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 1      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction      | 15   | 29     | 4           | 15     | 4    | 10     | 3        | 2      | 3       | 1      | 1        | 1      | 0     | 0      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.  | 92   | 438    | 44          | 292    | 10   | 44     | 12       | 7      | 22      | 82     | 0        | 4      | 4     | 9      |
| Hotels/Restrnts.  | 61   | 126    | 19          | 31     | 14   | 39     | 6        | 10     | 17      | 38     | 4        | 7      | 1     | 1      |
| Trans/Comm.       | 24   | 33     | 18          | 25     | 5    | 2      | 0        | 2      | 1       | 3      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 1      |
| Fin. Intermed.    | 7    | 98     | 5           | 80     | 1    | 10     | 0        | 3      | 0       | 3      | 1        | 2      | 0     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac. | 407  | 126    | 386         | 74     | 11   | 11     | 4        | 3      | 3       | 34     | 1        | 3      | 2     | 1      |
| Public Admin.     | 1    | 1      | 1           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 1      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education         | 7    | 51     | 6           | 40     | 1    | 6      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 4      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrk | 9    | 61     | 8           | 49     | 1    | 11     | 0        | 0      | 0       | 1      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Services    | 51   | 117    | 30          | 63     | 5    | 19     | 6        | 2      | 7       | 30     | 3        | 2      | 0     | 1      |
| TOTAL             | 691  | 1,102  | 523         | 685    | 60   | 153    | 32       | 29     | 56      | 202    | 13       | 20     | 7     | 13     |

Breakdown of Table 12 ( Full-Time Private Sector Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2002 ) HOA Question 283 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS       | ALL   |        | GIBRALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|-------------------|-------|--------|--------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                   | MALE  | FEMALE | MALE         | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|                   |       |        |              |        |      |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |       |        |
| Shipbuilding      | 258   | 10     | 119          | 6      | 22   | 0      | 22       | 2      | 78      | 2      | 17       | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.      | 79    | 38     | 37           | 25     | 9    | 6      | 18       | 1      | 12      | 6      | 1        | 0      | 2     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply   | 125   | 12     | 103          | 12     | 7    | 0      | 10       | 0      | 2       | 0      | 3        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction      | 1,253 | 69     | 481          | 44     | 291  | 13     | 132      | 1      | 274     | 5      | 65       | 5      | 10    | 1      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.  | 1,308 | 710    | 679          | 424    | 143  | 79     | 155      | 9      | 257     | 170    | 26       | 18     | 48    | 10     |
| Hotels/Restrnts.  | 395   | 324    | 68           | 58     | 66   | 67     | 121      | 37     | 105     | 145    | 21       | 16     | 14    | 1      |
| Trans/Comm.       | 558   | 172    | 399          | 136    | 51   | 13     | 40       | 3      | 56      | 12     | 12       | 8      | 0     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.    | 452   | 640    | 256          | 394    | 99   | 178    | 4        | 1      | 27      | 29     | 47       | 29     | 19    | 9      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac. | 514   | 436    | 317          | 290    | 96   | 79     | 19       | 8      | 51      | 42     | 26       | 13     | 5     | 4      |
| Public Admin.     | 109   | 73     | 93           | 71     | 5    | 0      | 8        | 0      | 2       | 2      | 1        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education         | 3     | 29     | 3            | 22     | 0    | 6      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrk | 39    | 187    | 29           | 130    | 3    | 27     | 0        | 2      | 7       | 27     | 0        | 1      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Services    | 504   | 253    | 225          | 102    | 174  | 79     | 28       | 1      | 40      | 35     | 16       | 11     | 21    | 25     |
| TOTAL             | 5,597 | 2,953  | 2,809        | 1,714  | 966  | 547    | 557      | 65     | 911     | 475    | 235      | 102    | 119   | 50     |

Breakdown of Table 12 ( Part -Time Private Sector Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2002 ) HOA Question 283 / 2004

| ALL SECTORS       | ALL  |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|-------------------|------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                   | MALE | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
|                   |      |        |             |        |      |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |       |        |
| Shipbuilding      | 3    | 5      | 1           | 4      | 2    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 1        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.      | 7    | 18     | 1           | 11     | 4    | 3      | 0        | 0      | 2       | 4      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply   | 0    | 2      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 2      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction      | 18   | 30     | 10          | 19     | 5    | 5      | 0        | 2      | 3       | 3      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 0      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.  | 104  | 415    | 55          | 273    | 9    | 37     | 15       | 6      | 19      | 91     | 4        | 4      | 2     | 4      |
| Hotels/Restrmts.  | 69   | 136    | 12          | 24     | 31   | 57     | 5        | 12     | 20      | 33     | 1        | 7      | 0     | 3      |
| Trans/Comm.       | 24   | 42     | 22          | 29     | 0    | 3      | 1        | 2      | 0       | 6      | 1        | 1      | 0     | 1      |
| Fin. Intermed.    | 12   | 114    | 5           | 80     | 2    | 29     | 0        | 2      | 3       | 3      | 1        | 0      | 1     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac. | 360  | 131    | 335         | 67     | 10   | 14     | 5        | 2      | 5       | 44     | 4        | 4      | 1     | 0      |
| Public Admin.     | 6    | 8      | 6           | 8      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education         | 5    | 47     | 4           | 36     | 1    | 4      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 4      | 0        | 2      | 0     | 1      |
| Health/Social Wrk | 9    | 70     | 9           | 47     | 0    | 11     | 0        | 1      | 0       | 11     | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Services    | 50   | 132    | 37          | 55     | 4    | 23     | 4        | 6      | 2       | 43     | 2        | 4      | 1     | 1      |
| TOTAL             | 667  | 1,150  | 497         | 653    | 68   | 186    | 30       | 33     | 54      | 245    | 13       | 23     | 5     | 10     |

**NO. 284 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY 2002**

Can Government state how many questionnaires have been sent to employers in relation to the Employment Survey 2002 and how many have been returned to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A total of 1082 October Employment Survey questionnaires were sent to employers of which 1,043 were returned by February 2003.

**NO. 285 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government list the public sector entities that are included as part of the private sector in the 2001 and 2002 Employment Survey reports and give the breakdown of the numbers of employees and industry classification of these entities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.



Answer to Question 285 of 2004

Breakdown of Public Sector Entities included in the Private Sector by Employee Numbers and Industry, HOA Question 285 / 2004

| Name of Company or Corporation     | Oct-01              |                     | Oct-02              |                     | Industry                          |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
|                                    | Number of Employees | Number of Employees | Number of Employees | Number of Employees |                                   |
| Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Ltd  | 35                  |                     | 35                  |                     | Real Estate & Business Activities |
| GJBS Ltd                           | 103                 |                     | 103                 |                     | Construction                      |
| Gibraltar Community Projects Ltd.  | 185                 |                     | 180                 |                     | Construction                      |
| Gibraltar Development Corporation  | 124                 |                     | 158                 |                     | Public Administration and Defence |
| Gibraltar Broadcasting Corporation | 46                  |                     | 46                  |                     | Other Services                    |
| Elderly Care Agency                | 138                 |                     | 146                 |                     | Health and Social Work            |
| Office of the Public Ombudsman     | 4                   |                     | 5                   |                     | Real Estate & Business Activities |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 285 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not sure whether it is that the Social Services Agency was not yet there in October 2002 or whether it is that it was included in the public sector, can the Minister clarify that for me?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes. The answer is as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition that it was in November after October 2002.

ORAL

**NO. 286 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state whether the local preparation of the 18 transbuses has been concluded?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 287 to 289 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 287 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government confirm whether all of the 18 transbuses were in Gibraltar by 21<sup>st</sup> November 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 286, 288 and 289 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 288 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state whether the process of recruiting and training drivers for the 18 new transbuses has been concluded?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 286, 287 and 289 of 2004.

**NO. 289 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state whether they are satisfied that the width of the new buses purchased for bus route services is adequate for Gibraltar, given the narrowness of some of our roads?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The 18 buses ordered from Transbuses are fully able to operate in Gibraltar. The last vehicles were received in the week of 22nd December 2003. The vehicles have been tested and found able to cope with all bus routes except for the Upper Town bus route which will be serviced, as planned, by small vehicles. The process of recruiting and training drivers for the new bus service will commence shortly.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 286 TO 289 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Was the statement or the article in the press purporting to the fact that the Traffic Regulations would have to be changed to allow these buses to use our roads incorrect?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I must say that the article in the press was actually following on a press release issued by the hon Member. Comments were attributed to him personally so obviously the hon Member should be aware of what was actually in the statement. Having said that let me say that there is not actually the need to change the legislation and the regulations in order to make these buses legal to operate. For a long time, and I mean years, buses have been allowed to operate in Gibraltar with an

exemption issued by the Licensing Authority in order to exempt them from the necessary legal requirements and so therefore what the Government have decided to do was actually to change the regulations in order to avoid having to go through this process on an on-going basis. At the moment the Licensing Authority is the Principle Secretary for the Ministry of Transport and I can say that most of the Toyota Coasters, for example, that operate in Gibraltar today actually operate with an exemption from this Authority and so therefore there is no need for us to change the law even though the Government have opted to go down that particular route. The exemption from the Licensing Authority is sufficient for those buses to operate. I hope that clarifies the matter for the hon Gentleman.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether at the time of issuing the tender all prospective tenderers were made aware that they could actually quote for oversized buses if they so wished?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The actual tender notice asks for 18 mini, midi, low floor buses and with that description all currently manufactured vehicles in the market would not conform to the actual size of the current Gibraltar Regulations. Let me say that all applications that were submitted too did not conform to the Regulations they were larger than the Regulations stated.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the actual award of the tender, when the Government are sued the statement at the time in relation to these transbuses the point was made that these were being purchased directly from the United Kingdom from a factory which the Minister was photographed at, is there no local agent or local support or backup from established Gibraltar companies for these buses?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The buses were purchased directly from Transbus as manufacturers. There is no local agent involved even though as part of the submission that was proposed to us by Transbus they will have an after sales service agreement with a local garage.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will Government confirm that the buses can take 29 passenger seated and 20 passengers standing?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

If that information is taken from our press release that is correct. The total number of passengers it can take is just under 50 and the configuration is varied between

standing passengers and seated passengers with some space available for disabled and senior citizens.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will the transbuses be permitted to use the stretch of Main Street between Referendum Gate and the Convent which I have been given to understand the cavalcade is not permitted to use in order to avoid the risk of the road caving in under the weight of the floats and as the buses can take 49 passengers and the weight of the bus is there no risk of this happening, are Government comfortable that these buses can circulate in that stretch without any risk at all?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes. We have not been advised on the contrary buses will be able to circulate in that part of Main Street. The technical explanation given in respect of the actual cavalcade is the fact that these cavalcade floats carry a substantial number of children et cetera and the actual weight on these exceed possibly what the buses can carry. I really cannot comment any further apart from the fact that we have not been advised to the contrary.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Following on from the answer given to me earlier by the Minister, which local garage will be providing the maintenance for the buses?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The local garage is A M Capurro.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I want to make it clear that that is not an arrangement with the Government that is under the tender contract the manufacturer has to provide for a minimum of one year after sales service. Whether they can provide it directly or through contractors of theirs that is entirely their arrangement. Government are in no way a party to those arrangements.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

To clarify what the Minister has just said is it that the buses have some kind of guarantee and this guarantee will be carried out by A M Capurro on behalf of the manufacturer and after that it will then be put out to tender or how will it work?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not just a guarantee it is also an after sales service but I suppose the bus operating company will come to some decision on its own. The hon Member should not assume that this service will be carried out by the Government.

**NO. 290 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBTELECOM**

Can Government state why the Gibtelecom report on securing an adequate supply of telephone numbers for Gibraltar has not been shared with this side of the House, as the Minister said he was prepared to do on the 28<sup>th</sup> March in answer to Question No 117 of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Gibtelecom have not presented a report to the Government on numbering, so there is nothing to share with the hon Members of the Opposition. The Government will embark on a process of consultation once it has itself identified and evaluated the technical and economic viability of possible ways forward.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 290 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

May I remind the Minister that in reply to Question No 117 of 2003 the Minister said that they expected the report shortly from Gibtelecom?

**HON F VINET:**

It is indeed true that in a reply to supplementary answer in Question No 117 of 2003. The House was informed that Gibtelecom were reviewing how the Gibraltar numbering plan might be expanded. Gibtelecom have subsequently informed the Government that they will not be issuing a report nor recommending an alternative numbering plan.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

May I then ask the Minister whether they have taken a decision as regards migrating Centrex to a new system in order to allow more numbers for Gibraltar?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Maybe in due term.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In answer to Question No 369 of 2003 the Government said that it was not financially viable to migrate to another system but that they would reconsider in the light of the Gibtelecom Report and give their consideration based on political consideration.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand that work continues both on that and on the surrendering up by Government of numbers that we can surrender but on the more general question that the hon Member asked I think the Government together with the Telecom's Regulator is going to have to take over the question of the new numbering plan rather than leave it to Gibtelecom because there are competition issues here. Whilst there are no telephone numbers to award in effect Gibtelecom is being insulated from the rigours of full competition because whilst there are no numbers to give there are no numbers to hand to a competitor Gibtelecom owning all the numbers that exist in the existing numbering plan. So, there is that situation, there was the hon Member's Colleagues that were in the last House of Assembly will recall that from time to time had discussions about this. There has been some element of consultation with the industry who did not like it very much or at least who were split some sectors of the Finance Centre did not like it very much on the question of this number shadowing module as it is called but I think that the Government are going to have to revisit that given that Gibtelecom has, let me explain why that debate stopped. That debate stopped because Gibtelecom said that they did not think that number shadowing was a very attractive option and that they were going to look for other solutions. That they were going to speak to I think it was Marconi or some UK Specialist phone manufacturer to see if there was a technology available that would enable them to come up with an alternative proposal. Now that Gibtelecom has decided as the Minister has answered in the Question not to do that the Government are basically as it was at the time that we were debating with the industry the number shadowing module. That is in effect the only option which is available as far as the Government are aware other than the hand to mouth and very short term solution of Centrexes and the Government freeing out lines so there might be a number of short term things that might put off the evil day for a short while but I think the Government are now going to have to make a final decision on the long term solution which is number shadowing. Whether the Government presses ahead with that immediately or awaits the outcome of the case that may now ensue outnumbering by Gibtelecom depends on the advice that we receive on how long any such case might take to come to judgement and whether Gibraltar can wait that long before expanding its numbering plan.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the present availability of numbers what is the kind of timescale when a decision will have to be taken?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know the answer to that question as at the moment, I know as I have told the hon Member before that for certain types of premium services which require a large number of numbers D-Day has in effect passed. There are already certain types of premium telephone services which Gibtelecom would like to be able to offer to its subscribers particularly business subscribers for which there is a demand and which in practical terms cannot be delivered which is not to say that they do not have a supply of numbers in sufficient quantities to give out, for example, to new domestic subscribers. I do not think they have run out of numbers for that, domestic single line sort of purpose but certainly in terms of bulk usage of lines in connection with modern technology for offices I think they have long since stopped being able to offer those services.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My question really was given that that is the situation and that that information follows the statement that a decision would have to be taken sometime and that one possible factor is how long the court case will take, what I am asking is are we talking about months, weeks or maybe one or two years is that the time scale?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Remember that this is the one that has not yet been initiated. This is the numbering issue but if court action is initiated and assuming that it will be and they make the same decision as they have made in relation to roaming, to expect a ruling of the European Court much quicker than 12 to 18 months is probably not realistic so the question is, is it necessary or desirable to wait that long when that length of time authoritatively identified by the lawyers or not. It is a question of how the telephone company is holding out but it is not just how Gibtelecom is holding out there is always lurking in the background the competition issue and that is that whilst there are no numbers to hand out to potential competitors the degree of competition and the number of services and the intensity of the competition to which Gibtelecom can be exposed with whatever effect that might have on a downwards driving of telephone prices is itself severely curtailed. So, it is not just, are there enough numbers for Gibtelecom to continue to deliver services but rather whatever might be the answer to that how long should Gibraltar be deprived of the full benefits of full blown competition which is presently being severely frustrated by the lack of numbers.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

We were told some time ago that there was in the pipe-line some company applying for a licence which actually wanted to provide land lines is that something that is not going to happen now or is this something that is not possible because of the .....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the hon Member is referring to an application by a company called Broadband Limited, I think we did identify it at the time, I believe although the new minister with responsibility in this area will nod his head if I am correct, that is still very much on the cards. I am not sure that they themselves are still ready to press ahead but the numbering shortage is a serious problem in that context even if they were ready to press ahead. The sort of competition that we have had in the past has the effect of having a favourable impact on price but in a way which is wholly undesirable from the point of view of Gibraltar's wider economic interests. These call-back services which I understand are not illegal under EU law but certainly that they are from Gibraltar's wider economic interests aside lower telephone prices are not particularly helpful because these companies who employ almost no staff in Gibraltar nevertheless cream the good revenue from the companies that do employ dozens and dozens of people in Gibraltar with a physical presence with an office with backup, billing staff and are therefore reinvesting some of that revenue back in the wider economy. The call-back services with minimal local infrastructure just siphon off usually the better quality business revenue leaving the locally established company who have to bear the infrastructure costs to deal with the less profitable domestic traffic so, there is not much the Government can do to stop it but certainly we ought not to be looking at that to encouraging it very much as a way out of our problems.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not recall if it was Broadband Limited or somebody else but I do recall having been told in the House that there was an application pending and there was some reference to local calls being provided free by this applicant. What I am asking is, in the light of the fact that the numbers are not available is that something that has now disappeared as a possibility or are they still around waiting for .....?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think anybody has gone away, I cannot confirm to him whether Broadband's proposal is the one that included that free local call offer but I do not think that anybody has gone away from the licensing lead up process since we last had this discussion.

**NO. 291 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EU – ELECTRIC COMMUNICATIONS**

Can Government state when they propose to transpose into Gibraltar law the new European Union Regulatory framework for the electronic communications sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Work on the transposition of the new regulatory package is at a very advanced stage and is expected to be completed early this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 291 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I am pleased with the answer provided by the Minister because the new regulatory framework will bring into effect a much more user friendly licensing regime amongst other advantages.

**NO. 292 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GTB - BEACHES**

Can Government state the date that they propose to make facilities for beach users available in our beaches this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Full facilities will be available at all beaches for the official bathing season, which will commence on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2004. In addition, some facilities will be available during the Easter holiday season. In the meantime, toilet facilities are available at Camp Bay and Little Bay during the winter months.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 292 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the facilities, over what period is it intended to employ lifeguards?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Lifeguards are employed during the official bathing season starting on the 12<sup>th</sup> June and usually finishing somewhere between the second week in September.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Not during the period of Easter that the Minister has mentioned?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Normally lifeguards are not available during the Easter period.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Have Government given any thought to extending the official bathing season so that it starts earlier in June?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This is a matter that has been given some consideration however the reality is that we have analysed those that use our beaches and we find that it is not until the half-day leave of school starts and until the end of the bathing season that people tend to go to the beach so targeting to the majority of people the bathing season is quite adequate.



ORAL

**NO. 293 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what are the estimated requirements for fresh water supply to the proposed east side reclamation development project announced by Government and how is it anticipated that this will be met?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 294 and 295 of 2004.

**NO. 294 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what are the estimated requirements for sewage disposal for the proposed east side reclamation development project announced by Government and how is it anticipated that this will be met?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 293 and 295 of 2004.

**NO. 295 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what are the estimated requirements for electricity supply to the proposed east side reclamation development project announced by Government and how is it anticipated that this will be met?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

It is premature at this stage of the negotiations to comment publicly on these issues. An initial assessment study has been made.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 293 TO 295 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say whether the initial assessment is that there is going to be a need at all or is he implying that a development of that size can be handled?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Obviously there is a need for infrastructure but the extent of it, the nature of it, who will pay it, et cetera are precisely the sort of details that are presently under negotiation with the developer and it would be most unhelpful for the Government to make any public statement on these things now. As soon as there is clarity on the matter or the negotiations are completed the hon Members can have all this information it is not that there is anything sensitive about this other than in the context that it happens to be the sort of issues that are presently under negotiations but obviously there is substantial infrastructure required for a project of this size.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government at least say, for example, there would appear to be from an outside point of view more of a problem in respect of the sewage and the electricity element than the water because presumably the water we can just put in more RO plants and produce more water but in terms of the existing installed capacity, for example electricity, are we talking about something that for the development as a whole the additional capacity that would be required would be something that would be very large or are we just talking about another engine and that is it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member has to just as he has done distinguish between production and distribution. There are infrastructural issues relating both to the generation of electricity, the distilling of water, and getting it there. The distribution networks in both cases and the requirement for significant investment applies to both. The distinction is that in relation to water both increase production, capacity and the additional distribution is much less money than for electricity but it still involves both and indeed the same applies to telephone capacity were there is a cost in getting telephones there but it is much less. Electricity is the biggest when it comes for both distribution and generation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

As regards sewage is the possibility of dealing with that in that area being looked at as opposed to sort of pumping it to Europa Point?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Leader of the Opposition may recall from his days in office that there is actually a longstanding project which no Government have ever proceeded with or funded to divert sewage in that direction. All Gibraltar's sewage goes down Winston Churchill Avenue and Line Wall, for example, the present sewage on the east side is pumped to the pumping station near the Victoria Stadium along Winston Churchill Avenue and then enters the main sewer at Line Wall Road so everything is diverted that way. This requires pumping stations and the sewers are old, small, new developments more demand being placed on them et cetera. They are now really creaking at the seams in terms of their ability to absorb greater volume so this longstanding report that exists is precisely to divert the sewage from the north and east side of the rock along Devil's Tower Road and straight to what will be the urban wastewater treatment plant which is going to be built somewhere in the area of Europa Point. So it will go round the east side through the tunnel which is a very cheap way of laying because one does not have to dig a ditch along the length of all the tunnel so the civil costs are lower than they would be to rebuild a ditch along the public highway and that scheme exists in respect of that and we are now seeing whether this project and those that need to contribute to the cost of the infrastructure works now provide a convenient opportunity to achieve that for Gibraltar as a whole.

ORAL

**NO. 296 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL**

Have any new appeals been lodged before the Development Appeals Tribunal since the last Question Time in this House, and if so listing the appeals showing the date they were lodged and the issue at stake?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 297 and 298 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 297 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL**

At what stage are the four appeals that were pending comment before the Development Appeals Tribunal at the last Question Time in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 296 and 298 of 2004.

**NO. 298 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL**

At what stage are the three new appeals before the Development Appeals Tribunal given at the last Question Time in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Three new appeals have been lodged since the answer to the Question No 340 of 2003.

1. On 17<sup>th</sup> March 2003 against a refusal to grant permission for the construction of a garage.
2. On 28<sup>th</sup> April 2003 against a refusal to grant a permission for the construction of a west-facing dormer window.
3. On 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2003 against a refusal to grant permission for the construction of an extension.

The present position is now summarised on the attached Schedule that I will now hand to the hon Member. He will see that of the four pending comments when Question No 340 of 2003 was answered two of the appeals remain awaiting comments (No 6 and 10). One has been withdrawn (No 4) and a decision was made (No 7). In respect of the three new appeals when Question No 340 of 2003 was answered one is pending a date for the hearing (No 11), a decision was made (No 12) and the other is pending comments (No 13).

| REF | PROPOSAL REFUSED                                     | DATE OF APPEAL | HEARING DATE     | REMARKS                     |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1   | Erection of corporate sign.                          | 15-Jun-01      | 6-Feb-02         | DPC decision upheld         |
| 2   | Fitting of an air conditioning unit.                 | 29-Nov-01      | 20-Nov-02        | DPC decision upheld         |
| 3   | Construction of 3 no. terraced houses                | 6-Nov-01       | 30-Oct-02        | Appellant case accepted     |
| 4   | Erection of double glazed partition.                 | 28-Dec-01      | Pending          | Withdrawn                   |
| 5   | Conditional permit for redevelopment.                | 25-Oct-01      | Not applicable   | Withdrawn                   |
| 6   | Construction of a wider shopfront.                   | 9-Jan-02       | Pending          | Pending DPC Comments        |
| 7   | Extension.                                           | 25-Oct-01      | 1, 8 & 13-Oct-03 | DPC decision upheld         |
| 8   | Re-roofing                                           | 18-Feb-02      | 16-Sep-02        | Appellant case accepted     |
| 9   | Residential development                              | 26-Feb-02      | Not applicable   | Withdrawn                   |
| 10  | Construction of a toilet building                    | 8-Mar-02       | Pending          | Pending Appellants Comments |
| 11  | Construction of workshop and offices                 | 14-Oct-02      | Pending          | Pending hearing             |
| 12  | Windows replacement                                  | 9-Jan-03       | 19-Nov-03        | Appellant case accepted     |
| 13  | Construction of two townhouses plus associated areas | 12-Feb-03      | Pending          | Pending Appellants Comments |
| 14  | Construction of a garage                             | 17-Mar-03      | Pending          | Pending DPC Comments        |
| 15  | Construction of west facing dormer window            | 28-Apr-03      | Pending          | Pending hearing             |
| 16  | Construction of an extension                         | 3-Sep-03       | Pending          | Pending hearing             |



| REF | APPELLANT                    | ADDRESS                         | PROPOSAL REFUSED                                                   | DATE OF APPEAL | DPC COMMENTS    | APPELLANT RESPONSE | HEARING DATE                         | REMARKS                      |
|-----|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1   | Benamor Ltd                  | 153 Main Street                 | Section of corporate sign.<br>Fitting of an air conditioning unit. | 15-Jun-01      | 17-Jul-01       | 30-Jul-01          | 6-Feb-02                             | DPC decision upheld          |
| 2   | ESP Ltd                      | 79 Prince Edward's Road         | Construction of 3 no. terraced houses                              | 29-Nov-01      | 29-Nov-01       | 9-Apr-02           | 20-Nov-02                            | DPC decision upheld          |
| 3   | H.L. Wilkie Ltd              | Engineer Road                   | Erection of double glazed partition.                               | 6-Nov-01       | 2-Jan-02        | 14-Jun-02          | 30-Oct-02                            | Appellant case accepted      |
| 4   | Mrs. A. Hadwen               | 30 Cornwall's Court             | Conditional permit for redevelopment.                              | 28-Dec-01      | 22-Mar-02       | Pending            | Requested                            | Withdrawn                    |
| 5   | Seruya Holdings Ltd          | 13-21 John Mackintosh Square    | Construction of a wider shopfront.                                 | 25-Oct-01      | Never submitted |                    | Not requested                        | Withdrawn                    |
| 6   | Mr. Stuart Adrian Bensadon   | 17/19 Engineer Lane             |                                                                    | 9-Jan-02       | Pending         |                    | Not requested                        |                              |
| 7   | Mr. P Hewett                 | 3 South Sheds Place             | Extension.                                                         | 25-Oct-01      | 21-May-03       | 15-Jun-03          | 1, 8 & 13-Oct-03                     | DPC decision upheld          |
| 8   | Mr. Kevin A Pizarro          | 47 Prince Edward's Road         | Re-roofing                                                         | 18-Feb-02      | 10-May-02       | Not submitting     | 18-Sep-03 & 30-Oct-03                | Appellant case accepted      |
| 9   | Anglo Hispano Company Ltd    | Sandpits Vaults                 | Residential development                                            | 26-Feb-02      | Never submitted |                    |                                      | Withdrawn                    |
| 10  | Mr. Jerry Parker             | Eastern Beach Kiosk             | Construction of a toilet building                                  | 8-Mar-02       | 16-Jan-03       | Pending            |                                      |                              |
| 11  | Bencrafts (Construction) Ltd | Unit 28 Eaton Park, Forbes Road | Construction of workshop and offices                               | 14-Oct-02      | 5-May-03        | 10-Dec-03          | Pending                              |                              |
| 12  | Mr. C Walker                 | 263/4 Main Street               | Windows replacement                                                | 9-Jan-03       | 13-Jun-03       | 24-Jun-03          | 13-Aug-03, 13-Oct-03, 13 & 19 Nov-03 | Appellant case accepted      |
| 13  | Mr. & Mrs. D Harnston        | 11/4 Gardiner's Road            | Construction of two townhouses plus associated areas               | 12-Feb-03      | 14-Apr-03       | Pending            | Requested                            |                              |
| 14  | Mr. M Ramagge                | 6 Transport Lane                | Construction of a garage                                           | 17-Mar-03      | Pending.        |                    |                                      |                              |
| 15  | Mr. N Cruz                   | 1 - 4 Rossa Cottages            | Construction of west facing dormer window                          | 28-Apr-03      | 24-Sep-03       | 9-Oct-03           | After election                       | No submission from Appellant |
| 16  | Mr. Paul John Balban         | Unit 9, The Square, Marina Bay  | Construction of an extension                                       | 3-Sep-03       | 30-Sep-03       | 14-Oct-03          | After election                       |                              |

**NO. 299 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NORTH MOLE – SULLAGE PLANT**

Are Government aware of the reasons for the planned installation of a new storage tank at the sullage treatment plant in the North Mole?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 299 OF 2003**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can Government give the reasons to the House?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

SAUT who are the owners of the sullage plant in the north mole need more storage capacity as a result of new EU legislation which requires that ships have to discharge their waste oil if they do not have enough capacity to take them to the next port. SAUT is also negotiating with the MOD in order to try and see if they can obtain the MOD contract to handle their waste.

**NO. 300 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ROCK HOTEL PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

Has an environmental impact assessment now been carried out into the proposed development of 76 apartments to the rear of the Rock Hotel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 300 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether that is a reflection on whether the project has been proceeded with or not or is it simply that the study that it has been proceeded with at this stage?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am informed that they do intend to proceed with the environmental impact study but that has not yet been undertaken or submitted for consideration.

ORAL

**NO. 301 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMPANIES**

Since Questions No 1030 and No 1031 of 2002, have any other companies defaulted in their obligation to repay capital and/or interest on any loans they may have received from Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 302 of 2004.

**NO. 302 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMPANIES**

What action has Government taken in respect of those companies involved in answers to Question Nos 1030 and 1031 of 2002 on not having complied with the obligation to repay capital and interest on the loans they had received from the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

One other company has defaulted. The Government have pursued legal action in respect of two companies; it has entered into an agreement with a third company; and is considering the action which it will take in respect of the fourth company.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 301 AND 302 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Opposition be told which of the companies which against legal action was taken?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I feel that this information may be slightly sensitive however I am happy to let him have the information on a confidential basis.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful.

**NO. 303 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**POLLUTION PREVENTION AND CONTROL ORDINANCE 2001**

Can Government state what plans it has to ensure timely compliance with Directive Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Council Directive 96/61 concerning integrated pollution prevention and control was transposed in Gibraltar by the Pollution Prevention and Control Ordinance 2001 which came into operation on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2001.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 303 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is exactly this directive which requires a best available technology to be employed whenever involved in regeneration of, for example, electricity generation equipment, will the Government have regard to that criteria if it is purchasing any new generation equipment or in respect of the importation of generation equipment by any other party in Gibraltar?

**HON F VINET:**

Absolutely.

**NO. 304 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

Can Government say how much of the £30,000 Trade and Industry budget allocated to Marketing, Promotions and Conferences in respect of Inward Investment and Lands has been spent as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, giving a breakdown of the sum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 305 of 2004.

**NO. 305 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

Can Government say how much of the £30,000 Trade and Industry budget allocated to Marketing, Promotions and Conferences in respect of Business Development has been spent as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 giving a breakdown of the sum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 305 of 2004**

**MARKETING, PROMOTION AND CONFERENCES**

**(a) Inward Investment and Lands**

|                                                           |          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Sum spent as at 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2003: £9,199.81 |          |
| Breakdown:                                                | £        |
| Subsistence/Allowance                                     | 1,825.77 |
| Air Passages/Hotel Accommodation                          | 5,836.19 |
| Goods                                                     | 10.00    |
| Subscriptions                                             | 417.90   |
| Courier Services                                          | 44.60    |
| Expenses                                                  | 715.35   |
| Sponsorship                                               | 350.00   |



**(b) Business Development**

Sum spent as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003: £15,964.72

Breakdown: £

|                                  |          |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| Air Passages/Hotel Accommodation | 7,407.67 |
| Student Placement                | 900.00   |
| Expenses                         | 3,659.54 |
| Subsistence/allowances           | 3,374.87 |
| Catering                         | 380.63   |
| Entertainment                    | 119.10   |
| Conference                       | 122.91   |

**NO. 306 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP**

Can Government list the conferences that they have assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored since March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There were three conferences:

- (a) the annual conference of the European Association of Airport and Seaport Police; and
- (b) a Chiropractic Conference;
- (c) the Calpe Conference.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 306 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether the assistance that they gave was financial or logistical in each case and what amounts?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

In respect of the annual conference to the European Association of Airport and Seaport Police there was a financial contribution which totalled £24,143.63 and \$228. In respect of the chiropractic conference I do not think that there were any actual expenses I think there were logistical arrangements and in respect of the Calpe Conference I believe from memory that this was partly funded by the European Union as part of the Interreg initiatives between Morocco and Gibraltar but the total cost was £40,000 and I believe that the European Union funded about 40 per cent of that.

**NO 307 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POWER CHIPS PLC**

Can Government say at what stage are discussions with Power Chips PLC to set up a manufacturing facility in Gibraltar and what potential sites are being examined for this project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There has been intermittent contact between the Government and Power Chips PLC over the last two and a half years but there are still no concrete proposals and therefore the Government cannot say where there is a real possibility of any sort of facility being set up in Gibraltar.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 307 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister give any indication of when was the last contact with this company?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe it may have been just before the general election. There has definitely not been any contact at ministerial level after the elections with me.

**NO 308 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LICENSING LAWS**

Have Government now completed all stages of the licensing review, the consultation process for which finalised in November 2000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Government are presently not pursuing a review of licensing laws.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 308 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In the light of that answer is the Minister saying that the review which closed with the consultation process in November 2003 which included amongst some areas the opening hours of bars and restaurants and discotheques which included other aspects like under age drinking et cetera, that wide review which was going to be looked at again has now been abandoned or is it still on the shelf?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not the bit about underage drinking laws that is still afoot what is no longer under consideration is any change to licensing hours et cetera outside of the existing I cannot remember what the Ordinance was called, the special regime that applies to Casemates, discotheques and the marinas but Government are still intending to review and to change the laws in relation to alcohol and tobacco in relation to young persons.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So, what was originally described as temporary licensing hours for Casemates and for discotheques and for the marinas is now a permanent arrangement is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is correct.

**NO 309 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NUMBER OF SHIPS**

How many ships called at Gibraltar in 2003 for:-

- (a) repair,
- (b) cargo?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 310 of 2004.

**NO 310 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NUMBER OF SHIPS**

How many ships called at Gibraltar for bunkering in 2003 and how many tonnes of bunker fuel were sold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of 75 ships called for repairs, 4,988 for bunkers and 133 for cargo. A total of 3.58 million tonnes of bunkers were supplied in 2003.

**NO 311 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUNKERING**

Can Government say whether any new bunkering licenses have been issued since April 2003 and if so when and to whom?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 312 and 313 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 312 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUNKERING**

Have any new applications for a bunkering license been made since April 2003, and if so at what stage is each application?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 311 and 313 of 2004.

**NO. 313 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUNKERING**

How much revenue, direct and indirect, did the Government receive from bunkering operations in the Bay of Gibraltar in 2002 and 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No new bunker operator licences have been issued since April 2003, neither have there been any new applications for such licences. The Government do not have any figures on the indirect revenue which accrues to the economy from the bunkering activities in the port, nor is it feasible to calculate the sum within the short time frame since notice of the question was given. This will require a vary considerable amount of work, and is too onerous to produce. Insofar as direct revenue is concerned, the exercise which would be required to analyse all ship calls in which bunkers were taken to establish whether it was exclusively for bunkering or for other purposes over and above bunkering and to apportion a proportion of the Port dues to bunkering.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 313 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister therefore saying that he has no way of establishing exactly how much revenue Gibraltar makes from bunkering operations?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The only figure that could be used for direct revenue could be possibly the port dues arrived at from ships calling at Gibraltar for bunkers. However, what I was trying to explain to the hon Gentleman is that ships call in to Gibraltar not necessarily just for bunkers they may call for other purposes and so therefore the economic benefit from the bunkering operation is not necessarily strictly speaking for bunkering but for other activities as well so one would have to apportion the figure to depending on the other

activities of whether one wanted to apportion part of the revenue to other activities. In the year 2003 the figure for port dues was £193,694 that is really new revenue because one will recall that back towards the end of the year 2002 Government introduced port dues for ships calling in for bunkering and other activities, prior to that ships of this nature had been exempt from port dues and so that can be I presume a source of revenue to the economy directly from ships that call in for bunkering. There is also the environmental levy which is a fund that was introduced again in the year 2002 for bunkering ships calling in at Gibraltar where there is a levy raised on them in order for us to be able to create a fund to be able to counteract environmental and pollution disasters or incidents and the figure for the year 2002 was £129,000 that was generated from that levy and in the year 2003 was £148,000. Obviously the Government policy is to go for the culprit of any incident but we need to have a contingency fund in place to be able to tackle the incident on the spur of the moment and then deal with the cost of the exercise later and blame and try to recoup the cost in that so those are two direct revenue earners from the bunkering business.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it not the case that most ships that call at Gibraltar for bunkering do not physically dock at Gibraltar and that there are bunkering activities carried out in the bay, do those ships also pay the port dues and the environmental levy or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely that is precisely what was introduced in the year 2002 in order to increase revenue and actually derive some benefit directly from this particular commercial activity.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the annual amount that comes in from the levy if it is not used is that put on one side to build up a fund in case it is needed if something goes wrong in a big way?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There is an internal fund that is accounted for even though the revenue from that actually goes straight into the Government General Account but there is an accounting process where we have access to that money and have an income and expenditure account to be able to cater both for the income that is coming in and expenditures that may be incurred. We need to buy, for example, anti-pollution equipment, human resources that need to be used and employed during an incident all that comes out of these funds.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it that the money simply goes into the Consolidated Fund and it is spent by the Appropriation Bill is that what happens or are we setting up like a contingency fund?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It actually does appear in the Estimates of Expenditure in the Port Department Revenue.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Except to the extent that there is a general contingency fund then as it is presently set up I believe that it is just an additional income stream from an activity in respect of which the Government incurs expenditure. The expenditure being the Consolidated Fund expenditure for the state of preparedness that exists for pollution response. Training, equipment, dispersants et cetera. I believe this is the thrust of the hon Members' questions I do not believe that it is set up as a special ring-fenced fund. I believe it is general Government revenue which off-sets general Government expenditure in the Consolidated Fund on that sort of thing so it is a general income stream.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Government not agree that the concept of an environmental levy would indicate that it is something which makes sense but which is there for a purpose and therefore as it is at the moment really at the end of the day the money will be used for whatever the money is needed as part of the general revenue?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes that view could be taken. We had this debate in relation to the environmental levy in respect of the Upper Rock last year or a few years ago whether this is hypothecated revenue or whether it is not hypothecated revenue one can either take both views. The extent to which Government creates little pockets of nest eggs to respond to different contingencies that may or may not occur I do not know but in this respect the first port of call is 'polluter pays' in fact we have an international treaty obligation to apply the principle of 'polluter pays' these are required by international treaty. If there was a pollution incident and it was not possible immediately to get the polluter to pay immediately the Government would always have to pay the cost of the clean up whether or not there was a separate fund. Whether or not there should be a separate fund is something that the Government can give consideration to, I can see the arguments for there being a separate fund given that this could be very heavy expenditure if the incident was large enough or whether the £800,000 or whatever is left in the general contingency fund would be enough. It is something the Government can give consideration to whether the fund should be made at least to a certain level. Anything in excess of that level could then flow into the General Consolidated Fund. It is certainly scope for reviewing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Other than this in terms of the direct revenue to the Government are most of the companies there operating qualifying companies or are there full-time tax paying companies engaged in the bunkering business?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We do not know the answer to that question. We certainly know of one that is a full taxpaying company, Shell and its partner, Gibunco or Cepsa Gibraltar or whatever the company is that they do it through. As to the Greek owned companies of which there are two or three what their tax status is I would have to check.

**NO 314 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDS**

Can Government list the parties who have applied for EU funding since the last Question Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purposes for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful, and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 315 and 316 of 2004.

**NO 315 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INTERREG IIIA PROGRAMME**

Have any specific projects now been identified in order to access funding assistance from the Gibraltar/Morocco Interreg IIIA Programmes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 314 and 316 of 2004.

**NO 316 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INTERREG IIIB PROGRAMME**

Can Government now say whether the two projects in which Gibraltar is a participant under the South West Europe Interreg IIIB programme have been approved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought in this question is being handed in written format.



**Answer to Question 316 of 2004**

**EU FUNDING APPLICATIONS**

Seventeen applications for EU funding have been received since the last question time in the House. Thirteen applications were for ERDF funding under the 2000-2006 Objective 2 Programme and four were for ESF funding under the 2000-2006 Objective 3 Programme.

**ERDF Projects**

| <b>Sponsor</b>                                     | <b>Status</b> | <b>ERDF</b> | <b>GOG</b> | <b>Purpose of grant</b>                                                                                                           |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cotton Leisure Ltd                                 | Approved      | £3,696      | £3,696     | Purchase of equipment                                                                                                             |
| D Torres/A Torres T/A Fotografiks                  | Approved      | £2,254      | £2,254     | Purchase of equipment                                                                                                             |
| Miss Shapes                                        | Approved      | £1,932      | £1,932     | Purchase of Furniture & Equipment, fit-out costs & rent subsidy                                                                   |
| Yvette Playgroup                                   | Approved      | £2,160      | £432       | Fit-out of new premises                                                                                                           |
| Simon Hobbs T/A Digital Solutions                  | Approved      | £3,493      | £3,493     | Purchase of Equipment & Marketing                                                                                                 |
| J J B Amar Ltd                                     | Approved      | £1,047      | £1,047     | Purchase of Equipment                                                                                                             |
| Ministry of Tourism & Transport                    | Approved      | £545,600    | £818,400   | Develop the Northern Defences as a Tourist Amenity. Infrastructure Work, Specialist lighting and Restoration Works                |
| Department of Trade, Industry & Telecommunications | Approved      | £449,800    | £473,700   | The beautification of Orange Bastion and its surrounding urban environment. Infrastructure works, Consultancy & Relocation Costs. |
| Asbestos (Gibraltar) Ltd                           | Approved      | £5,011      | £5,011     | Purchase of Equipment                                                                                                             |
| Auto Work-Shop Services                            | Approved      | £2,162      | £2,162     | Purchase of Equipment                                                                                                             |
| Let's Go Walking Tours                             | Approved      | £632        | £632       | Purchase of Equipment & Marketing                                                                                                 |
| Slop Oil & Reception Treatment Ltd                 | Approved      | £31,050     | £31,050    | Purchase of Equipment & Site installation                                                                                         |
| USURF Internet Centre                              | Approved      | £3,086      | £3,086     | Fit-out of Premises<br>Purchase of Equipment & Marketing                                                                          |

contd...

**Cont'd Answer to Question 316 of 2004**

**ESF Projects**

**Sponsor: Department of Education & Training**

|     |                              |                      |   |            |
|-----|------------------------------|----------------------|---|------------|
| (1) | Vocational Training Scheme 4 | Total Project Cost   | - | £1,283,908 |
|     |                              | ESF (45%)            | - | £ 577,753  |
|     |                              | GOG (55%)            | - | £ 706,155  |
| (2) | BMP 7 Intake 2003            | Total Project Cost   | - | £ 88,187   |
|     |                              | ESF (45%)            | - | £ 39,684   |
|     |                              | Private Sector (20%) | - | £ 17,638   |
|     |                              | GOG (35%)            | - | £ 30,865   |

**Sponsor: Employment Service**

|     |                 |                    |   |          |
|-----|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------|
| (3) | Focus 5503      | Total Project Cost | - | £ 52,325 |
|     |                 | ESF (45%)          | - | £ 23,546 |
|     |                 | GOG (55%)          | - | £ 28,779 |
| (4) | Complement 2002 | Total Project Cost | - | £ 51,900 |
|     |                 | ESF (45%)          | - | £ 23,555 |
|     |                 | GOG (55%)          | - | £ 28,545 |

**INTERREG IIIA**

Three projects have been approved.

**INTERREG IIIB**

Two projects in which Gibraltar is a participant have been approved.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 316 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No 316 and to the third sponsor, when the Government gives a grant which includes a rent subsidy if the premises that are going to be occupied are Government premises or does it apply irrespective of whether they are Government premises or private sector premises?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Could the hon Member repeat the question?

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If one looks at the answer to Question No 316 the third sponsor on the list received a grant of £1,932 which is approved from the ERDF and £1,932 from the Gibraltar Government. That was for the purchase of furniture and equipment fit out costs and a rent subsidy, my question is about the rent subsidy, if the tenant is in private sector premises or in Government premises or is it given irrespective of what premises are being occupied?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid I am not able to confirm either way but I can find out and revert back to him on this particular issue but I assume that it is irrelevant whether it is done within Government property or whether it is done within the private sector. The application would be considered irrespective of that but I can confirm it to him in writing if he so wishes.

**NO 317 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – GOODS VEHICLES**

What was the value and number of goods vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since March 2003 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 317 and 319 of 2004.

**NO 318 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES**

What was the value and number of private motor vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since March 2003 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 317 and 319 of 2004.

**NO 319 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS - COMPUTERS**

What was the value of computers imported into Gibraltar since March 2003 inclusive on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member the information requested.

**Answer to Question 319 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 317**

(a) VALUE AND NUMBER OF GOODS VEHICLES IMPORTED INTO GIBRALTAR

| 2003      | Individuals |                     | Licensed Dealers |                     |
|-----------|-------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|
|           | Number      | Value (£ thousands) | Number           | Value (£ thousands) |
| March     | 3           | 1                   | 5                | 18                  |
| April     | -           | -                   | 5                | 20                  |
| May       | 1           | -                   | 9                | 43                  |
| June      | 2           | 4                   | 6                | 31                  |
| July      | 3           | 16                  | 3                | 6                   |
| August    | -           | -                   | 2                | 5                   |
| September | -           | -                   | 5                | 17                  |
| October   | 4           | 3                   | 7                | 43                  |
| November  | 2           | 1                   | 3                | 27                  |

Figures beyond November 2003 are not yet available.

**Answer to Question 318**

(b) VALUE AND NUMBER OF PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES IMPORTED INTO GIBRALTAR

| 2003      | Individuals |                     | Licensed Dealers |                    |
|-----------|-------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|           | Number      | Value (£ thousands) | Number           | Value (£ millions) |
| March     | 13          | 33.8                | 523              | 6.0                |
| April     | 25          | 87.6                | 191              | 1.9                |
| May       | 17          | 38.5                | 485              | 2.0                |
| June      | 28          | 70.6                | 243              | 2.1                |
| July      | 18          | 27.8                | 182              | 1.4                |
| August    | 17          | 56.0                | 251              | 1.8                |
| September | 35          | 103.0               | 722              | 7.3                |
| October   | 21          | 82.0                | 135              | 0.9                |
| November  | 24          | 61.0                | 459              | 6.0                |

Figures beyond November 2003 are not yet available.

Cont...

**Contd Answer to Question 319 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 319**

**(c) VALUE OF COMPUTER HARDWARE IMPORTED INTO GIBRALTAR**

| <b>2003</b> | <b>Value of Computers<br/>(£)</b> |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| March       | 751,267                           |
| April       | 1,293,763                         |
| May         | 494,652                           |
| June        | 566,089                           |
| July        | 485,855                           |
| August      | 345,525                           |
| September   | 543,541                           |
| October     | 537,242                           |
| November    | 985,658                           |

Figures beyond November 2003 are not yet available.



**NO 320 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**E-COMMERCE**

Can Government list the specific strategies that it has been developing to create an environment for businesses to trade electronically, speedily and securely?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Strategies the Government have been developing are as follows:-

- (1) Legislative initiatives in the field of e-commerce and liberalisation of the telecoms markets;
- (2) Investment in telecoms infrastructure.
- (3) Development of an e-commerce House project.
- (4) Moratorium on the payment of import duty on computer hardware and software to 30<sup>th</sup> June 2004.
- (5) Encouraging EU funding applications within this field.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 320 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the second point, telephone infrastructure investment can the Minister tell the House what investment that is?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The information that I have here in respect of investment in telecom infrastructure adds up to a total of £13 million which has been invested not just Government, the industry in itself in the providing of the broadband, the cheap 884, the old ISP service, the prepaid mobiles and the cheap IDD rates.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether those initiatives are actually initiatives of Gibtelecom not necessarily of the Gibraltar Government?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The investment in telecom infrastructure broadly speaking the responsibility and the initiative is of Gibtelecom.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can Government say whether there is any appreciable increase in the use of e-commerce in Gibraltar as a result of these strategies, are Government monitoring their effect?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I cannot really give the hon Member a categorical answer on this particular issue but I am told by those who operate within the Department of Trade and Industry and have responsibility for the promotion of this particular sector that there is increased activity however I cannot really give them any particular detail to backup that particular statement.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Do those who make those comments base their information on anything, a survey or any other kind of statistical compilation of the use of e-commerce in Gibraltar?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I presume they base it on, for example, the increase on the imports of computer software as an indicator of activity in this particular area. The level of interest that has been generated within the private sector as a result of the announcement of the initiative by Government to develop an e-commerce house project.....I am being completely honest with the hon Gentleman I cannot give him any more than that.

ORAL

**NO 321 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**E-BUSINESS**

What was the cost to the Government, with a breakdown, of attending and organising the e-business conference in London on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2003, how many people made up the Government delegation and what posts did they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 322 and 323 of 2004.

**NO 322 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**E-BUSINESS**

How many delegates were invited, how many actually attended the “Gibraltar – International E-Business Centre” conference in London on 25<sup>th</sup> June, and how many were from Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 321 and 323 of 2004.

**NO 323 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**E-BUSINESS**

What other EU territories attended the "Gibraltar – International E-Business Centre" conference in London on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I hand the hon Member the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 323 of 2004**

**GIBRALTAR – INTERNATIONAL E-BUSINESS CENTRE CONFERENCE**

- (a) 45 delegates were invited to attend and 30 attended, 2 delegates were from Gibraltar.
- (b) Company representatives from the UK, Ireland and Germany were present at the conference.
- (c) The Gibraltar delegation comprised:-

|                     |   |                                                 |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------|
| Mr James Tipping    | - | Finance Centre Division                         |
| Mr Darion Figueredo | - | Communications & Technology Development Officer |
| Mr Paul Canessa     | - | CEO, Gibraltar Regulatory Authority             |
| Ms Veena Purswani   | - | Market Assistant                                |

(d) The cost of the conference was £7,179 as follows:

|                         | £        |
|-------------------------|----------|
| Venue hire and catering | 3,601.90 |
| Air passages            | 832.90   |
| Hotel accommodation     | 2,124.00 |
| Subsistence             | 307.30   |
| Out of pocket expenses  | 187.90   |
| Courier charges         | 125.00   |

**NO 324 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADSL**

What steps do the Government intend to take to lower the cost of ADSL to the business community and to home owners?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government do not provide ADSL to anyone and cannot therefore lower the cost of that service. However, the Government regularly urges Gibtelecom to make its telephone services price competitive. I suggest the hon Member should pursue the matter directly with Gibtelecom and the two local Internet Service Providers, Gibconnect and Gibnet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 324 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the policy of the Government that there should be wider use of the Internet in Gibraltar?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In the execution of that policy in trying to push it forward, have Government approached the operators in the field to see whether the cost of ADSL can be lowered or not?

**HON F VINET:**

As I have said Government do continuously urge Gibtelecom to lower its ADSL prices.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I take it that Government accepts that the cheaper the cost of Internet the more people will use it, that is in the interest of Gibraltar and in the interest of pursuing the policy of greater use.

**HON F VINET:**

Subject to resilience and quality of service I would agree with that.



**NO 325 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR CITY PLAN**

At what stage is the production of the new Gibraltar City Plan?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

What is now at an early stage is the production of the Development Plan.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 325 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister give an indication of when the development plan is expected to develop?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The estimated time for this development plan to be completed is the end of 2004.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Let us make sure that we are actually talking about the same thing, is this the plan that will include the different zoning arrangements for different parts of Gibraltar and which is open out to the public to make representations?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct. The question originally was for the city plan and or going back in history this plan was basically for the City of Gibraltar, now this plan will encompass the whole of Gibraltar and will have zoning in terms of planning policy and proposals for use of the areas et cetera and obviously this will be subjected and open to public input.

**NO 326 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 6<sup>th</sup> March 2003 and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Ten meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 6<sup>th</sup> March 2003. Meetings were held on the following dates:-

16<sup>th</sup> April 2003  
27<sup>th</sup> May 2003  
3<sup>rd</sup> July 2003  
31<sup>st</sup> July 2003  
4<sup>th</sup> September 2003  
2<sup>nd</sup> October 2003  
9<sup>th</sup> October 2003  
20<sup>th</sup> November 2003  
22<sup>nd</sup> December 2003  
6<sup>th</sup> January 2004.

ORAL

NO 327 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**SIR HERBERT MILES ROAD**

Can Government say whether outline planning permission has been granted in respect of the 65 residential units and car parking at Sir Herbert Miles Road?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos 328 to 334 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 328 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MONACO OCEAN VILLAGE**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission over the application by Monaco Ocean Village Ltd to erect a temporary workshop published on 21<sup>st</sup> August?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 327 and 329 to 334 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 329 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**OCEAN VILLAGE**

Has any application been made for the dredging of Sheppard's Marina in connection with the Ocean Village development?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos 327, 328 and 330 to 334.

**NO 330 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FUNICULAR SERVICE**

At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration of planning permission for the installation of a funicular service from Casemates Square to the top of the Rock?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 327 to 329 and Nos 331 to 334 of 2004

ORAL

**NO 331 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FUNICULAR SERVICE**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the application by 21<sup>st</sup> Century Rock Ltd to provide a funicular installation from Casemates to Rock Gun?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 327, 330 and Nos 332 to 334 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 332 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUENA VISTA ROAD**

At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration of the proposed development at 2 Buena Vista Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 327 to 331, 333 and 334 of 2004.

**NO 333 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LITTLE GENOA, CATALAN BAY**

How many representations were received in response to the request by the developers of the Little Genoa project in Catalan Bay for a relaxation of building rules, what exactly did this request entail, and has the application been accepted or rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 327 to 332 and 334 of 2004.

**NO 334 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BOTH WORLDS**

At what stage is the consideration by the Development and Planning Commission of the application for planning permission to construct two additional houses at the northern end of Both Worlds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No outline planning permission has been granted for the proposed project at Sir Herbert Miles Road, nor has any application for dredging at Sheppard's Marina been made. No representations were received with respect to the Monaco Ocean Village Ltd application to erect a temporary workshop or the Little Genoa request for relaxation of the building rules. Two representations were received in respect of the funicular proposal. The Little Genoa application related to ventilation requirements for a rear bedroom window on three of the houses, and it was granted. The DPC is awaiting submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment in respect of the funicular application before considering the matter further. The DPC is awaiting further information on the Both Worlds application prior to considering the matter further. The DPC is awaiting the outcome of further discussions with the applicant for the proposed 2 Buena Vista Road development.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 327 to 334 of 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There are a number of questions answered together so I will be going through them and asking supplementaries accordingly. In relation to Question No 327 of 2004 which was to do with the Outline Planning permission in respect of 65 units and car parking at St Herbert Miles Road to which the answer was that the Planning Commission was not given is it that the project will now not be proceeded with on

that basis, or can Government say for what reason the permission has not been given?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The no Outline Planning Permission has been granted in respect of the 65 residential units and carpark at Sir Herbert Miles Road DPC is awaiting the submission of environmental impact study prior to considering the application. An environmental consultant met with the Town Planner some months ago to discuss this but there has been no further feedback subsequent to this meeting.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No 329 of 2004 which is the dredging of the Sheppard's Marina in connection with the Ocean Village development, are Government aware that part of the project is being marketed with a dredged marina?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I can tell the hon Member that in my discussions with Monaco Ocean Village Ltd they have intimated the fact that they intended to make out some dredging. No formal submission or application has been made so therefore until that happens I am not able really to comment on the matter. Whether they wish to market the product that they do not really have is really up to them it is nothing that the Government can do.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask Government whether a formal application for dredging is actually something that is needed in the light of other legislation before this House?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Traditionally there has always been a planning application, it happened in respect of the Island project, for example, and we assumed this would be a requirement, legislation for this House for discussion for consideration later on in this meeting actually clarifies the issue as to whether there is a local requirement for that or not.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether that legislation has been put forward to this House for consideration in the light of this project?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Legislation responds to an observation by the European Commission that the Town Planning Ordinance is deficient in terms of some EU Directives in that it does not statutorily require planning permission for the seabed. In the context of some environmental Directive it was a non-compliance of some such directive I will

have this information for the hon Member when the Bill comes to the House but there is some EU Directive which is not being complied with as a result of it not being clear in the Planning Legislation that the seabed is part of the territory covered by the Planning Legislation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the Ocean Village Development is that something that can be accommodated within the existing infra-structure, I know that they do not have a problem on one side but in terms of the capacity that we have?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The issue has not been raised with us but I do not think that there is an issue in respect of it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of planning the investment the Government needs to make is there a system for looking at the projects that are there to see what that is going to do, for example, the load on electricity, is that something that is happening or happens?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Member knows it is sometime since there has been some investment in electricity generation or distribution but the studies are now being done in-house by the management of the Electricity Authority and that is certainly things that they are taking into consideration. On the sewers there is not much one can do, the sewers are there and it either has the capacity or it does not. There what one has is a major infrastructural work but yes, it is not just in terms of the projects in the pipeline but in terms of, for example, the urban waste-water treatment plant and the new refuse incinerator are being planned on the basis of realistic growth expectations both economically and in terms of population projected forward by actuaries there is quite a lot of strategic planning now going into various utilities co-incidentally because for one reason or another they have all arrived at the need to do it at more or less the same time both in sewer and electricity in particular but also I know that Lyonnaise is doing the same in respect of water.

**NO 335 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CATALAN BAY**

Can Government list the tenderers and the respective amounts bid by each in respect of Phases 2 and 3 of the upgrading and beautification of Catalan Bay?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

This tender has not yet been awarded.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 335 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The closing date for the tender was September 2003 can the Minister say why it has not been awarded?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The decision is under consideration and an announcement should be made shortly.

**NO 336 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MINISTER'S OVERSEAS VISITS**

Can the Minister for Tourism give the dates when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business from 15<sup>th</sup> March 2003 to date, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The dates are as follows:-

|                                               |   |                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 12 <sup>th</sup> – 13 <sup>th</sup> May       | - | London (UKGTA and other meetings)                       |
| 15 <sup>th</sup> – 17 <sup>th</sup> September | - | London (meetings)                                       |
| 5 <sup>th</sup> – 6 <sup>th</sup> October     | - | London (meetings)                                       |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> – 7 <sup>th</sup> October     | - | Madrid (meetings)                                       |
| 17 <sup>th</sup> – 21 <sup>st</sup> October   | - | London (Gibraltar Day and meetings)                     |
| 8 <sup>th</sup> – 10 <sup>th</sup> November   | - | London ( World Travel Market, UKGTA and other meetings) |
| 18 <sup>th</sup> – 20 June                    | - | Cambridge (CPA Conference)                              |

**NO 337 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Tourism Advisory Council met since 20<sup>th</sup> March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Twice, on 29<sup>th</sup> May and 25<sup>th</sup> September 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 337 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are Government satisfied that the Council can do its work with so few meetings in a year, I believe it is three?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Normally the Tourism Advisory Council meets every quarter so therefore by implication it is roughly four times a year. There would have been a further meeting if the elections had not been called there was a meeting due some time in November and that would have probably completed the quarterly quota. Yes, the answer is that we feel we can carry out the business with quarterly meetings however if the need arises for meetings at more regular basis that would happen in any case.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has the composition of that Council changed over the last 12 months?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am not totally sure about that, there may have been an addition to the board but I do not know when that exactly happened. Let me say that shortly after the elections I wrote to all members thanking them for their participation in the Council and informing them that I would be appointing new members during this term of office and that would happen shortly.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In the event that he was re-elected?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I said I wrote after the elections.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Sorry, I thought the Minister said before the elections.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When does the Minister envisage that the new appointees will be in place and will the Council be based on a similar format to what it was last time?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, it will be based on the same format. Some members of the public have been contacted by the Chief Executive of the Tourist Board and we are now waiting for its formal formation which will probably happen sometime during the next month.

**NO 338 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**REDLEAF ASSOCIATES**

Can Government say whether and if so when the contract to Redleaf Associates as public relations consultants to the GTB was renewed and if it was for what sum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The contract was renewed on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003, in the sum of £30,000 per annum. This contract expires on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 338 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has the work that Redleaf performs in relation to this contract for the £30,000 paid changed over the last year or does it form the same kind of function?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No. Throughout this year the work that Redleaf has undertaken is based on the contract which currently exists with the Government of Gibraltar. Let me say that later on sometime next month we are inviting other parties including Redleaf to re-submit their offer because as the hon Member knows the contracts that we have for services in the UK are reviewed annually. Some are renegotiated, others are terminated and new contracts are put in place depending on the performance and the value for money they represent.

**NO 339 OF 2004****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****CORPORATE EVENTS**

Can Government say what promotional materials will be provided by Corporate Events Ltd in respect of the tender award of £9,220?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS****PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL PROVIDED BY CORPORATE EVENTS LIMITED**

|                            |   |                |
|----------------------------|---|----------------|
| 10,000 pens                | - | £ 2,500        |
| Screen charges for pens    | - | £ 20           |
| 8,000 pencils              | - | £ 880          |
| Screen charges for pencils | - | £ 20           |
| 10,000 pins                | - | £ 3,500        |
| 10,000 window stickers     | - | £ 2,300        |
|                            |   | _____          |
| <b>Total</b>               |   | <b>£ 9,220</b> |
|                            |   | _____          |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 339 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There were two bidders for that particular tender can the Minister say how much did the unsuccessful bidder bid and for what products?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The information I had that there were two tenders, however the only other tenderer that bid for this was in respect of one item only and that was the car sticker at a cost of 36 pence each. There were no other bidders and so the Treasury Tender Board decided to go along the lines of recommending Corporate Events for the award of that tender.

**NO 340 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB - LOGO**

Are Government now in a position to give the costs with a breakdown associated with the change of logo of the Gibraltar Tourist Board?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The cost was £5,162. The design was £1,734, the changing of signs was £2,845 and the press conference was £583.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 340 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Do any of these items of expenditure relate to the changes in things like stationery et cetera that needed to be changed as a result of the change of logo?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There was change of stationery, literature et cetera, but those were costs that would have to be incurred anyway. It was not costs that were attributed particularly to this because we planned this rebranding at least two years before and so therefore our ordering of stationery, our ordering of the various literature was done so as to try and terminate the stock in existence of these at more or less the time of the launch and it has worked quite well in the sense that most of the reprinted material actually came into place when the need arose.

ORAL

**NO. 341 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

Can Government say how much of the £950,000 budget allocated to Tourism, Promotion and Conferences for the year 2003/2004 has been spent as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 giving a breakdown of the sum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is being given to the hon Gentleman in written format.

**Answer to Question No 341 of 2004**

**TOURISM MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND ADVERTISING**

**Amount Spent As At 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003**

|                                                                                                                               | £                  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Literature, including UKGTA brochure and literature for use in Gibraltar                                                      | 107,397.65         |
| Trade Activity, including FAM trips, roadshows brochure distribution, et cetera                                               | 35,616.69          |
| Media activity, including press trips                                                                                         | 23,901.23          |
| Promotional material                                                                                                          | 4,436.37           |
| Advertising, including consumer and trade Advertising and special interest/niche advertising                                  | 236,637.37         |
| Trade Fairs                                                                                                                   | 135,305.64         |
| Gibraltar events                                                                                                              | 78,525.95          |
| Website development                                                                                                           | 6,139.39           |
| Recurrent expenditure, including PR consultancy Travel costs, annual subscriptions, staff expenses for sales calls, et cetera | 104,722.56         |
| <b>Total</b>                                                                                                                  | <b>£736,605.83</b> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 341 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the £6,139 spent on website development can the Minister tell the House whether that involved the construction and design of a new website?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, this is an on-going contract that currently exists in order to maintain the UK website in order to up-date information on events, developments, changes. There is a UK tourism website which is exclusively for that purpose and that is the on-going cost of that.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the £78,525 spent on what is called "*Gibraltar events*," can the Minister elaborate on what that item of expenditure relates to?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes. Those cover events like the Gibraltar Regatta where we are part sponsors, the Rally Antigua which is the rally that set off from Gibraltar, the Gibraltar Kennel Club Dog Show where we are part sponsors, the Classic Car Rally, the Gibraltar Powerboat Festival that actually did not take place this year but it has got a slot with zero expenditure, the Chess Tournament that is due to happen for the second time and the BGTW dinner which is the dinner that we part sponsored in the UK. It is not actually a Gibraltar event it is the dinner of the Institute of Guild of Travel Writers where we participated with the Federation of Small Businesses.



**NO 342 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ABTA**

Can Government provide a list of those who made up the ABTA delegation that visited Gibraltar in mid-October, showing the position held and the company or organisation that each delegation represented?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 343 of 2004.

**NO 343 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ABTA**

What was the cost to the Government of hosting a delegation from the Association of British Travel Agents (ABTA) in mid-October?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is given to the hon Gentleman in written format.

**Question No 342 of 2004**

The ABTA visitors were not an ABTA delegation: It was a familiarisation trip for senior ABTA members who work in the travel industry in the greater London region.

The persons who made up the group were:

|                            |                   |                               |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mr David Kent              | Managing Director | Sampson Travel (Hon Sec ABTA) |
| Mrs Patricia Kent          | Manager           | Samson Travel Popular         |
| Mr Vic Horton-Griffiths    | Managing Director | Horton Griffiths              |
| Mrs Maureen Walker         | Director          | Horton Griffiths              |
| Mr John Mason              | Managing Director | Expert Travel                 |
| Mrs Rosemary Mason         | Director          | Expert Travel                 |
| Mr Winston Pickersgill     | Managing Director | New Look Travel               |
| Mrs Enid Pickersgill       | Director          | New Look Travel               |
| Mr David Steadman          | Managing Director | TTW Travel (ABTA Treasurer)   |
| Mr Wadi Wafta              | Managing Director | Blue Bird Travel              |
| Mr Andrew Ford-Hutchinson  | Director          | Sampson World Travel          |
| Mrs Marion Ford-Hutchinson | Director          | Sampson World Travel          |

### **Question No 343 of 2004**

The cost to Government was £1,755 as follows:

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Contribution to air fares | - | £ 520  |
| Entertainment             | - | £1,091 |
| Miscellaneous expenses    | - | £ 144  |

Further bills in respect of a dolphin tour and transportation within Gibraltar have not yet been submitted for payment.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 342 AND 343 OF 2004**

#### **HON DR J J GARCIA:**

A point of clarification, the answer to Question No 342 of 2004 says that the ABTA visitors were not an ABTA delegation a statement which was issued by the Government says, "*The Gibraltar Tourist Board is hosting a delegation from the Association of British Travel Agents (ABTA),*" that was issued at the time in October, can the Minister clarify which of the two it is?

#### **HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

One of the delegates by the name of Mr David Kent he is the Honourable Secretary of ABTA so that was the only connection with the actual ABTA Committee the others were ABTA Members that came along to this familiarisation visit and they were not an ABTA delegation as such, they did not represent the ABTA Committee but they were all ABTA Members.

**NO 344 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**WORLD TRAVEL MARKET**

What was the cost of attending the World Travel Market in London in November last year, how many people made up the official Gibraltar delegation, and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 345 and 346 of 2004.

**NO 345 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**WORLD TRAVEL MARKET**

What was the cost to the Government, giving a breakdown, of sponsoring the British Guild of World Travel Writers dinner at the Savoy Hotel in November?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 344 and 346 of 2004.

**NO 346 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**WORLD TRAVEL MARKET**

What travel titles and travel journalists representing newspapers were present at the press conference given by the Minister for Tourism on the first day of the World Travel Market in London in November last year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is being submitted to the hon Gentleman in written format.

### Answer to Question No 344 of 2004

#### Official Gibraltar delegation:

|                         |   |                                                         |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Hon J J Holliday        | - | Minister for Tourism                                    |
| Mr Richard Garcia       | - | Principal Secretary, Ministry for Tourism and Transport |
| Mr Peter Canessa        | - | Chief Executive, Gibraltar Tourist Board                |
| Mr Marcello Sanguinetti | - | Sales and Marketing Manager, Gibraltar Tourist Board    |

#### Costs:

|                             | £                 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Stand design and building   | 41,762.80         |
| Rental of stand space       | 13,540.72         |
| Printing of literature      | 5,081.96          |
| Postage                     | 2,207.56          |
| Reception and Entertainment | 2,522.49          |
| Giveaways                   | 2,000.00          |
| Air Travel                  | 2,518.20          |
| UK travel                   | 565.23            |
| Hotel (bed only)            | 1,077.52          |
| Subsistence                 | 460.94            |
|                             | <hr/>             |
| <b>Total</b>                | <b>£71,737.42</b> |
|                             | <hr/>             |

### Answer to Question No 345 of 2004

#### BRITISH GUILD OF TRAVEL WRITERS DINNER – SPONSORSHIP

This event was part sponsored by Government and part sponsored by private sector players. The Government cost was:

|                          | £                 |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Sponsorship fee          | 10,000.00         |
| Video Presentation       | 15,370.00         |
| Gifts for Attendees      | 3,430.00          |
| Travel and Accommodation | 2,007.78          |
| Entertainment            | 1,056.65          |
| Other Expenses           | 1,374.12          |
|                          | <hr/>             |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>£33,238.55</b> |
|                          | <hr/>             |

**Answer to Question No 346 of 2004**

**WORLD TRAVEL MARKET – PRESS CONFERENCE MEDIA ATTENDEES**

|                      |                                                 |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Mathew Hampton       | Travel Weekly                                   |
| Sarah Wild           | Conference & Incentive Travel                   |
| Robert Wilson        | Take a Break                                    |
| Gary Noakes          | TTG                                             |
| Howard Carr          | Freelance TTG                                   |
| Mark Reynolds        | ABTA Magazine                                   |
| Andrew Mueller       | Independent on Sunday                           |
| Bill Todd            | The Sun                                         |
| David Leask          | Evening News                                    |
| Amanda Hilton        | Weddings and Home                               |
| Ken Brookes          | Freelance/Chartered Institute of Travel Writers |
| Richard Gardiner     | Freelance, shortbreaks, history, politics       |
| Christopher Portaway | Freelance, conference and incentive             |
| Jasmine Birtles      | Freelance, shortbreaks, and sports              |
| Graham Norton        | Church of England Travel correspondent          |
| Frank Guillory       | Le Soleil de Quebec                             |
| David Segall         | Radio London                                    |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 344 TO 346 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No 345 of 2004 which is to do with the British Guild of World Travel Writers Dinner sponsorship, can the Minister explain how this sponsorship actually materialises is it that the Guild of Travel Writers put it out to competitive tender and so many territories or organisations express an interest and bid to sponsor the event?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The reality of this is that we are well connected with members of the Institute Guild of Travel Writers hierarchy, in other words the chairman and her Board and on one of the visits to Gibraltar along one of the cruise ships they had meetings in Gibraltar and they know certain members of the tourism industry here in Gibraltar quite well and met them socially and they said that would Gibraltar be interested in sponsoring this dinner. I have been to these dinners before, they represent good value for money in the sense that the exposure that Gibraltar obtains from the evening's event is quite significant and the Federation of Small Businesses approached some of its members and decided to put a proposal to the Government where if we were to match their participation in this event, put in £25,000 of public funds the private sector would put £25,000 themselves in order to promote the event and sponsor the event and the government decided that it would support the Federation in this initiative and carry the event forward.



**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The cost of the dinner was £33,238 of which £15,370 was spent on a video presentation can the Minister elaborate on that particular item of expenditure?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes. Basically the sponsorship of the evening is £50,000 out of which the Federation put in £25,000 and the Government of Gibraltar put in another £25,000 out of those £50,000, £15,370 were actually the cost of the presentation that was made at the dinner and was produced by leading personalities within the tourism industry that were out here in Gibraltar and was actually shown on the evening. Therefore the cost of the video presentation was that but it was part of our sponsorship money, that came out of our contribution towards the cost of that.

**NO 347 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GDC - TOURISM**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, how many employees of the Gibraltar Development Corporation were employed in tourism?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 351 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 348 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – INFORMATION OFFICER**

How many persons applied for vacancies of Information Officer (Grade 1) with the Gibraltar Tourist Board advertised on 26<sup>th</sup> June and how many posts were available?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 381 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 349 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**UKGTA BROCHURE**

Did any local hotel make representations to the Government following the publication of the UKGTA brochure last year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No 350 of 2004.

**NO 350 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**UKGTA BROCHURE**

Can Government say who is responsible for checking for mistakes in the UKGTA brochure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

One local hotel, the Queen's Hotel, made representations to the Government following publication of the 2004 UKGTA brochure. The brochure consists of two elements: pages written by and provided by tour operators, and pages produced by the Gibraltar Tourist Board. The Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Tourist Board is only responsible for the accuracy of the Gibraltar Tourist Board pages in the brochure. Any inaccuracy noted in tour operator pages is pointed out to the tour operator in question.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 349 AND 350 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the representations made by the Queen's Hotel once the brochure was published, can the Minister say what was the substance of the complaint?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The substance of the complaint was that the Queen's Hotel which appeared under accommodation A to Z section of the general Gibraltar Tourist Board pages did not include a telephone number.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Have I understood the Minister correctly when he said that this appeared under the Tourist Board pages that the telephone number was not included?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is right.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister then say what action was taken on receipt of the complaint from the Queen's Hotel?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We agreed with the Queen's Hotel that a flyer would be inserted into the brochure which would include information on the telephone number.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Am I correct in assuming that this would involve an extra cost so what was the extra cost of including a flyer in the many thousands of brochures which I am sure were printed.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The cost of this is not significant as we had a number of flyers actually printed but the actual cost was not of significance. I cannot recall what the figure was. The Queen's Hotel wanted the flyer to be inserted in every single brochure and we agreed. We were willing to insert the flyer only on brochures that are requested by members of the public directly from us at the Gibraltar Tourist Board the reality is that the main purpose of the brochure apart from distributing to the public is to have them on travel agents and tour operators for them to get relevant information so they would go to the tour operator. This information actually appears on the general pages of Gibraltar because as part of the UKGTA brochure only the three big hotels find it cost effective for them to participate in it so therefore, in order for us to present a far more complete picture to the general public we actually put in general pages ourselves which we list hotels that are not part of this UKGTA forum in order to show that we do have not just three hotels but that we do have more budget rated hotels available in Gibraltar as well. It is part of the general information on Gibraltar rather than specific hard sale that we intend to do by providing that information.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Would the Minister none the less agree to supply information relating to the cost of this flyer and how many flyers were printed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I will indeed.

**NO 351 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR OFFICE IN MADRID**

Can Government say how many persons are employed at the Gibraltar Office in Madrid listing the posts that they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of 72 members of the GDC staff are employed with the Gibraltar Tourist Board. They include the 2 members of staff at the Madrid Office, namely the Marketing Co-ordinator and the Officer Administrator.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 347 AND 351 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Madrid Office now manned on a permanent basis?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.



**NO 352 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ST MICHAEL'S CAVE**

How many parties submitted a tender for the maintenance of the audio-lighting system and ancillary equipment at St Michael's Cave?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 353 and 354 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 353 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ST MICHAEL'S CAVE**

At what stage is the tender for maintenance of the lighting system at St Michael's Cave?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 352 and 354 of 2004.

**NO 354 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**UPPER ROCK**

How many parties have submitted tenders for the supply of litter bins at the Upper Rock?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

One tender was submitted for the St Michael's Cave Tender and three tenders for the litter bins. The Government decided not to award the St Michael's cave tender to the sole tenderer.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 352 TO 354 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can Government say why the tender was not awarded in respect of the maintenance of the audio lighting system and ancillary equipment at St Michael's Cave to the only entity that submitted a tender?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This was not awarded on two counts, value for money, significant costs and also the level of expertise offered by the tenderer was not appropriate for the maintenance that is required by the system.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Was the tenderer for the maintenance the same company that carried out the original installation in relation to the value for money element and is that why it was not

considered to be value for money because it was a company from abroad or was it a local company?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It was a local company.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the second reason as to why the tender was not awarded, the level of expertise, can the Minister say who made that judgement in relation to the level of expertise that is needed for this type of tender?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not know who was in the Tender Board but there must have been an element of technical expertise within the Tender Board to advise on that matter.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that there was one tender that the Government rejected who is doing the maintenance of the lights in St Michael's Cave at present?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The Electricity Authority.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it that the Electricity Authority submitted a tender for this at some stage or is it that Government have directly allocated it to them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not organise tenders to award things to its own in-house publicly owned facility. Having the tender is to put things out to the private sector as an alternative of doing it in-house. In-house does not include just Government departments it includes statutory Authorities which are in the public sector.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My question is really aimed at establishing why is the Authority interested in carrying out this type of work which was normally carried out by a private contractor if they did not bid for it at the time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government departments and private sector entities are not at liberty to participate in Government tenders. There is one that does but that is because it is more remote and that is GJBS they sometimes bid for Government tenders but even then very rarely. Government departments and statutory agencies are not at liberty to participate. I have never known a case where a Government department.....the tender is as a potential alternative to it being done by a Government department so the decision is made at political level whether something should be done in-house or go out to tender, goes out to tender, if the prices that come back from the private sector are too high and is more than the Government wants to spend on that then it reverts back to the public sector.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Going back to the original question can the Minister say what was bid by the sole tenderer that was considered not to be value for money and how much it will cost to have the Government do this in-house?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid I do not have the relevant information about the actual cost. I can submit it to the hon Member if he wishes.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If the Minister could supply the information I would be grateful for it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Was it being done in-house before it was put out to tender?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No. It was the actual manufacturers and those that actually put the system in who had an obligation of after sales service maintenance contract and when that expired then it went out to tender.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Most of the new thing that is being set up with the Authority having its own separate accounts would a situation like this mean that it would show as revenue the expenditure of the tourism side of the budget or there would not be a paper exercise?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am not sure what has actually been agreed but I would tend to say that there would be a cost incurred as far as the Gibraltar Tourist Board budget is concerned and a

revenue on the Electricity Authority as well. The terms to be honest I do not have here with me.

**NO 355 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CITY UNDER SIEGE EXHIBITION**

What was the total cost with a breakdown of sending the wax models in the City Under Siege Exhibition to the United Kingdom for refurbishment, and what was the cost of the actual refurbishment itself?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A fee in the sum of £50,260 was negotiated with H & H Sculptors which included transportation of the models and their refurbishment.

**NO 356 OF 2004****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****GTB – REVENUE COLLECTED**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from March 2003 inclusive:

- (a) by charging coaches that use the coach park?
- (b) In admission fees to the Upper Rock?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I will hand this information to the hon Member in written format.

**Answer to Question No 356 of 2004**

- (a) Upper Rock Revenue, March-December 2003

|              | £                    |
|--------------|----------------------|
| March 2003   | 153,221.50           |
| April        | 210,657.00           |
| May          | 224,995.00           |
| June         | 210,953.00           |
| July         | 244,514.00           |
| August       | 243,002.00           |
| September    | 227,999.50           |
| October      | 234,306.50           |
| November     | 118,892.00           |
| December     | 83,603.00            |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>£1,952,069.50</b> |



(b) Coach Park Parking Fees, March-December 2003

|              | £                 |
|--------------|-------------------|
| March 2003   | 9,160.00          |
| April        | 9,940.00          |
| May          | 11,160.00         |
| June         | 9,590.00          |
| July         | 8,390.00          |
| August       | 8,350.00          |
| September    | 11,300.00         |
| October      | 12,430.00         |
| November     | 6,360.00          |
| December     | 4,780.00          |
|              | <hr/>             |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>£91,460.00</b> |
|              | <hr/>             |

**NO 357 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ST MICHAEL'S CAVE**

On what date did a major tour operator pull out of sending tourists to St Michael's Cave for safety reasons?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

In May 2003, Thomson Travel took a completely unjustified decision without reference to the Gibraltar Tourist Board to stop their clients visiting St Michael's Cave. The GTB in consequence engaged in a successful campaign to make Thomson Travel appreciate that the Cave is safe for visitors and that the reports that they had heard to the contrary were completely without foundation. Thomson Travel visitors therefore continue to visit the Cave.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 357 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Did the decision by Thomson follow several accidents at the Cave on the part of tourists who had come to Gibraltar with them?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

As Thomson Travel reported to us that there had been a few, and I cannot really quantify but it must have been something like maybe two, three, four, accidents that had been suffered by senior citizens who had visited the Cave and had fallen and therefore they decided that they were not going to continue offering St Michael's Cave as part of the Rock Tour because they thought it was unsafe so we then contacted the relevant management that had taken that decision, brought them over to Gibraltar, showed them the Cave, produced the relevant Health and Safety

Reports that had been produced and they were convinced that in fact the Cave was safe for them to continue with their tours.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it not also the case that members of staff working at the Cave have also had similar accidents to these senior citizens, presumably those are not senior citizens as well?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am not aware of any member of staff actually having had an accident in the Cave. They may have but it definitely has not come to my knowledge.

**NO 358 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BARBARY APES**

How many apes have been killed in 2002 and in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of six in 2002 and 35 in 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 358 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA**

Do Government continue to look into other options such as exporting the apes to zoos or parks in other parts of the world or has that avenue now been closed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No. That continues to be our policy and GONHS who have management responsibility for the apes consider all other options before they consider the culling of the apes. Once the decision has been taken that culling is the only option I can assure the hon Member that all other options will have been explored.

ORAL

NO 359 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**AIRLINES**

With how many airlines interested in flying to Gibraltar are Government currently in discussion with?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos 360 to 365 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 360 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES**

At what stage are the discussions with the five airlines which were interested in flying to Gibraltar at the last Question Time in the House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 359 and 361 to 365 of 2004.

**NO 361 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES**

How many airlines have expressed an interest in establishing air links between Gibraltar and the South West region of the UK?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 359, 360 and 362 to 365 of 2004.

**NO 362 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES**

Are there on-going negotiations with Flybe with the aim of opening an air route between Gibraltar and the South West England?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 359 to 361 and 363 to 365 of 2004.



**NO 363 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES**

Do Fly Europa remain interested in flying to Gibraltar and when was the last time the Government had contact with them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 359 to 362, 364 and 365 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 364 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES**

How does Government expect the commercial agreement between Iberia and British Airways to impact on flights to Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 359 to 363 and 365 of 2004.

**NO 365 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES**

When do Government foresee the resumption of air links between Gibraltar and Morocco?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Government are presently in discussion with four airlines. None of these airlines are airlines with which the Government was previously in discussion: at present there is no dialogue with those five airlines. Two airlines have expressed an interest in a route between Gibraltar and South West England, one of which is Flybe and discussions with them continue. Government last had contact with Fly Europa in April 2003 and it would appear that the airline is no longer in existence. Government would wish to see the resumption of air links between Gibraltar and Morocco but there is no immediate prospect of this happening. The Government do not expect any impact on flights to Gibraltar consequent on the commercial discussions between British Airways and Iberia.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 359 TO 365 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister said that he is in discussion with four airlines. That all the four airlines are new and that two of the four are in respect of links between Gibraltar and the southwest, can the Minister say whether the other two airlines he is in discussion with will open up new routes from Gibraltar airport to a new airport not being served at present?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible for him to say what airport these are or to give an indication of regional nature, north of England, south, Wales et cetera?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We are talking of Stanstead and Bristol.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the airlinks with Morocco which the Minister has said there is now no prospect of re-establishing those links, is it the case that the on-going discussions with regional airlines have now finally and definitely come to an end?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

My understanding is that Regional Airlines have had problems and so therefore there has been a complete change of management and strategy and the long-term prospects of the airline are at risk at the moment. Therefore, the possibilities of coming to an arrangement at least in the short to medium term are quite remote.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am not certain whether it was Regional Airlines or whether it was another airline that was interested in flying a Morocco route including Gibraltar as a stopover, can he confirm to me if that was Regional airlines or was it a different carrier?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It was not Regional Airlines it was another operator that came but there was no stopover it was Gibraltar/North Africa type of link. It included Tetuan and Tangiers it came and went nowhere to be seen again.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Do Government consider it important to develop airlinks between Gibraltar and Morocco in the light of business contacts Interreg Funds et cetera and if so what further can be done to encourage that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government would greatly welcome and would enormously value there being airlinks between Gibraltar and Morocco but at the end of the day the marketplace has got to itself decide whether such a service is commercially viable for the operator. The Government attempts to bring its desires about firstly by talking to people and to applicants and then by participating with them in a negotiation about a degree of publicly funded subsidy of some sort so those are the two ways in which the Government goes about trying to bring it about but at the end of the day just to answer the hon Member's last part about how much more can the Government do, not much more. The Government certainly cannot go so far as to in effect underwrite the commercial viability or the full cost of the operation on an open ended basis it is not that important although it would be desirable. There is a Question on the Order Paper about even the ferry links to Morocco are down to two a week which appears to be what there is demand. The amount of traffic movement that there is however desirable he and I might both agree that it is the actual traffic that exists does not seem to sustain commercial operations for it.

**NO 366 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SEA LINKS – GIBRALTAR/MOROCCO**

How many operators are currently providing a service by sea between Gibraltar and Morocco and with what frequency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There is a single operator who runs a service on the route on Fridays and Sundays.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 366 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it that the operator leaves Gibraltar and goes to Morocco on the Friday and then comes back on the Sunday or is it a round trip on each day?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No the current operator leaves Morocco on a Friday arrives in Gibraltar and goes back on the same day. On Sunday the same operation is done. Between that time it actually travels to other ports in the area.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The information given by the Minister in this House is in conflict with the information in the Government's Tourism Website when I last looked at it where the indications were that there was a daily service leaving in the mornings and returning in the afternoons, a round trip every day, can the Minister ensure that the information

provided to the tourists who may wish to visit Morocco through Gibraltar is corrected on the Tourist Board's Website?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.

**NO 367 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BOUTIQUE LINER TERMINAL**

Can Government say whether there has been any progress on discussions with a private sector operator to set up a boutique liner terminal in connection with an existing berthing site in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 367 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are there still any on-going discussions regarding the setting up of the boutique liner terminal in connection with an existing berthing site?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When we originally raised this issue in the House the Minister mentioned that there were two or three sites which were being considered and it emerged subsequently that there was another site in connection with the east side project for this, is it now definitely the case that all the other discussions have fallen through and the only one that remains is the east side project?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**NO 368 OF 2004****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****HOTEL ARREARS**

What amounts are due and owing to Government by hotels broken down by item and in respect of which period these monies become due as at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2003 and 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The hon Member has been asking at each meeting of the House how much is owed by hotels in respect of arrears, to monitor the success or otherwise of the Government in recovering debts in respect of social insurance, PAYE and electricity which totalled nearly £1 million. This was the situation inherited by the Government when it came into office in May 1996. The success of the Government in this area is testimony to the way in which tourism in Gibraltar has grown and hotel occupancy increased thereby allowing hotels to clear a large proportion of this debt. Of the original £924,000 owed to the Government, the following amounts remained outstanding on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2003 and 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003:-

|                                |                  |         |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2003     | PAYE             | £46,180 |
|                                | Electricity      | £91,876 |
|                                | Social Insurance | £19,164 |
| 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2003 | PAYE             | £ 2,180 |
|                                | Electricity      | £53,876 |
|                                | Social Insurance | £ 9,164 |

The total amount still outstanding is therefore about £65,000, and this will be recovered during the first half of 2004.

**NO 369 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CRUISE LINERS**

Can Government say what the latest position is in relation to cruise liners calling at Gibraltar from a Spanish port, or sailing to a Spanish port from Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Both the operations described in the question happen frequently and routinely.

ORAL

NO 370 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**MEDCRUISE**

What was the cost to the Government of hosting the meeting of the MedCruise Board of Directors in London in September?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The cost was £974.00.

**NO 371 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CRUISE LINERS**

What steps are the Government taking to encourage the development of full-day tours for cruise passengers visiting Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

In cases where a cruise call at Gibraltar is scheduled for a full day, the Government urges Shore Excursion Agents to develop new products to offer cruise passengers. This will encourage more passengers to go on organised tours. Given the size of Gibraltar, it is not feasible to offer a full-day tour. That only occurs at ports where passengers need to travel a certain distance from the ship because places of interest to tour are a greater distance from the port than is the case with Gibraltar. Nor would it be in the commercial interests of retail businesses in Gibraltar that cruise passengers be engaged in organised tours all day.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 371 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it not the case that the Minister in the past has highlighted the lack of full day tours as one of the reasons why cruise operators might prefer to go into another port as opposed to coming to Gibraltar?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Could you repeat the question again please?

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it not the case that in the past the Minister has highlighted the lack of full day tours as one of the reasons why cruise operators may prefer to go to another port rather than come to Gibraltar?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely, what I have said in the past is that obviously the geography and the possibility that are available in Gibraltar due to its size makes it difficult to get cruise calls into Gibraltar for a full day. Let me say that, for example, when one compares the likes of say Malaga and Cadiz when cruise calls actually call at Malaga they are actually intending for tours in Granada and so therefore they tend to be travelling for a couple of hours there and back so the actual tour in itself has a longer duration. When it happens in Cadiz they end up in Sevilla or in Jerez. In Gibraltar if they turn to find themselves within the Upper Rock within minutes of arrival so therefore they find that they can basically carry out the same function in Gibraltar by actually calling in Gibraltar for four to six hours which is the average duration of a cruise call.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In his budget address this financial year which was at the end of June, the Minister said that it is important to highlight one of the problems which Gibraltar suffers with compared to other ports of call in the region. The Gibraltar tours that are sold on board do not allow for full day tours for which a cruise operator can charge a high premium price and make a substantial profit. What this means is that cruise operators are unable to make as much money from shore excursions at Gibraltar when compared with other ports. Given that the Minister accepts that this is what he has been saying what action is the Government taking to try and encourage that the development of these full day tours in terms of, for example, I know that the normal Rock Tour might take two or three hours but combining it with shopping and combining it with some of the other excursions where the Rock tours do not normally stop at or allow enough time for passengers to see the whole of the area. Is Government not thinking of taking any action or encouraging tour operators to take any action in this area considering the problem was identified by Government?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think where the confusion is is in the actual duration of the visit and the duration of the tour. The duration of the visit obviously we try and encourage cruises to visit Gibraltar for as long as possible. The duration of the tours have limitations as I have explained before what we try and do is actually try and see whether we can get cruises to actually stay in Gibraltar for longer but not necessarily on tour. We prefer them obviously to spend some of their time going through the shopping experience in Gibraltar and actually spending money in our economy rather than actually being bussed around which really generates very little for the economy as such apart to the tour operators themselves.

**NO 372 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ARRIVAL OF YACHTS**

What special security arrangements were put in place for the control of yachts arriving at Queensway Quay when the security state in Gibraltar rose to amber in April/May of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yachts arriving at Queensway Quay prior to the increase in security alert state did not need to report to the Yacht Reporting Berth. With the change in the security alert state, the Government did not consider this acceptable. The operators of the Marina therefore implemented new measures, to the satisfaction of the Government, to ensure that yachts arriving at Queensway Quay had to report to the proper authorities on arrival at the Marina. I can write to the hon Member to furnish more exact details, which is not prudent to discuss openly in this House.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 372 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If the Minister does that we would be grateful for the information but presumably every yacht that came into Gibraltar in that time went through those procedures so there would not necessarily be any secret but if the Minister prefers to put it in writing we will accept that.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I will.

**NO 373 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**YACHT VISITS**

Can the Government supply figures for the length of stay of yachts in Gibraltar on a monthly basis for 2001, 2002, and 2003 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 374 of 2004.



**NO 374 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**YACHT VISITS**

Can Government supply the figures for marina occupancy by yachts on a monthly basis for each month of 2001, 2002 and 2003 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is not information which the Government have to hand, as this is not statistical information which is supplied to the Government on a regular basis. The Marinas have been asked to supply the information sought and once it is received it will be sent to the hon Member.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 373 AND 374 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

*"This information is not supplied to the Government on a regular basis,"* is his answer can he say when it was last supplied to the Government?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

In terms of statistics I believe that it was when we were having this exchange of press releases as to whether marinas were actually in deterioration or actually performing better and at that point I did seek some information. I then followed that up recently but in terms of whether the occupancies were actually increasing or whether there was any decrease and the information that was given to me was that the occupancy levels were increasing. We have asked for them but marinas fail to deliver this within the short period of time that we requested.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

But does the Minister accept that when we had that exchange and that was in May of last year the marina yacht occupancy figures and the marina length of stay of yacht figures are not part of the official statistics so therefore there would not be figures that will be available to the Opposition?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes that information has not been supplied to him or supplied to me unless I ask them.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I say that because during his budget contribution which was in June the month after we had the exchange the Minister said, "*...what Dr Garcia fails to do is analyse whether the length of stay of yachts has increased.*" Given that that the information is not part of the authorised statistics and is not available to the Opposition not even to the Government it was something quite difficult for us to do but I take the point that the Minister has written to the marinas and we expect that information when he receives it.

**NO 375 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**YACHT VISITS**

Can Government say, on a monthly basis , of the number of yachts that called at Queensway Quay in 2002 and 2003 how many yachts were monitored and visited on arrival by:

- (a) Customs officers?
- (b) The Immigration authorities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 376 of 2004.

**NO 376 OF 2004****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****YACHT VISITS**

Can Government say how many yachts arrived at Queensway Quay for each month of 2002 and 2003 to date?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is being supplied to the hon Gentleman in written format.

**Answer to Question No 376 of 2004****Yacht Arrivals at Queensway Quay 2002 and 2003**

The following are the yacht arrivals at Queensway Quay. They were cleared by customs as follows:

| Month     | Yachts<br>2002 | Cleared by<br>Fax | Visit<br>and/or<br>searched | Yachts<br>2003 | Cleared by<br>Fax | Visited<br>and/or<br>searched |
|-----------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| January   | 22             | 22                | -                           | 22             | 21                | 1                             |
| February  | 30             | 28                | 2                           | 25             | 24                | 1                             |
| March     | 45             | 45                | -                           | 48             | 46                | 2                             |
| April     | 77             | 77                | -                           | 89             | -                 | 89                            |
| May       | 138            | 138               | -                           | 148            | -                 | 148                           |
| June      | 160            | 160               | -                           | 135            | -                 | 135                           |
| July      | 174            | 174               | -                           | 164            | -                 | 164                           |
| August    | 190            | 190               | -                           | 160            | 64                | 96                            |
| September | 125            | 125               | -                           | 118            | 95                | 23                            |
| October   | 97             | 97                | -                           | 67             | 53                | 14                            |
| November  | 91             | 91                | -                           | 48             | 37                | 11                            |
| December  | 42             | 42                | -                           | 16             | 12                | 4                             |

**Notes:**

During 2002 all yachts arriving at Queensway Quay were cleared by fax communication between the Marina and Customs. Customs visited and/or searched yachts only when suspicious.

As a result of a heightened State of Alert, all yachts arriving at Queensway Marina were visited and/or searched by Customs from 21 March 2003 to 14 August 2003.

This was reduced to only 20 per cent being visited and/or searched from 15 August 2003 to date.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 375 AND 376 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What the figures show is that these are the figures in relation to the yacht arrivals at Queensway Quay that were cleared by Customs is that in fact if my reading of this is correct the Minister can correct me if I am wrong is that in the whole of 2002 of the several hundred yachts that arrived at Queensway Quay Marina only two were visited or searched the rest of them were cleared by fax is that the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is the correct, obviously the situation changes in the year 2003 especially during the period in which there were high alerts.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The situation then changes as he says in 2003 in relation to the alerts and also in relation to the fact that this situation came out in public at the time although it seems to me that after April and May is when every yacht is actually visited and searched. I am grateful for the information.

**NO 377 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CRUISE LINERS**

What arrangements have been put in place to ensure that the tourist sites remain open when there is a cruise liner in port?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The question implies that it is only of recent date that arrangements have been put in place to ensure that tourist sites are open outside normal hours to service cruise ships' needs. This is not the case. It was an early priority of the Government to ensure that this happened. At the request of Shore Excursion Agents, the GTB ensure that staff are available to man the sites outside normal hours every day of the year except Christmas Day.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 377 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I know this is not really a tourist site but are Government aware whether the cable car itself remains open when there is a cruise liner in port that may come in late?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

As the hon Member clearly points out the cable car is a private commercial entity which takes a commercial decision as to whether it wishes to have its facilities available or not but from what I understand it depends on the cruise ship that is in port whether it does open or not.

ORAL

**NO 378 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BEACH LIFEGUARDS**

What was the commencement and termination date for the contract offered to beach lifeguards for the official bathing season for 2003 and which public holidays were they entitled to during that period?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 379 and 380 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 379 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BEACH LIFEGUARDS**

How many beach lifeguards were employed by the Gibraltar Development Corporation for the official bathing season for 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 378 and 380 of 2004.



**NO 380 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TEMPORARY VISITOR INFORMATION PATROL OFFICERS**

How many Temporary Visitor Information Patrol Officers were employed by the Gibraltar Tourist Board for the period 7 July to 5 September 2003 and how many public holidays were they entitled to during the period of the contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of 14 Temporary Visitor Information Patrol Officers were employed, and there were 28 lifeguards at the start of the season on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2003, although there was not full lifeguard cover at the end of the season on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2003, because some persons resigned.

The VIP officers were not required to work on 25<sup>th</sup> August, a public holiday.

Lifeguards were rostered to provide cover at beaches on a seven day a week basis and only enjoyed a public holiday if it fell on a rostered day off.

**NO 381 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERMINALS SUPERVISOR**

Can Government say how many persons applied for the post of Terminals Supervisor advertised on 23 April and how many posts were available?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There were 32 applicants for two Information Officer vacancies and 10 applicants for the one Terminal Supervisor vacancy.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 348 AND 381 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Did I understand that in answer to Question No 348 of 2004 it was two applicants?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

A total of 32 applicants.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say first in relation to the vacancies for Information Officer whether those vacancies have now been filled?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No 348 of 2004 it asked how many posts were available?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I have said in my answer that there were 32 applicants for two Information Officer vacancies.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No 381 of 2004 it was 10 applicants for how many vacancies?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

One.

**NO 382 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MOROCCAN TOURISM MINISTER**

Does the Minister for Tourism have a date for his next meeting with the Moroccan Tourism Minister and if so when is it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 382 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Minister first met with his Moroccan counterpart at a trade fair did the Minister announce an intention to organise a visit by himself to Morocco or by his counterpart to Gibraltar and if so why has that visit not materialised?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

When I met the Minister for Tourism from Morocco in FITUR in Madrid and we agreed that this was going to be the case that I would visit Morocco and he in turn would visit Gibraltar. Unfortunately due to security threats in Morocco between the period of March to the summer period, this did not happen as they recommended that there should not be any official visits during this period. We then subsequently agreed to meet at World Travel Market but unfortunately the elections had been called by then so we agreed that we would re-establish contact with each other after the elections. This has not yet happened.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Am I correct in understanding that the Minister has only met with his Moroccan counterpart once not twice?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No. We have met twice we have met in Madrid in FITUR and then subsequently at World Travel Market in November last year.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the question that we discussed earlier of airlinks between Gibraltar and Morocco one of the issues discussed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not think it is really appropriate that I should comment on our discussions on specific matters.

**NO 383 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews have been carried out with persons who said that they had not stayed at a hotel since March 2003 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 384 and 385 of 2004.

**NO 384 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews with persons who said that they had stayed at a hotel have been carried out since March 2003 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 383 and 385 of 2004.

**NO 385 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government state of the number of persons who have been interviewed since March 2003 inclusive, who said that they had stayed at a hotel, how many were interviewed at the airport, how many were interviewed at the land frontier and how many were interviewed elsewhere, and in each case what was the average length of stay in hotels?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought by the hon Gentleman is being submitted in written format.



**Answer to Question 385 of 2004**

Answer to Question 383

Interviews of persons who did not stay at a Hotel in Gibraltar

(a)

| 2003      | Total Persons Interviewed | PLACE OF INTERVIEW |      |          |           |        |            |
|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------|------|----------|-----------|--------|------------|
|           |                           | Airport            | Port | Frontier | Waterport | Marina | Coach Park |
| March     | 1389                      | 30                 | 11   | 763      | -         | 1      | 584        |
| April     | 1376                      | 27                 | 173  | 676      | -         | -      | 500        |
| May       | 1864                      | 63                 | 168  | 918      | 1         | -      | 714        |
| June      | 1444                      | 37                 | 99   | 684      | -         | -      | 624        |
| July      | 957                       | 10                 | 170  | 471      | -         | -      | 306        |
| August    | 927                       | 30                 | 217  | 292      | -         | 1      | 387        |
| September | 1015                      | 22                 | 214  | 534      | -         | 2      | 243        |
| October   | 611                       | 4                  | 3    | 591      | -         | 9      | 4          |
| November  | 625                       | 1                  | 12   | 572      | 19        | 21     | -          |
| December  | -                         | -                  | -    | -        | -         | -      | -          |

Answer to Question 384

Interviews of Persons who stayed at Hotels in Gibraltar

(b)

| 2003      | Total Persons Interviewed | PLACE OF INTERVIEW |          |      |            |
|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------|------|------------|
|           |                           | Airport            | Frontier | Port | Coach Park |
| March     | 56                        | 50                 | 3        | -    | 3          |
| April     | 23                        | 22                 | -        | 1    | -          |
| May       | 44                        | 43                 | 1        | -    | -          |
| June      | 59                        | 55                 | 4        | -    | -          |
| July      | 17                        | 17                 | -        | -    | -          |
| August    | 34                        | 33                 | 1        | -    | -          |
| September | 37                        | 36                 | 1        | -    | -          |
| October   | 7                         | 7                  | -        | -    | -          |
| November  | 6                         | 6                  | -        | -    | -          |
| December  | -                         | -                  | -        | -    | -          |

Answer to Question 385

Interviews of Persons who stayed at Hotels in Gibraltar

(c)

| 2003      | Total Persons Interviewed | PLACE OF INTERVIEW |                        |          |                        |           |                        |
|-----------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------|------------------------|
|           |                           | Airport            | Average length of stay | Frontier | Average length of stay | Elsewhere | Average length of stay |
| March     | 56                        | 50                 | 4.8                    | 3        | 2.5                    | 3         | 1.0                    |
| April     | 23                        | 22                 | 5.6                    | -        | -                      | 1         | 1.0                    |
| May       | 44                        | 43                 | 4.5                    | 1        | 4.0                    | -         | -                      |
| June      | 59                        | 55                 | 4.7                    | 4        | 2.5                    | -         | -                      |
| July      | 17                        | 17                 | 5.1                    | -        | -                      | -         | -                      |
| August    | 34                        | 33                 | 7.8                    | 1        | 14.0                   | -         | -                      |
| September | 37                        | 36                 | 5.5                    | 1        | 7.0                    | -         | -                      |
| October   | 7                         | 7                  | 5.9                    | -        | -                      | -         | -                      |
| November  | 6                         | 6                  | 3.7                    | -        | -                      | -         | -                      |
| December  | -                         | -                  | -                      | -        | -                      | -         | -                      |

**NO 386 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY BOOK**

How much was paid:-

- (a) to the author,
- (b) to the photographer,
- (c) to the printer,

of the Tercentenary book "300 years of British Gibraltar 1704-2004?"

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 387 to 390 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 387 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY BOOK**

What profit, if any, are Government projected to make from the sale of the Tercentenary book?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 386 and 388 to 390 of 2004.

**NO 388 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY BOOK**

How many copies of the Tercentenary Book, "300 Years of British Gibraltar 1704-2004", have been printed, and what was the printing cost per book?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 386, 387, 389 and 390 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 389 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY BOOK**

Can Government say whether the £25 cost of the Tercentenary book is subsidised by the taxpayer in any way?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 386 to 388 and 390 of 2004.

**NO 390 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY BOOK**

On what basis and using what criteria did the Government select the author, photographer and printer for the Tercentenary book?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government have not paid the author, the photographer or the printer anything for the Tercentenary Book "300 Years of British Gibraltar 1704-2004." The Government merely committed themselves to purchasing 2,800 books of the 8,200 print run. Some of these books are for marketing use and for presentations. The Government are the sole supplier of the book to bookshops and purchasers who had not placed advance orders with the publisher, and have already recouped more than half of the cost of the books it ordered. The intention is not to make a profit from the sale of the book but to cover costs and there is every likelihood that this will be achieved. This book has not been subsidised by the tax payer. I am prepared to write to the hon Member to inform him of the printing cost per book as this is confidential commercial information. The author and publisher of the book, Mr Peter Bond, was approached by the Tercentenary Committee because of his excellent track record in producing the Millennium book, "Impressions of Gibraltar". As publisher, Mr Bond selected his preferred photographer and printer as the Government were not paying for the publication of the book.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 386 TO 390 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Just to clarify a couple of points in relation to the answer that the Minister has given to the five questions, is the Minister saying then that the Government have been charged £25.00 for each of the 2,800 books that it committed itself to purchase?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, Government have paid the cost of the book.

**NO 391 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY WEBSITE**

When did the design of the Gibraltar Government Tercentenary website go out to tender, how many parties expressed an interest, and for what amount was the contract awarded to the successful party?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The design did not go out to tender. As designer for the Tercentenary logo, Mr Stephen Perera was asked to develop the theme through the website. In respect of creative work of this nature, it is often very difficult or impossible to go through a tender process. A certain standard of creative excellence is required and a proven ability to deliver in the way that the Government envisages can usually only be obtained by going direct to a graphic designer who has worked in a particular field and understands its needs. The key element is value for money.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 391 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that the key element is value for money and the question asks what amount the Government paid, does the Minister have that information?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes. The design and set up costs were £1,700. There is a website maintenance of £220 per month.



**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In respect of the £220 a month website maintenance what maintenance exactly does the website require?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There will be constant update of information that will need to be added to the website and various changes made depending on how the programme develops throughout the year.

ORAL

**NO 392 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY - COSTS**

What are the terms and the cost of advertising the Tercentenary on 40 London taxis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 393 of 2004.

**NO 393 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY - COSTS**

What was the cost of having the Tercentenary design painted on the side of 40 London taxis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A contract for 40 London taxis to advertise Gibraltar and our Tercentenary was entered into in the sum of £9,066.67 per calendar month, which equates £226 per taxi per month. This sum includes the design and painting of the taxis in question.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 392 AND 392 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Just to clarify the point, the Minister has said that the cost of painting the Gibraltar Tercentenary design and the cost of advertising together comes to £9,066 per month for the duration of the year?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The contract actually started on the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2003 and terminates on the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004.

ORAL

**NO 394 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS CO-ORDINATOR**

How many people applied for the post of Tercentenary Events Co-ordinator?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No 395 of 2004.

**NO 395 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS CO-ORDINATOR**

What are the conditions of the contract of employment of the Gibraltar Government Tercentenary Events Co-ordinator?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There were five applicants for the post of Gibraltar Government Tercentenary Events Co-ordinator. The contract is with GRP Conference Limited and requires it to be discharged by Mrs Marilou Guerrero personally. The contract fee is £40,000 per annum and its duration is 15 months. The duties are the co-ordination and organisation of events and other initiatives to celebrate 300 years of British Gibraltar as directed by the Tercentenary Events Director.

ORAL

NO 396 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

How many ideas for Tercentenary events were submitted by members of the public and what were they?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos 397 to 400 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 397 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY - COSTS**

What was the cost of commissioning the Tercentenary logo and how many different designs were submitted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 396 and 398 to 400 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 398 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY – COSTS**

What is the Government's budget, with a breakdown, for the Tercentenary events planned for this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 396, 397, 399 and 400 of 2004.



**NO 399 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What Tercentenary events other than the church service and the Parliamentary dinner are planned to take place in the United Kingdom?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 396 to 398 and 400 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 400 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What Tercentenary events followed directly from proposals made by members of the public?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information sought by the hon Member is being submitted in written format.

#### **Answer to Question 400**

(a) There were 57 ideas submitted by the general public for Tercentenary events. They are listed below. Those which have been adopted, sometimes with certain changes, are marked with an asterisk.

1. Bars and catering outlets along Main Street to go to the streets from Casemates to the Convent. Drinking vessels with logo could be sold to revellers.
2. Organise a "Real Ale" campaign (British beer) in liaison with local breweries.
3. Promote and enhance local cuisine in participating outlets.
4. International Nursing Conference.
5. Military Tattoo.\*
6. Start 2004 with a Midnight Bonfire and Fireworks at Eastern Beach.
7. Parade of historic events with floats.
8. Parade of floats.
9. "Tall Ship Battle" similar to cardboard boat race.
10. Stay in Gibraltar Day – Fancy Dress Competition for different age groups.
11. A competition to design a new flag for Gibraltar that has all the historical connections but no Spanish link.
12. A cavalcade of thematic floats and other topical themes.
13. Re-unite 60's and 70's groups (ie The Diamond Boys) and perform for us the Gibraltarians 40 or 30 years later.
14. Marching bands to perform (Rooke, St John's, Gib Regiment, Scouts, etc)\*
15. Quiz on relevant topics
16. Freedom of City Parade by the Royal Engineers is scheduled for 20/3/04.
17. Special Commemorative £50 note with the theme of The Rock's 1704 in its "Battleground Series" of publications.\*
18. Tercentenary Stamp issue to include a stamp book and a high value £10 stamp or stamp sheetlet to denote significance of Tercentenary.\*
19. The commemorative, uncirculated and standard 2004 Gib coins to contain themes of the 1704 capture.\*
20. Lobby "Osprey Publications" as to the possibility of publishing a book on the British capture of Gib in 1704 in its "Battleground Series" of publications.

Cont..

**Contd Answer to Question 400 of 2004**

21. Lobby "Leo Cooper/Pen & Sword Books Ltd" as to the possibility of creating a book on the British capture of Gibraltar in 1704 in its "Battleground Series" of publications.
22. Questionnaire on Gibraltar aimed at different age groups.
23. A football match to be played against a premier soccer team. Similar activity with cricket and rugby.
24. Organise a Regatta in the bay.
25. Regatta.
26. Play spanning 300 years of Gibraltar's British History.
27. CD Tunnel Visions could be performed at St Michael's Cave. CD could also be sold in Gibraltar as a promotional tool.
28. Lobby "Cromwell Productions" as to the possibility of creating a documentary of the British capture of Gibraltar in 1704. This could then be offered for sale in dvd/vhs format. It could also be produced for TV Broadcasting as an episode of Cromwell's "History of Warfare" or "Line of Fire" series.
29. Try to arrange that a "Songs of Praise" programme be recorded in Gibraltar.\*
30. Working tableaux at Casemates (people in period dress going about their tasks).
31. Recreate Gibraltar as it was 300 years ago.
32. Making a documentary on the 300 years of Gibraltar British history.
33. 4<sup>th</sup> August 2004 to be made a Bank Holiday.\*
34. The Burial of a Time Capsule.
35. Invite a Member of the Royal family.\*
36. Sell souvenirs and wares throughout Main Street and locate musicians of all types of music (except Spanish) at allocated and reserved points.
37. Walkway from Casemates to Ragged Staff. Also opening of King's Bastion and possible visits to the Convent Gardens.
38. Develop route of Green Lane and old Queen's Road enabling tourists to visit the old Genoese Battery and Devil's Gap Battery.
39. Walkway from Casemates to Moorish Castle and Queen's Lines.
40. Donating three thousand red and white carnations for the week.

cont...

**Contd Answer to Question 400 of 2004**

41. Miscellaneous.
  42. The Queen or a member of the Royal family invited to visit Gibraltar.\*
  43. National Day to be celebrated in August instead of September for 2004 only.
  44. A statue or column of Admiral Rooke be commissioned and placed in the centre of the new John Mackintosh Square or the pillar and statue of General Elliot at the Alameda Gardens be re-sited at John Mackintosh Square.
  45. Invite representative members of all the Regiments who took part in the capture of Gibraltar in 1704.\*
  46. A Genoese militia (who defended the Eastside) be banded together in typical dress of the times.
  47. Offer free use of premises for any event available to meet to discuss and explore other ways in which the Club can contribute to the celebrations.
  48. Event in the USA.\*
  49. Porcelain doll exhibition.
  50. Exhibition related to 300 years of British Gibraltar consisting of family trees of Gibraltar families showing their origins.
  51. Gibraltar Museum to create a special Tercentenary Exhibition in 2004 in its Casemates Exhibition rooms.
  52. Short story competition organised by GBC or any other institution.
  53. Poster/logo competition.
  54. Historical period exhibition held at John Mackintosh Hall.
  55. Llanito Literary Competition.
  56. Living History Exhibition.
  57. Exhibition based on British Gibraltar.
- (b) The additional UK events are:
- a Thanksgiving Service in the City of London Synagogue
  - a Philatelic exhibition of Gibraltar Stamps in London
  - Gibraltar Day in the City of London
  - A Gibraltar exhibition in the Jewish Museum of the City of London

cont...

**Contd Answer to Question 400 of 2004**

- (c) The specific budget for Tercentenary events in the present financial year is £100,000. The budget for 2004/5 has yet to be presented to this House, and this will be done at the appropriate moment. It is not possible at this stage to provide the detailed breakdown sought.
- (d) The cost of designing the Tercentenary logo was £1,500. 18 designs were submitted.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 396 TO 400 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The answer to Question No 400 which is that there is a list of 57 events submitted by the general public , it is quite a lengthy list so does the Minister know offhand how many of those have been adopted as events which are going to take place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am not sure how many. I can tell the hon Member that all were considered and those that have been taken onboard appear in the provisional programme that has been made public. I think the hon Member will have to do this exercise himself.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The answer to another question. The cost of the Tercentenary logo is that the cost of designing the logo was £1,500 and that 18 designs were submitted, is the Minister in a position to say whether this £1,500 was the cheapest of the 18 or how did it fare?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The design work was actually presented by one individual. They submitted different options and obviously it kept on coming for comment and going back for further changes and eventually there were 18 submissions before the final logo was approved.

ORAL

**NO 401 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say which tenderer withdrew from the award of the east side project tender, on what date and for what reason?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 402 to 407 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 402 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Is there a second choice of preferred bidder for the East Side Project on stand-by in case the first choice does not satisfy the Government in some respect?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos 401 and 403 to 407 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 403 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

What is the preferred bidder for the East Side Project expected to do within the 90 days given?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 401, 402 and 404 to 407 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 404 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government give the reasons why it took them about nine months to decide who was the preferred bidder for the East Side Project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 401 to 403 and 405 to 407 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 405 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government now say whether a full environmental impact assessment will be required in respect of the east side project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 401 to 404, 406 and 407 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 406 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government list the parties that submitted tenders for the East Side Development Project, with a brief outline of the project, indicating which were local consortiums and which were not, and showing the sum of money bid by each?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos 401 to 405 and 407 of 2004.

**NO 407 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EASTSIDE DEVELOPMENT**

On what basis was one particular tenderer for the East Side project selected as the preferred bidder and given the sole option for 90 days?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The preferred bidder for the Eastside project was required to negotiate the terms of a Development Licence Agreement with the Government within a period of 90 days from the start of negotiations. Should the negotiations fail, there are other short-listed parties which submitted proposals which the Government can consider. One party withdrew from the tender but it is not appropriate at this stage to name the entity concerned or to provide information on the reasons for its decision nor is it possible to provide the details sought in respect of who the tenders were together with details of the project submitted or why one tenderer had been selected as the preferred bidder. The tender has not been awarded yet. Until such time as negotiations with the tenderer are successfully concluded the issue of an environmental impact study does not arise. With regards to the time taken to decide on the preferred bidder the hon Member should realise that the development of the eastside is a major project. Government must ensure that the right decisions are taken. A short list of projects had to be considered in detail and analysed. All short-listed tenderers were asked to submit to further and better particulars of their project. They in turn required assistance and advice which took time to obtain. There was a need for presentations by bidders, discussions with them and the eventual choice of the preferred bidder. The Government are satisfied that there was no undue delay in deciding on the preferred bidder.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 401 TO 407 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has said that there are other short-listed parties in answer to one of the question, can he say how many more other short-listed parties are there?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think that this information has already been made available to the House previously but if not, there were three short-listed parties.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that there were a number of questions taken together I will go through them one by one for supplementaries. In relation to Question No 403 of 2004 and Question No 407 of 2004 which referred to the preferred bidder giving the option for 90 days by the choice of the preferred bidder was announced by the Government in a statement that they issued on 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2003. If my calculations are correct, we are already above 90 days, can the Minister say whether an agreement has been reached within 90 days or has an extension been provided to continue the negotiations?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The actual 90 days commenced on the 19<sup>th</sup> August 2003 and the 90 day period concluded on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2003. That fell just a few days before the general election so an extension was granted to the negotiating process in order for us to go through the election process and then take a decision.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There is something that does not quite tally. On the 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2003 which is midway through the 90 days in the way that the hon Member has just explained, Government are sued a statement which says, “*..following the public tender process Government have awarded one of the bidders preferred bidder status, this means that they have a 90 day exclusive negotiating right period to reach a detailed and binding agreement with the Government. Those negotiations are now under way.*” This gives the impression that the 90 days started on the 3<sup>rd</sup> October and 90 days from then on the Government will be negotiating with this preferred bidder, is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The 90 days is an initial period that the ‘preferred bidder’ is entitled to and cannot hold the Government to more. In other words, it is a maximum entitlement to period by the preferred bidder but the Government are free to extent for as long as it likes and to give extensions for as long as it likes provided that it is satisfied that satisfactory progress is being made towards reaching an agreement. That is the

position that we are at the moment, only this week the 'preferred bidder' has asked the Government for a further extension and Government will continue to give short extensions whilst we believe that the preferred bidder is negotiating with the Government seriously and with a view to reaching a doable deal. That is the position subject to what the next supplementaries might be I am going to ask the hon Gentleman not to press us further. All of this information is of some commercial value to the other side to the extent that the hon Member gets us to explain our attitude towards extensions in public. These things are useful for the other side to know and therefore given that this is a large commercially sensitive and commercially significant in terms of both development and premium value to the Government, I think that the Government will not allow itself to be pressed further in answer to any question which involves information which involves the negotiations with the 'preferred bidder'. Obviously if the hon Member has other aspects of the project to ask we would be very happy to give them information.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am grateful for that clarification that was the point that we were trying to establish to see whether in fact there had been extensions granted beyond the 90 days and the Chief Minister has confirmed that there have been and there will be, at least one, that was the point that we wanted to establish. The other issue is more specific and perhaps the Minister will be able to answer it, is he in a position to say whether the projects will contain one or two hotels as it is currently envisaged?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Again it relates to the content but I will try to give him the maximum amount of information consistent with the Government's negotiating interests. The Government's requirement is for a minimum of one and that is the position that Government adopted with all bidders and with all tenderers. That has been the Government's position from the outset and it has not changed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the preferred bidder expected or required to put cash up front and presumably this is not something he does not know so he is not going to find out from me putting the question because he must have already been told whether he is expected to put up cash or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The comment that the Leader of the Opposition adds namely that the 'preferred bidder' already knows the answer and therefore there is no reason not to put it in the public domain is actually not exhaustive as to the prejudice that it does to the Government's negotiating procedure because if the negotiations break down with the preferred bidder this information will be of very significant value to the second bidder, somebody with which we might wish to negotiate later would know what it was that we were holding out for with the unsuccessful bidder but given that the Government would not take a different position with the second bidder anyway the position is that the transaction envisages the payment of a substantial premium and that it envisages



that a significant part of that premium will be payable upon the signing of the development licence agreement.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government say whether this project is or perhaps will be linked to the project to expand Eastern Beach and Catalan Bay which was also put out to the tender at the time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Beaches Project which is how the Government knows the project to which the hon Member has referred is a Government project and not a project that will belong to the successful bidder of the east side project. However, because for technical reasons it is desirable both as to cost and as to marrying one project and another it is preferable although not essential that they both be done at the same time and by the same party. One of the options available to the Government are to contract the successful bidder as a contractor to the Government not as a developer of the Beaches Project if he understands me. So, if that were to materialise in that way the successful bidder would be the developer of the east side project and the Government's contractor in respect of the Beaches Project pursuant to a separate contract.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of this substantial sum that they are expected to put up if they are successful it is not that different people have been asked to put up a sum, we are talking about what the Government in its own mind has got as a figure that it is looking for or is it that it is like an auction and different people have said how much are you prepared to pay?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are only negotiating with one party.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When it opened initially was it done like that, when they open bids is that what it was?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. The bids that were submitted included the premium that they were willing to offer.

**NO 408 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**VISIT BY SPANISH TRAVEL JOURNALISTS**

What was the cost of inviting eleven Spanish travel journalists to Gibraltar in November, what media did they represent, and what publicity has been obtained as a result of these visits?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought is being submitted to the hon Gentleman in written format.

The 11 travel journalists were:-

|                        |   |               |
|------------------------|---|---------------|
| Pablo Ignacio Dalmases | - | Onda Cero     |
| Albert Hernaiz         | - | La Vanguardia |
| Carolina Lopez         | - | Guia Del Ocio |
| D Jose Gil Franqueza   | - | De Viajes     |
| Cristina Sanchez       | - | Telva         |
| Ana Ruiz Cortezo       | - | Editur        |
| Pilar Pardinias        | - | Ronda Iberia  |
| Ernesto Melcon         | - | Eventos XXI   |
| Guzman Cobos Garcia    | - | Aire Libre    |
| Victoria Hinojosa      | - | Preferente    |
| Pedro Aviles           | - | Jubilo        |

The cost of the familiarisation trip was £5,080.

An article has already appeared in Preferente. However, the other journalists are committed to publishing articles in the editions of their publications which come out for FITUR in late January 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 408 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the answer passed on to me in writing by the Minister regarding the 11 Spanish travel journalists, the cost of the trip is given here as being £5,080 for the 11 journalists, can the Minister perhaps clarify whether these people came by air to Malaga or by rail or which mode of transport was used?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The delegation came down by train from Madrid.

**NO 409 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**WESTERN BEACH**

Can the Government now confirm when they can expect to transfer the boats at Western Beach to the area of Coaling Island, something they promised to do nearly four years ago?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The transfer will take place when all relevant construction and marina related works are completed, following the successful conclusion of a reprovioning agreement with MOD. We expect that the move will take place this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 409 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are we still talking about the fee that the Government expected to incur as regards the facilities that they need to provide?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Just before answering that question can I point out to the hon Lady that the premise and the factual content of her original question is false. Yes, it is false, Government did not promise to do anything four years ago they did not promise to transfer the boats to Western Beach in fact longer than four years ago the Government committed itself to transferring the boat owners to Coaling Island when the Coaling Island had been made available to the Government by the Ministry of Defence which is not the same thing as the way she has asked the question which suggests that Government have been default of a promise for four years having had the wherewithal with which to honour it and has simply chosen not to do so.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can Government not confirm that they reacted to a statement made by the boatowners themselves saying that they were expressing doubt as to its commitment and Government actually said in their statement that they were detailing the six years of negotiations?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

This is a Government statement is he saying that he does not believe that he issued the statement?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We issue lots of statements.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore he is not accepting that his statement is correct he is saying that what he issued is false is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. What I am saying is that the hon Lady persists in saying things that are not true. Government have never promised to do anything regardless of other events happening which were outside of its control and the Government have made it perfectly clear from the outset that it was promising and committing itself to transfer the boatowners to Coaling Island as soon as the necessary land transfer deal could be negotiated with the MOD. Since it has only recently been possible to conclude the conditional aspect of that the promise has not been outstanding for four years as the question falsely suggests.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Chief Minister aware that for the second occasion in replying being just now he has said that the promises to transfer the boatowners to Coaling Island and would he like to rectify that before he accuses us of having put words in his mouth that he did not say?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is the Leader of the Opposition seriously drawing a distinction between the boats and the boatowners?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Absolutely, unless he is saying that he is going to put everybody in the water in the Coaling Island presumably he is transferring the boats and not the boatowners.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Perhaps the Chief Minister can agree that in the press release that he did issue and I am sure that he will accept that he did issue the Government referred to the legitimate and agreed expectations of the boatowners and that therefore it is not the Opposition that believe that he promised something but obviously clearly in his own statement also the boatowners.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. That line of logic is as illogical as the hon Lady next to him and the boatowners themselves understand where the problems have laid and they do not blame the Government they know where the problems are made so, the answer to the hon Gentleman is no he is entirely wrong and the Government have honoured its obligation and promised and commitment which was to proceed without delay with the transfer as soon as it was physically in a position to do so which is when the deal with the MOD has been done.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Therefore the extent of the Government's promise is to try ..

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is really very difficult to debate with the hon Member of Opposite . I have less difficulty I have to say with people who should know better. The hon Member must know that when land belongs to the MOD and when Gibraltar would like to do something on that land it is a matter of reality of life that it cannot be done until the land is procured from the MOD. The MOD are not obliged to give up land they are entitled to negotiate and place conditions and demand price et cetera, et cetera and therefore if the hon Member cannot understand that Government cannot just expropriate land from the MOD and therefore requires to negotiate with the MOD he will not ask the question that he has just asked. Obviously the Government if it wants to do something on MOD land cannot do it until the land has been acquired by the Government. Yes, that is absolutely right could it possibly be any other way?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Therefore the Chief Minister is agreeing with me that the full extent of the promise or commitment is that they would try to get the land back by negotiation and once they got it back then to effect the transfer but really the full extent of the commitment is only to try?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member's logic limitations are becoming quite apparent. The Government's commitment was to relocate the marina once the land had been obtained from the MOD for which the Government was then and has until recently been in negotiations with the MOD. That was the Government's commitment.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have never been in a public school debating society so I do not know whether it is common for them to call themselves illogical but certainly in the comprehensive education which I had it was uncommon when debating to accuse other people as the Chief Minister has done in this case but I thank him because he has proved the point that the hon Lady was trying to show, namely that the Government have been able to progress this matter not one jot.

**NO 410 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**LANDLORD AND TENANT ORDINANCE**

Can Government state when it expects to finalise the process of consultation in relation to the reform announced of the Landlord and Tenants Ordinance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Government expect to publish legislative proposals to reform the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance in the first six months of this year. Consultations have not yet been concluded.



**NO 411 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MUNICIPALITY OF LOS BARRIOS**

Can Government state whether they are involved jointly with the Municipality of Los Barrios in Spain, in a venture to attract a recycling company to Los Barrios?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are not involved jointly with the Municipality of Los Barrios in this project.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 412 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is any Government entity or company in which the Government have a shareholding involved in this project?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No and to save the hon Member the trouble of formulating 20 questions, the Government are not either directly or indirectly or by whatever any other means involved in this matter.

**NO 412 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**HARBOUR VIEWS**

Can Government state whether it has now given the go ahead to Land Property Services to sell parking spaces within Harbour Views to tenants of the Estate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The sale of car parking spaces in Harbour Views is pending consideration of the podium remedial works, and whether the execution of those works will require the Government's spaces to be available for temporary relocation of flat owner's spaces during those works.

**NO 413 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**POST OF HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER**

Can Government state whether they have now recruited a Human Resources Manager?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government have a Human Resources Manager.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 413 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Human Resources Manager on an acting, temporary or permanent basis?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure. I do not think that he is still acting but I could not be completely sure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The last time we asked he was acting and what we are trying to find out is if there has been any change since the last time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I could not tell the hon Members, I am not aware that he is still acting but he could be. If they think that he is he might be.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The last time that we asked was a long time ago because we have not been able to ask since March 2003.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In answer to Question No 374 of 2003 Government was not sure if it would go to an incumbent on upgrading in post or whether the vacancy would be thrown open that is why I am asking the question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If that is the issue I believe that it is being done by the incumbent in post.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is the post that of Senior Officer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe that the incumbent is a Senior Officer.

**NO 414 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**LAND PROPERTY SERVICES**

Can Government state whether they have now signed a new contract with Land Property Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Not yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 414 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

May I ask the Chief Minister if they propose to conclude this soon or what stage are the negotiations at?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand that the negotiations are very advanced and a paper has recently been submitted to my office for ministerial approval of the arrangements and therefore I suppose that it will be either approved quickly or submitted to further negotiations depending on the views that Ministers take of what has been arrived at so far, it is very advanced now.

ORAL

**NO 415 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can the Government state to whom the tender for the construction of the Theatre Royal has been awarded to?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No 416 to 420 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 416 OF 2004

THE HON S E LINARES

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state what will be the cost of the Theatre Royal once completed?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 415 and 417 to 420 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 417 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state how much has been spent on the Theatre Royal to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 415, 416 and 418 to 420.



ORAL

**NO 418 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can the Government state how much money has been obtained from the European Union for the Theatre Royal to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 415 to 417 and 419 to 420 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 419 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state whether asbestos has been found in the Theatre Royal subsequent to the signing of the contract with the owners of the property?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 415 to 418 and 420 of 2004.

**NO 420 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state whether the Theatre Royal will be managed by the Ministry of Culture?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No 415 of 2004**

The tender of the Second Stage of the construction has not yet been awarded.

**Answer to Question No 416 of 2004**

The approved budget is £8.5 million.

**Answer to Question No 417 of 2004**

The total amount spent on the Theatre Royal to date has been £3,063,709.48.

**Answer to Question No 418 of 2004**

A total of £481,855.94 of EU money has been obtained as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003.

**Answer to Question No 419 of 2004**

Asbestos residue was found in the Theatre Royal in August 2002. A Clean Air Certificate was issued on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2002.

**Answer to Question No 420 of 2004**

It has not yet been decided how or by whom a new Theatre Royal would be managed. It would either be by the Ministry for Culture or, under its auspices.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 415 TO 420 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

If the finding of the asbestos was in August 2002 the Chief Minister is then confirming that this asbestos was found after the signing of the agreement with the owners, correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot remember the date in which the agreement with the owners was signed but I do not suppose that we had access to the building to conduct construction works in it until after the date of the agreement so by that logic I suppose it must be as he says, yes, but unless he can remind me of the date if he has it...

**HON S E LINARES:**

The date of the agreement of was in 2001 for the Chief Minister's information and 2002 was the year asbestos was found, would it not have been the logic that before signing the agreement with the owners that inspections and at least surveys were done of the property?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Are Government envisaging more money from the EU?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Government said that they would be spending £8.5 million once completed, can the Chief Minister explain why they have budgeted £9.8 million according to the Estimates of Expenditure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The budget is £8.5 million.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I beg to differ, it might be a budget that they originally thought of but the budget in the estimate is £9.8 million, is it because they are envisaging over-budgeting on the Theatre Royal?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member will have to agree the terminology here between the budgets in the context of the contractors and the approved budget in the Government's Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. The budget that the Government have set themselves for the construction of the Theatre Royal is £8.5 million.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the cost of the project then £9.8 million?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, £8.5 million is the budget for the construction that is the amount of money that the Government have budgeted. The hon Member say that there is a different figure in the Estimates. I would have to find the explanation for that. I am telling him now what is the Government's budgeted figure, not budgeted in the sense of approved estimates but the amount of money that the Government have decided to spend in that respect is £8.5 million. If there is a higher figure there has to be an explanation of which I am not aware but it is not the fact that Government intends to spend that sum on the construction of the Theatre Royal.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the item in the Improvement and Development Fund is described as Theatre Royal refurbishment, is it that by using the word '*construction*' there are £1 million of other costs?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If that is not an error and there is an explanation, a real explanation not a semantic one.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the estimates before the House at budget time last year it was shown as an EU Objective 1 Project. Is the sum that has been given to the House today of the

amount received from the European Union Funding all the European Union money or is there more to come?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe that there is more to come. There is a cut-off date from one programme to another. I think that there is more to come than that but I would not be able to give the hon Member details about that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When this project was originally announced in the House was there not a need to complete certain works by a certain date in order to be able to get the money that was thought to be available initially, I am speaking from memory but I am pretty sure that dates were given in the House as to the work having to be started and completed by certain dates to get the initial sum that was being bid for under EU. Is this the same we have got or is it some thing else?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have with me the detailed breakdown but I certainly recall that in order to maximise the amount that was available by a certain date materials were purchased in advance and they are in storage but as to sums of whether it was the full....I need to further .....

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is it still with the EU funding a 60/40 arrangement in which the EU will be paying 40 per cent and the Gibraltar Government 60 per cent as the Minister stated in answer to certain questions I made at the time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether as things now stand it will be 60/40 on the full amount of the project or whether some of the sums originally allocated to this project given the delays that it has suffered may have been diverted to other projects. I would have to find out whether there is still full funding available for 40 per cent of this project available from EU funds.

**NO 421 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CIVIL SERVICE**

Can Government state whether it is their policy not to allow Civil Servants to use Government telephones for private or charitable matters?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The political Government have no policy on this matter but assumes that telephones provided to Civil Servants, the usage of which is paid for by Government, are used for official Government business.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 421 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Are these instructions given to the Head of Department and therefore disciplinary action will be taken against members of the Civil Service if they do so or phone out privately?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not suggested in my answer that there are any instructions.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I am actually asking him whether there has been?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not given anybody any instructions and to my knowledge nor has any Minister.



**ORAL  
WITHDRAWN**

**NO 422 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**XXXXXXXXXXXX**

Can Government state if it is still its intention to introduce the new business tax structure on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2004?

**ANSWER**

**NO 423 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**BUSINESS TAX STRUCTURE**

Is it still Government's intention to introduce the new business tax structure on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This depends on the EU Commission. Subject thereto, it is Government's intention to do so.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 423 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know that was the original position, obviously I am asking at this stage because there appears to be at least from the information that has come our way less than 50/50 chance that the decision will be forthcoming before the 1<sup>st</sup> July and therefore the question really is on the premise that would it still do it if the Commission had not replied before July perhaps that is what I should have said?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am aware of the statements, if he does not mind my saying so, rash statements made by the hon Members of the Opposition in their own manifesto in which I think they said that they would proceed with some sort of plan regardless. The hon Members need to bear in mind that there are two dimensions to this issue in terms of EU Legality. One relates to the nitty gritty of the measure itself and I suppose the hon Members or indeed the Government might be able to devise another tax scheme which was less likely to fall foul of the State Aid Rules on this one in terms of the

content of the proposal. Indeed it might be possible to devise a scheme of revenue and or taxation which did not invoke breach of the taxation which did not involve conceivably breach of the State Aid Rules itself, it might be possible I am not saying that it is easy or that it is not severely disruptive. That by itself would not be the whole story because the issue now is not so much the nitty gritty or the content of the Government's proposal but rather this issue of regional selectivity which would apply to every and any other scheme other than the existing corporate tax laws of Gibraltar. What the Commission is saying in the regional selectivity issue although we are very confident that it would not end up being applied to Gibraltar but the regional selectivity principal applied to Gibraltar would preclude Gibraltar from having a tax system different to the United Kingdom's. So, we would not be arguing what we would like our tax system to be or whether my system is better than his or indeed of whether he can think of one that could be implemented sooner or later than the Government's, it would simply be a question of Gibraltar being compelled to have the same tax regime as the United Kingdom. That is the reason for the delay now not a consideration of the technical content of Gibraltar's notified tax regime. In that circumstance anything that were done and if things could be done, we could all say we could just take the risk and do this or that or something else, any such thing that were done without EU approval would be new as opposed to existing aid bear in mind the hon Member will recall the discussions we have had about the difference that we are only able to continue even with the existing exempt status regime because we took the Commission to court and won on the question of whether the exempt status regime was new or existing aid. They said it was new aid and therefore subject to immediate suspension and subject to recoverability if it was eventually found to be unlawful, we said it was at worst existing aid in which case we could continue it and if it eventually turned out to be unlawful not subject to recoverability. That is a vital distinction because anything that were done which would be new aid which would certainly include anything that were done now for July of next year would definitely new it was not existing at the time that we joined the Community, the Finance Centre could not live with because it could not be offered to clients with any degree of certainty that it would not have to be refunded. That the tax benefit derived for the customer would not have to be refunded to the Government under the recoverability rules and as if that were not bad enough the Commission could immediately say, "*We are investigating it.*" And because it is new aid our decision to investigate it has immediate suspensory effect. So, not only could they cause one to suspend it immediately the day after one has introduced it but if they did not do that one would still be in danger of recoverability so about the only thing that might be doable by the 1<sup>st</sup> July regardless of EU Commission approval would be the abolition of corporation tax altogether on companies but to anything that involves a new tax law would definitely require notification and be subject to everything that I have just explained and I would like to withdraw what I have just said that even that could be done because to abolish corporation tax would be a breach of the principle of regional selectivity if it correctly applies to Gibraltar because having no corporate tax in Gibraltar is not the same thing as having the tax regime as the UK. The real issue now which is why I started by saying that I thought that the hon Members' manifesto commitment was rash because I think it failed to have due regard to the issue of regional selectivity which if it is sustained in it's application to Gibraltar would require us to have the same tax regime as the United Kingdom and that includes having no tax as well as having a lower tax so the option of doing things unilaterally on the 1<sup>st</sup> July attractive as it might at first sight seem works neither in law nor in delivering the certainty that the Finance Centre craves for.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Perhaps the Chief Minister will agree that those are not the arguments that he used the last time that we asked him about this. If he looks back he will find that his argument then was that because there had been slippage and because it was not manageable to do it in mid tax year and because it was wiser to wait for the decision to be made rather than do something and then find that it needed amending as a result of on-going discussions with the Commission, it was more prudent to delay it for another tax year and we in fact agreed with the Government that that was a sensible approach.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

At that stage the issue of regional selectivity was not at the fore. That was at the stage where the Commission was simply considering the merits of our proposal as against the State Aids Regulations. What has now happened is that they have stopped asking us for information on that and when I last went to Brussels sometime in the autumn of last year and asked, *“is there any more information that you want on our reforms?”* the answer was *“No”* in effect the matter is pending (a)Europe-wide discussion on regional selectivity. The regional selectivity debate is not specific to Gibraltar it is for the whole of the EU and all the sub-layers of Governments in Member States that have taxation powers. I said, *“Can we not for these obvious reasons that Gibraltar is not a region of the United Kingdom can you not surely immediately accept that whether or not the Commission is right in its regional selectivity arguments with respect to everybody else, it obviously would not apply to Gibraltar, and the question now is whether we can persuade the Commission to extricate Gibraltar from the ring-fenced debate and that they should proceed with considering our notified proposal on its merits on the basis that the regional selectivity principle whatever may be its applicability elsewhere cannot apply to Gibraltar because Gibraltar is not a region of the United Kingdom.”* There are many arguments that have been advanced to try and persuade the Commission of that most simply that if Gibraltar did not have its own tax laws, the United Kingdom's still would not apply to Gibraltar. Unlike all the other regions that whereby the taxing powers of the sub-set so to speak is in derogation of the National System so if there was not a subset derogation, for example, by the Landau in Germany or by Scotland the United Kingdom National System would then apply. There are many, many arguments. I would not want the hon Member to think that that is the only one there are many arguments but that is now the issue and that has come to the forefront because the Commission has in a sense the debate in the Commission about the relevance generally of the regional selectivity principal Europe-wide has arrived on the scene after our own notification but our own notification has now in effect been arrested by until somebody is willing to make the decision not to await the outcome of the regional selectivity discussion. That said, the 18 months that is allowed to the Commission to consider the scheme that we notified expires I am advised in very early February. That is the earliest time that the Government of Gibraltar could take any action for failure to act on the part of the Commission. In other words, it is entitled to 18 months and one cannot complain if within that 18 months period they have not said yae or nae but that 18 month period is about to expire.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that I think both sides of the House agree that the regional selectivity in Gibraltar's case is completely absurd there are many, many arguments that can be

paraded against him and that the Chief Minister has said that the regional selectivity would apply to this or anything else that was not exactly the same as the UK it would obviously raise many more questions on the Finance Centre.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the hon Member could give way he would have heard me say that if the regional selectivity arguments succeeds the least of the casualties is the fate of the Government's tax reforms there are then massive Constitutional and economic implications which do not bear thinking about, which is I suppose, amongst others, the reasons why the United Kingdom is as persuaded and as firm and as robust as we are in this matter.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Therefore on that basis we ought to be looking at this on the premise that as he says if this was in fact a non-starter because the regional selectivity argument was deemed to be applicable we would be facing a completely different scenario with lots of other problems which would require this House to be addressing what it is doing here even if it does not even have the power to raise taxation. But is it the case then that the Government's position is that until the question of regional selectivity is decided one way or the other whether it is exclusively for Gibraltar or in the context of the whole EU it will not be able to move all the tax structure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is an issue, not that issue but what the Leader of the Opposition has just said touches upon an issue about which the Government are about to embark on extensive consultation to the industry because there is a choice to be made here, either we accept to wait, to sit on our hands and await the decision which we hope will be that regional selectivity, Gibraltar can be excluded from the regional selectivity debate on the basis that at least in the meantime the Commission is playing ball and is not aggressively pursuing its exempt status investigation so that we are at least able to carry on with the existing regime, remember that these are two different dossiers, one is the notification of our new reform and a quite separate thing is the investigation into the legality of our exempt status regime. If we were to adopt.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That would be as existing aid.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

...as existing aid but they could close it at any time and once they closed it, if they were to decide tomorrow as they could. That they have finished their enquiries on the exempt status and they have reached the conclusion that it is unlawful then it becomes unlawful regardless one has to stop. So, the choice is, to sit on our hands, not provoke the Commission and therefore continue to benefit from the status quo, it at least gives the industry some sort of product or adopt a more aggressive stance

with the Commission with no guarantee that that will result in an approval of the tax scheme but with the risk that they might then close the exempt status regime and then we end up with neither. That is a tactical choice upon which the Government wishes to consult with the industry who would ultimately be, let me say that the people in the industry who are knowledgeable of these things and follow the case and who make enquiry with the Government tend to favour *[INTERRUPTION]*. It is economically quite important not just to the Finance Centre but to us all.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do Government not agree that given the way he has put the choice what answer does he expect to get if he tells people, *“Look you have got a choice, either one is let to do the business that one is doing because the Commission is not pursuing this very aggressively and we sit down on our hands and pray for the best possible result or else, we can choose to be more aggressive and provoke the wrath of the Commissioner and then one might finish up with nothing,”* and if that is the choice I think it is a pre-foregone conclusion what the answer might be?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

But that is the reality. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition is not suggesting that we are somehow distorting the reality in order to obtain a particular result. That is the reality. In all the starkness that he has made it sound that is the reality and I think that the Government are duty bound to lay out the realities to the industry and to at least give them the opportunity to give an informed opinion to the Government.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

At one stage it was being argued by the United Kingdom I am not sure where that argument is today but at one stage it was being argued right at the beginning that there was an obligation and there was this question of whether that political agreement or an enforceable obligation to roll back what we were already doing by 2005 and I think they were saying that in the context of the exempt company being existing state aid.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The leader of the Opposition is correct except as to the source. The source was not state aid at all, the source was the code of conduct, the Primorolo Group Assessment. Other than that he is entirely right. It is clearly understood by everybody that we cannot be pressed on that until we have something to replace it with and the United Kingdom understands the logic and fairness of that position and is therefore not pressing us on the roll back or even on the standstill.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister has said that the industry is really presented now with a very stark choice whether or not we proceed aggressively against the Commission which may incur their wrath also relation to our existing Finance Centre product. In fact, our existing Finance Centre products because all our Finance Centre products will fall if

the argument of regional selectivity obviously succeeds but I recall hearing the Chief Minister saying in more than one occasion that it would not come to this because there was always a plan B, is this time to start fine tuning our plan 'B'?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is the same point as the Leader of the Opposition asked me before. That was in the context of the merits of our notified scheme, in the context of regional selectivity there can be no plan 'B'.

**NO 424 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PACE**

Do Government plan to implement the PACE in Gibraltar in whole or in part ?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The matter is under non-urgent consideration at technical levels within Government. The issue has not yet been submitted for Ministerial consideration. It may happen, but I could not give an indication when.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 424 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Police And Criminal Evidence Act attaches great importance to the rights of defendants held in custody, in the custody of the Police in particular before they appear before a Magistrate and I would urge the Chief Minister to keep this issue not so much in the back burner but at the forefront of his mind because at my understanding is that at all levels of law enforcement in Gibraltar, all parties in the Criminal Justice system, defendants, police officers, in the Chambers of the Attorney General, in the Chambers of defence council in Gibraltar, everybody would favour the implementation of PACE, the arguments advanced previously against implementation have usually related I believe to expense of implementation but already a lot of the expense has been incurred because the police have had the equipment that they would need and the PACE for recording et cetera, so will the Chief Minister undertake to try and keep this on a closer wicket than it does at the moment.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not wish that I would like to give the hon Member that undertaking as I think the hon Member, he may not know but certainly some of his Colleagues will know, detailed amendments to the Criminal Law and the Criminal procedure very rarely result from political policy of the Government. They tend to come up to the Government from technical levels. There is a joint working group here or the Law Revision Committee. I am not quite sure what the Committee is called. The Government have no political policy in favour or against this. If this comes up from the Law Revision Committee or from the joint working Committee that I believe has been established by the Attorney General to consider these things then the Government will give it consideration and I suppose that that consideration will be favourable if it is clear that everybody else in the legal fraternity supports it. There might be a short consultation process just to make sure that everybody did support it, it is unlikely that the Government would fail to bring and support legislation that everybody thought was a good idea but this is not something that the Government will do the running on or make a political commitment to the hon Member to give priority to or to pull or to push. If it comes up to us we will do it, if it enjoys, not everybody's support it does not have to be unanimous but at least that it enjoys sufficient groundswell of support. I do not want to get involved with the hon Member on a debate about which I suspect he may know more than me given that he has been in practice until very recently but I seem to recall that PACE in the United Kingdom has both its supporter and its detractors. In other words, that there are aspects of PACE which are thought to have worked very well but there are aspects of PACE, I do not know if this sounds right to the hon Member, which are criticised. I do not know whether that is the case or not.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes. There are aspects of PACE which are criticised but none of the criticisms suggest that they should go back in the United Kingdom to the days pre-PACE but rather that PACE itself should be further improved. I am bringing to him a groundswell of support for implementation, I am putting to him that all Government's in Gibraltar should have a policy in relation to the rights of defendants in custody and I urge him to consider the issue perhaps before the next House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have already declined to give him an undertaking to do so.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister is right he declined, the undertaking I asked for was to consider very carefully whether they should do it. I have just asked him now to consider the issue again before the next House to see whether at that stage he might have a different view. He is right to say that having, I qualified after him, I do not know whether he qualified before or after 1984 I think one will find that most people who qualified after 1984 are almost to a man in favour of PACE.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So, the young Turks all want it?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do not know about the Turks.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It seems to me that the second thing that he is asking seems to me more onerous than the first given that I was not willing to give him an undertaking to adopt it at all, to ask me to consider it and bring it back to the House at its next meeting or to consider it before the next seems to be like a tougher ask than the one that I had already said no to. What I will agree to do is to make enquiry of the Attorney General as to the status of the work of whichever committee is considering this to find out where the matter is. That is the most that I would contemplate doing.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that, it is a good start.

**NO 425 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**OESCO**

Will Government state whether it has commenced or is considering commencing discussions or negotiations with OESCO and/or the MOD for the relocation of the OESCO power station?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Government are not involved in negotiations for the relocation of the OESCO Power Station.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 425 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are Government considering commencing in such discussions or negotiations?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not presently considering it, no.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think that the Chief Minister will agree with me that although there may be a dispute between Government and Opposition as to what the decibel level emanating from the OESCO power station is, there can be no dispute between us that those who live near that area because it has two power stations do feel very aggrieved at the fact that they have to live in that area and would benefit certainly from the relocation of the power station. If it were possible to relocate the power station with the

agreement of OESCO and MOD hence the question about negotiation would the Government not be happy to be a catalyst to that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If it were to be so then many more hundreds of people would benefit from the relocation of the Waterport Power Station. The idea that one can relocate in a small place like Gibraltar all sources of noise and move them all away from residential areas, the only non-residential area that one could think of is Lathbury Barracks Europa Point area. The cost is enormous. The Government's approach at this stage is to focus not on relocation but on noise reduction. The Government accepts and indeed we have a manifesto commitment, as the hon Member may be aware, to reduce the noise and there are proposals and projects and plans in hand to do that. That is where the Government's focus now lies and not in the relocation of those stations which would necessarily take many, many years. Let me say that when the MOD talks of building a new power station it is talking about making the decision in the next three years and starting maybe six or seven years before the noise could be eliminated from the existing sources. The Government accepts its commitment to noise reduce through insulation leaving open the possibility if a Government of Gibraltar can afford it to relocate the stations but it would have to be both of them and the cost, I would caution the hon Member, in relocating the power stations are enormous. Bear in mind that the MOD, their power station is obsolete. The machinery has outlived its useful life and they have got to start afresh again anyway. For us, it would mean dismantling the plant that is presently in use, we cannot shut down whilst we do this, very difficult, very expensive, to relay all the main feeder cables up to the whatever position, rebuild the stations, manage the process of a continuation of supply whilst one moves machines physically, dismantle generators, reinstall them in the new plant, it is a massive, massively expensive exercise and I really do think that it is much more sensible to focus and even if it were possible it would take many more years than I think it is fair to make people wait in terms of noise reduction. Government have persuaded that the more sensible approach, the more realistic approach and the more deliverable approach both in terms of cost and timing is to invest money in the noise insulation of both the OESCO plant and indeed Waterport Power Station to ensure that the noise that emanates from them are completely not unobtrusive there will always be some noise but we understand that the technology now exists to very significantly reduce to levels that will not be regarded as extraordinary in Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Best available technology which is where we were yesterday on Question No 11 of 2004 and Question No 12 of 2004 which were my questions asking what it was that the Government was going to do in order to reduce the noise levels emanating from the OESCO power stations below the recommended levels. The only answer that I got then was that the Government do not accept that there is a noise pollution problem because of the recommended levels at the OESCO power station.*[INTERRUPTION]*. I have absolutely no difficulty with us not having the dispute about who has the short memory and looking at Hansard once it appears but I would say this to the Chief Minister, he has showed himself to have obviously as much knowledge almost of electricity generation as the City Electrical Engineer and I appreciate that he is right when he says that it is a very, very, complex job to move a power station. He is absolutely right but what I was asking was could there not be some benefit without having to waive a magic wand that would enable us to spend

millions in doing this in commencing a negotiating process with OESCO and the MOD to see whether it is in fact viable that OESCO move with the MOD because we would in any event be looking at the provision of new generators et cetera which are best available technology so that we achieve the movement out of the residential area of the OESCO plant and that is what I would urge the Chief Minister to consider. In relation to the Waterport Power Station the Chief Minister is right to say that it would be wrong for us only to act to benefit those in the south district in the area of the Alameda Estate, Jumper's et cetera and ignore all those who live in the Waterport area but the Waterport generating station belongs to the Government and it would be the Government involved in making the expense. If we could at least save the expense in relation to OESCO because we get them to move it that would make it easier as a result of negotiations for us to bear the cost of the other.

#### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government did not say yesterday and it is not a question of shortness of memory and it is not a question of looking back at Hansard it is a question of the hon Member just being coherent and conducting debate in this House by reference to what people have actually said and not by reference to what he would like them to have said in order to enable him to illustrate whatever point he wishes to make at that precise moment. Government did not say there was no problem with noise in OESCO. If Government thought that there was no problem with noise in OESCO why would we have committed ourselves in our manifesto to introduce noise reduction measures? What Government said yesterday was *"the Government do not accept that relevant EU Directives and local legislation relating to noise are not being complied with."* That the law is not being broken but that does not mean that there is not a problem with noise. That is what the Government said and the hon Member really must learn that precision of language in Parliament is important and not to be dismissed with some quip about shortness of memory. Secondly, it is not true that our discussion in relation to this issue is contradictory to or somehow proves that he was right in his questions on best technology yesterday. The discussions about best technology yesterday related to generators and generation equipment. The new technology that I am referring to has nothing to do with the generators which he said should be best technology, these are silencers on factory flues and things of that sort, nothing to do with generation equipment, so if only he would listen to the nuances and differences between both the questions that he asks and the answers that he receives he would less often fall into the traps that he has already laid for himself quite frequently in the two days that we have been discussing. Thirdly, if he does not mind my saying this to him almost as a gratuitous comment, it really is extraordinarily unrealistic of him to think that it is okay to move the OESCO plant because OESCO would bear the cost of it and this is not the Government unlike Waterport where it would be the Government but OESCO can be asked to move the plant at its expense – OESCO operates under a contract in which it is entitled as a matter of contract to occupy that plant and indeed it's contract requires the Government at its expense to noise insulate it. The idea that in a contract for service in which the prices have been keenly negotiated and the rights and obligations of the parties are both fixed that we can turn round to OESCO and say, *"Well, now spend £12 million in moving your plant somewhere else..."* OESCO would turn round and say, *"look Chief Minister thank you very much if you want me to relocate my plant this is how much it is going to cost you."* The idea that they could pay for the cost out of their own pockets is not something that the Government could realistically hope to achieve in a negotiation and it is not the basis of the contract that exists.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Let me start first with the question of the OESCO contract before I move on to the question of the insults about not being able to understand nuances et cetera. Is the Chief Minister telling this House that the OESCO contract has now in fact been renewed and that a new contract is in place because that is what it appears. He is saying, In relation to the nuances et cetera which the Chief Minister refers to and without stooping to his level and calling him all the sorts of names that he calls me can I ask him to refer to my questions because my questions really only related to the reduction of noise pollution below recommended levels. There was no reference there to legal levels and the other question, Question No 12 of 2004 very clearly stated what measures the Government had agreed with OESCO were to reduce levels emanating from the plant. That is all that I asked and then said, *“Will this ensure that those levels are below the legal levels.”* For me only to have got the answer that Government was satisfied that the noise levels were below the legal levels did not address the issues which I was trying to address and which very clearly in Question 11 of 2004 addressed on its own which were what the Government was going to do to reduce noise pollution levels without reference to the legal limits. So, having detected those nuances and entirely properly appreciated them I will be very grateful for what the Chief Minister has to say.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I fear that a debate with the hon Member could be absolutely interminable. What he has just said is not true. His question no 12 of 2004 asks the Government what he was going to do about reducing noise levels *“..to those required for compliance with the relevant EU Directives and local legislation.”*

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

For him now to say the question.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

Order. He has raised a point of order I have got to hear what the point of order is first.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of Order. I think it is unfair for the Chief Minister to have parried my question that way. I think it is important that Hansard should show that my question actually says as follows, *“Can Government state what are the measures that have been agreed with OESCO to reduce noise levels emanating from the plant, when they are expected to be introduced and is Government satisfied that these measures will bring down noise levels to those required for compliance with the relevant EU Directives*

*and local legislation.”* That is what my question says and the Chief Minister should not jump three quarters of it.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Okay the hon Member has made clear what the question was.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Precisely, so the question yesterday was implying that noise needed to be reduced to comply with relevant EU Directives and local legislation ergo at present they do not otherwise there would not be a need for measures to reduce it for it to comply to which he received a two part answer. Firstly, not exclusively, that the Government did not accept that there was a breach with the legislation and secondly that the Government had a manifesto commitment on noise reduction and we would make an announcement as to how and when that would be done when we were ready to do so. The suggestion now by the hon Member that he asked a question that was not based on legal compliance or non-compliance and that he only got an answer based on legal compliance and non-compliance is wrong on both counts. His question was linked to legal compliance or non-compliance but the answer that he got was not limited to legal compliance or non-compliance. It dealt with the question of legal compliance or non-compliance but then went on to deal with the matter outside the law by reference to what the Government's political commitment was. I do not recall calling the hon Member any names but if it gives him any pleasure in suggesting that I did call him names then so be it. As to his remark that, *“Well it is clear from the hon Member's argument, is he saying now that the OESCO contract has been renewed?”* Of course, the OESCO contract has been renewed the Government have made public statements saying that it has been renewed, there was a question in the House in which it has been answered saying that the OESCO contract has been renewed, the fact that the hon Member is unaware of all that does not entitle him to insinuate that some answer that I had given here suddenly lets the cat out of the bag that the OESCO contract was being renewed. It is a matter of public record that the OESCO contract was renewed back in October, November or earlier than that. The hon Member should therefore stick to the facts and if he is not aware of the facts which is not surprising.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of Order.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I will not allow it. I am only going to allow one more question and one more answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have finished.

**MR SPEAKER:**

One more question, one more answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think I should end this because I think that we are moving away substantially from the original question. One of the things that the Minister has said is that in questions in this House he has already made clear that the OESCO contract had been renewed. In the last House in answer to Question No 118 of 2003 which was as follows, *“Have Government now taken a decision on whether or not they will renew the OESCO contract for the supply of electricity which expires in 2004? The answer was this and it was given then by the Hon and Gallant Mr Britto, “These matters are still under consideration and no final decisions have yet been taken by the Government.”* I leave my Hon Friend’s recollections in light of that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government have issued press releases, interviews have been given informing the general public that the OESCO contract has been renewed. Indeed if he had read the GSD’s manifesto at the last election it is stated in the manifesto that the OESCO contract has been signed and has been extended.



ORAL

**NO 426 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TEPs**

Are Government aware that parties who have made complaints to the FSC arising out of the “TEP” issue, have not been provided by the FSC with the report of a provisional investigation carried out by that body into their complaint, although said report has been provided to the licensee who is the subject of the initial complaint?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 427 and 428 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 427 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TEPs**

Will the Chief Minister confirm that he will ensure that any information made available to him in relation to these TEP investments is made available?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 426 and 428 of 2004.

**NO 428 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TEPs**

Will the Chief Minister confirm that the Government are monitoring developments in the on-going difficulties being experienced by a large number of Gibraltarian investors in "TEP" plans who have found that they have lost substantial amounts of monies they invested?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No 426 of 2004**

The Government are not accountable or answerable for the behaviour of the financial Services Commission. However, the Government have every confidence that the FSC operates professionally and properly. If the premise of the question is factually correct then Government are happy to assume that there is a good and proper reason why the Financial and Services Commission have decided not to make the report available.

**Answer to Question No 427 of 2004**

I cannot confirm that I will pass on to investors any information that I receive. That must depend upon the source of the information, the basis upon which it is provided to me and the propriety and appropriateness of my making it available.

**Answer to Question No 428 of 2004**

The Government are obviously taking an interest and monitoring developments.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 426 TO 428 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The first part of that intervention is absolutely right. The Government are not accountable for the actions of the Financial Services Commission which is an independent statutory body but how is the Government going to monitor developments and how is the monitoring going to see itself in action favourable to the investors.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are not in a position to take action favourable or disfavourable to the investors. In so far as the case raises regulatory issues the Government have no jurisdiction in regulatory issues. As one knows it is exclusively the jurisdiction of the Financial Services Commissioner and to the extent that it raises legal claims and counter claims it is a matter for the courts and not for the Government. The way in which the Government are monitoring it is that the Government receives from time to time reports from the Financial Services Commissioner, about how it is going. The Minister who is now myself with responsibility for financial services gets very brief overviews of how particular cases are going and secondly the company itself chooses to keep the Government informed of particular developments or things of that nature.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the last answer is the Government then saying that it is being informed by the company, because it chooses to do it but it is being informed by the company?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. There is a difference between being informed by the company which implies of everything fully and comprehensively which is not the case and being told whatever it is that the company wishes to tell us. If a representative of the company asks for a meeting with the minister with the responsibility for financial services to inform him of certain matters then the minister does that. I have not yet done that but I know that my predecessor did do it. That is not being kept informed because one is informed of what is communicated to one in that meeting but one has no way of knowing whether that is the whole story or not. One just hears the information being communicated and the views that company itself expresses to the Government and that is the extent.

**NO 429 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION**

Can the Chief Minister state what action, if any, the Government proposes to take to ensure that obligations imposed by legislation on licensees under the Financial Services Ordinance 1989 and 1998 (in particular rules relating to the regulation of advertisements for Financial Services products and rules requiring licensees to be covered by professional indemnity insurance) are effectively enforced and policed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The issues alluded to in the question are matters for the Financial Services Commissioner who is the authority responsible for policing and enforcing the Ordinance. If he requires and seeks assistance from the Government, we shall, of course, consider it sympathetically. He has not yet done so, nor do I expect him to need to do so.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 429 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The issues that we are dealing with here are that certain obligations imposed on licensees by the Ordinance or as conditions on licences are sometimes not complied with and as the Chief Minister has said, the Financial Services Commission is an independent body for which he is not answerable but it is "*a creature of statute*" and this House through statute cannot, and I will hesitate to use the word, interfere, but can legislate to ensure that the Commission acts in a particular manner and what I am trying to get to at and I am sure that the Hon Gentleman will agree with me is that this House could, through legislation, improve the Financial Services Ordinance to ensure that there is a mechanism in place to check more effectively the existing rules as to PI cover and advertising, is that something that the Government will now consider?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Government will not now consider it nor do Government consider that there is a need to do so. If the hon Member believes that the Financial Services Commissioner is not properly discharging his duties then he should write to the Financial Services Commissioner and urge him to do so. This House has already legislated the Regulatory Regime in Gibraltar which imposes certain obligations on the Financial Services Commissioner. The legislation of this House gives powers, responsibilities, rights and obligations to whomever this House has chosen to give it. This House has not chosen to give those rights and responsibility to the Government, it has chosen to give them to the Financial Services Commissioner. So, the Government have no responsibility in the context of to quote him, "*A creature of statute*" which the statute has not bestowed on the Government and it would be, there was an issue at the time in 1993 when these Ordinances were passed and I do not think anybody would have voluntarily wanted to have given control of the Financial Services Regulatory Process in the way it was done. We all understand the historical backdrop in which it occurred but that happened and that is the legislation as it is. Government have not only no responsibility in the area, it has no means of deploying any executive authority in the area. It has no enforcement powers, it has no administrative responsibilities and I would not wish any part of my answer to be interpreted as accepting, which I do not, any implied criticism which the hon Member may be making of alleged shortcomings in the way the Financial Services Commissioner discharges his obligations. I do not suppose that he would accept that he is in breach of any obligations. If the hon Member feels that he is he might wish to write to him and point them out to him and seek to persuade him to do things differently if that is what the hon Member believes the Financial Services Commissioner should do.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

There is no question of legislation being "*as it is*" as the Chief Minister has said and us not having in this House any remedy in that respect. Legislation is as it is whilst this House allows it to be "*as it is*". It is always subject to amendment in this House. The issue that this question gets at is the question about advertisements and professional indemnity cover and in particular in relation to advertisements, where advertisements have appeared which are not in keeping with the relevant Ordinance and where professional indemnity cover has not been in place in relation to more than one company operating in Gibraltar under licence of the Financial Services Commission although that is a requirement, we in this House have to ask ourselves whether in 1993 and the Chief Minister was not in Government then thus not responsible for the legislation passed then, whether the statutory framework that we put in place was sufficiently clear in those particular respects and that is why what I am asking the Chief Minister and ask to address now is whether Government will consider in these two very distinct areas looking at the Ordinance to make sure that there is effective enforcement and policing of the provisions as to advertisement and the provision as to professional indemnity cover. Where necessary giving the Financial Services Commissioner not a rap on the knuckles but more power to enforce obligations in that respect.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It seems to me that the hon Member is now raising a wholly different question . The hon Member is now for the first time suggesting that there may be a lack of clarity in

the 1993 Ordinance which could be eliminated through clarifying or amending legislation and he is suggesting for the first time that the Financial Services Commissioner lacks sufficient powers to enforce the legislation that he is charged with enforcing. Those are wholly novel to the exchange that we have had until this supplementary. I have to say to the hon Member that if, which I do not believe to be the case, the Financial Services Commissioner shares the hon Member's view he has never found it necessary or appropriate or helpful or desirable to express those views to the Government with a view to asking the Government to strengthen his powers by amending the legislation.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I therefore ask that the Chief Minister consider an amendment to the Financial Services Ordinances of 1989 and 1998 to the effect that copies of the professional indemnity cover notes required to be in place are provided to the Financial Services Commissioner periodically and annually so that in that way the Financial Services Commissioner shall receive a copy of the cover note and second that copies of advertisements must on pain of licences being suspended be provided to the Financial Services Commissioner before they appear. There is already provision in the Ordinance for adverts to be provided to the Financial Services Commissioner before they appear. I believe that they have fallen into misuse that is why I believe that the rule should be made mandatory upon pain of licences being suspended if they are not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government will not propose that or any other amendment to the Ordinance unless and until the Financial Services Commissioner makes submissions to the Government suggesting that any such amendments are needed by him.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

My final point therefore would be, *"Would the Chief Minister take up those points with the Financial Services Commissioner now that I have raised them in this House?"*

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Chief Minister will not. The Financial Services Commissioner is perfectly capable of himself bringing to the attention of the Government any deficiencies in the legislation which he has identified and which he would like the Government to correct or remedy through legislation. When he has done so, and if he does so, the Government will then contemplate it. Government are not going to go around chasing the Financial Services Commissioner for advice on legislative proposals for which the Government are not aware that there is any need. What I suggest the hon Member does if he is as exercised as he appears to be by this point is that he writes to the Financial Services Commissioner pointing out to him that in his, that is the hon Member's view, the legislation is defective in respects that he might wish to set out in the letter. If the Financial Services Commissioner agrees with the hon Gentleman the Financial Services Commissioner will then and to the extent that he agrees make submissions to the Government and that is how the Government proposes legislative amendments in these and all matters.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is in fact.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

One more, the hon Member said it was the last one.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So, is the Chief Minister in fact saying that it is not the merit of the proposal for the amendment of legislation but the source of the proposal for the amendment of legislation that matters?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister has made what he is saying perfectly clear and has no intention of repeating it again.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Chief Minister not agree that if at some point we provide funding for the Commission from public funds we are entitled to question whether there are customers of Gibraltar's financial services that express dissatisfaction with the way their investments have performed on the basis that they feel that the level of supervision in terms of the accuracy of what is being sold is not what it ought and expect it to be and that if we are using the taxpayers money to help out the Commission to carry out the role we are also entitled to question when there are constituents that bring their concerns to us?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Absolutely. All Members of this House have that right regardless of and whether or not there are public funds being used to support the costs of the Financial Services Commission. The Financial Services Commission is a *'creature of statute'* as the hon Member next to the Leader of the Opposition likes to call it and that is enough to give this House the right to express concerns. All I am saying is that the concern with which the hon Member has every right to express and the account that he may have a right, I am not sure whether he has the right to demand an account, but I would certainly support his right to seek an account, should be sought from the party that is statutorily responsible for it namely the Financial Services Commission rather than to seek to make the Government accountable for something which it is not accountable, in respect of which it has not authority or powers. I fully support the hon Member. On the same basis as I discuss these things with the Financial Services Commissioner even though I have no statute I suppose the hon Member is just as free to bring things to the attention of the Financial Services Commissioner and ask for his views or explanation. Whether or not the Financial Services Commissioner responds in the way the hon Member would hope and expect is another matter but I would certainly support his right as an elected representative of investors that may be affected by the acts or emissions of be it an investment firm or be it the Commission



itself, I would recognise that he has as much right as any other Member of this House as an MP so to speak to write to the Financial Services Commissioner. The issue is whether these points are correctly addressed at the Government or whether they ought to be made directly and I think they ought to be made directly to the Commissioner.

ORAL

**NO 430 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**GIBRALTAR AS A CENTRE FOR FUNDS**

Can Government state how many senior executives from the funds sector attended the VIP dinner that took place in London on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> April, who were they, and what was the cost of the dinner?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 431 and 432 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 431 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**GIBRALTAR AS A CENTRE FOR FUNDS**

Can the Government state how many persons made up the Gibraltar Government delegation at the "Gibraltar as a Centre for Funds" conference and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 430 and 432 of 2004.

**NO 432 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**GIBRALTAR AS A CENTRE FOR FUNDS**

Can Government state what the cost to the Government was, with a breakdown of the "Gibraltar as a Centre for Funds" conference that took place in London on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> April 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheet which I hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 430 of 2004**

25 (twenty-five) individuals attended the VIP dinner in London on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> April 2003.

They were:-

|                        |   |                                          |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|
| The Hon Keith Azopardi | - | MTIT – GOG                               |
| James Tipping          | - | Finance Director – GOG                   |
| Guy Canessa            | - | GOG                                      |
| Maite Mir-Parody       | - | GOG                                      |
| Albert Poggio          | - | Gibraltar Government London Office – GOG |
| Brian Morris           | - | Financial Services Commission            |
| Chris Labrow           | - | Sovereign Asset Management – GASIM       |
| Alex Bonnet            | - | Methodology Group                        |
| Mathew Hulme           | - | UBS                                      |
| Marko Lehtimaki        | - | Methodology Group                        |
| Jacob Hishbaeck        | - | Fidux Trust Company                      |
| Teilhard De Chardin    | - | Invitee of Fidux Trust Company           |
| Gerard Delambilly      | - | Fimat International Bank                 |
| Moe Cohen              | - | Deloitte & Touche                        |

|                      |   |                                         |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------------|
| Eliza Dungworth      | - | Deloitte & Touche (UK)                  |
| Trevor Nichols       | - | Solent Corporate Services Limited       |
| Pramda Ralhan        | - | Finansbanken A/S                        |
| David Traill         | - | Alternative Structured Projects Limited |
| Albert Mena          | - | KPMG                                    |
| Neith Fartharly      | - | KPMG(UK)                                |
| Simon Davies         | - | Threadneedle                            |
| Paul tipping         | - | British Bankers Association             |
| Edgar Lavarello      | - | PricewaterhouseCoopers                  |
| The Hon Peter Benson | - | PricewaterhouseCoopers                  |
| Tom Ainsworth        | - | Lloyds TSB                              |

Cost of RAC evening event – Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> April:- £2,119.00

#### **Answer to Question No 431 of 2004**

The following 4(four) persons made up the Gibraltar Government delegation at the “Gibraltar as a Centre for Funds” conference:-

|                        |   |                                                  |
|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------|
| The Hon Keith Azopardi | - | Minister for Trade Industry & Telecommunications |
| James Tipping          | - | Finance Centre Director                          |
| Guy Canessa            | - | Marketing and Liason Officer                     |
| Maite Mir-Parody       | - | Personal Assistant                               |
| Brian Morris           | - | Investment Services Supervisor – FSC             |

#### **Answer to Question No 432 of 2004**

Please find below the breakdown, of the costs relating to the “Gibraltar as a Centre for Funds” conference that took place in London on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> April 2003.

|                                        |                  |
|----------------------------------------|------------------|
| Flights                                | £1,573.00        |
| Accommodation                          | £2,243.00        |
| Subsistence                            | £ 461.00         |
| Expenses                               | £ 635.00         |
| Courier                                | £ 145.00         |
| London Underwriting Centre (Room Hire) | £1,500.00        |
| London Underwriting Centre (Catering)  | £1,671.00        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                           | <b>£8,228.00</b> |

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 430 TO 432 OF 2004**

#### **HON F R PICARDO:**

In relation to Question No 431 of 2004 the answer kindly provided by the Chief Minister, the following 4 (four) persons made up the Gibraltar Government delegation at the Gibraltar As A Centre For Funds Conference:

|                        |   |                                                  |
|------------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------|
| The Hon Keith Azopardi | - | Minister for Trade Industry & Telecommunications |
| James Tipping          | - | Finance Centre Director                          |
| Guy Canessa            | - | Marketing and Liason Officer                     |
| Maite Mir-Parody       | - | Personal Assistant                               |
| Brian Morris           | - | Investment Services Supervisor – FSC             |

Is that another one of the nuances I have to be careful about, they say four but there are five or should I simply take it that I should not count Mr Morris as a part of the Government delegation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It would really be a matter of enormous Parliamentary import that the Government should say four and then proceed to list five I suppose that would be an act of gross misbehaviour on the part of the Government. If that is the level of issue that the hon Member wishes to raise I suppose that we have to deal with it. It is in fact the second version and that is that Mr Morris whilst attending in support of Gibraltar is not part of the Gibraltar Government delegation because he is a member of the Financial Services Commission. It should have said four persons, the Government delegation accompanied by Mr Morris and then the hon Member would not have been misled.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I did not mean to make a frivolous point I wanted to establish that in fact as a Member of the statutory body which is '*a creature of statute*' he was not there as part of the Government of Gibraltar which is a serious and important point.

**NO 433 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION**

Can Government state how many applications there have been for passporting in investment services since the announcement of 7<sup>th</sup> July 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Since 7<sup>th</sup> July 2003, the Financial Services Commissioner has received five notifications of an intention to provide investment services on a cross-border basis in other EU Member States. As the hon Member I was going to say presumably knows, clearly the way he has formulated his question he clearly does not know, one does not need to apply for passporting one simply needs to notify an intention to do so.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 433 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would this provision of investment services in another Member State be something that would require a presence in the other Member State or is it something that would be done from Gibraltar?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It can be both. One can establish a presence and one can directly market into the market from outside. In either case I believe one simply notifies ones Home Regulator of ones intention to do so. The Home Regulator then has to pass on that notification to the Regulator in the country that one has given notice that one intends to perform in and that is why the postboxing arrangements were necessary in this context for that transfer of notification and then one is just allowed to do it. One does not have to wait for any permission from the foreign Regulator. It is a process of notification, it is both for presence and for direct marketing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it exactly the same whether it is one or the other? I was under the impression that there was more to it if one was actually establishing a presence than if one was just selling the product.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe it is one and the same thing so that one can establish even establish a branch as indeed there are some in Gibraltar. I believe there are one or two branches in Gibraltar of organisations that have passported in and they are regulated by their home regulator and not by the others.



ORAL

**NO 434 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAPTIVE INSURANCE CONFERENCE**

Can Government state how many persons made up the Government delegation to the 18<sup>th</sup> Captive Insurance Conference and Exhibition in Burlington, Vermont from 5-7 August 2003 and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No 435 of 2004.

**NO 435 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAPTIVE INSURANCE CONFERENCE**

Can Government state what the cost to the government was of attending the 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Captive Insurance Conference and exhibition in Burlington, Vermont from 5-7 August 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Two persons made up the Government delegation to the 18<sup>th</sup> Captive Insurance conference and exhibition in Burlington, Vermont on the dates that the hon Member has mentioned. They were Mr Guy Canessa , the Marketing and Liaison Officer and Darion Figueredo, Communications and Technology Development Officer.

The costs were £9,520.00 in total.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION TO NOS 434 AND 435 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The total of £9,520 seems like a very high figure for two individuals to spend over a period of only three days, can the Chief Minister provide a greater breakdown of how that figure is made up?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member should not assume that it was just three days. If the conference is between the 5<sup>th</sup> and the 7<sup>th</sup> I suppose there might have been a need to travel on the 4<sup>th</sup> and return on the 8<sup>th</sup> but in any case as the hon Member is particularly interested and I do not suppose that there is any suggestion that the money was spent on anything else the information I have is as follows:

|                                |                  |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Flights                        | £3,514.00        |
| Accommodation                  | £1,184.00        |
| Subsistence                    | £1,112.00        |
| Expenses                       | £ 856.00         |
| Courier                        | £1,049.00        |
| Exhibition & Registration Fees | £1,805.00        |
|                                | <hr/>            |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>£9,520.00</b> |
|                                | <hr/>            |

**NO 436 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EUROMONEY'S 4<sup>TH</sup> ANNUAL OFFSHORE FINANCIAL SERVICES SUMMIT**

Can Government state what was the cost of sending the Finance Centre Director to speak at Euromoney's 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Offshore Financial Services Summit in London on 26<sup>th</sup> June 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The total cost was £626.00. In anticipation that the hon Member might want a breakdown I can say that the flight was a much more economical flight, £153 on this occasion. The accommodation was £374 and the expenses were a mere £99.

ORAL

NO 437 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**CATEGORY STATUS 2**

Can Government provide a breakdown by year of the number of individuals taking up Category 2 status and its predecessor High Net Worth Individual Status since the status was introduced?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered with Question No 438 of 2004.

**NO 438 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals are registered with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheet which I now hand to him. As to the number of category 2 individuals that there were as at the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, the answer is 155.

**Answer to Question No 437 of 2004**

The records kept by the Finance Centre show that a total of 378 individuals have been registered as Category 2 or High Net Worth individuals since the status was first introduced.

The yearly registrations are as follows:

| YEAR               | REGISTERED |
|--------------------|------------|
| 1992               | 7          |
| 1993               | 14         |
| 1994               | 28         |
| 1995               | 15         |
| 1996               | 23         |
| 1997               | 44         |
| 1998               | 34         |
| 1999               | 34         |
| 2000               | 41         |
| 2001               | 46         |
| 2002               | 43         |
| 2003               | 49         |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>378</b> |

But of this total 124 individuals had their certificates revoked or returned.

The current active yearly registrations are therefore as follows:

| YEAR               | REGISTERED |
|--------------------|------------|
| 1992               | 2          |
| 1993               | 3          |
| 1994               | 15         |
| 1995               | 9          |
| 1996               | 10         |
| 1997               | 20         |
| 1998               | 20         |
| 1999               | 25         |
| 2000               | 26         |
| 2001               | 37         |
| 2002               | 39         |
| 2003               | 48         |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>254</b> |

**Answer to Question No 438 of 2004**

As at the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 there are 155 active registered individuals with Category 2 status.

ORAL

NO 439 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new application for banking licences have been received since March 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

None.



**NO 440 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian), as at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2003 and 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

According to the best statistics available to us, as at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2003 the insurance industry in Gibraltar included 28 employers with a total of 200 registered employees of which 130 were Gibraltarian, 58 were other British, 1 Czech, 1 Irish, 1 Moroccan, 1 Portuguese and 8 Spanish. As at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 the insurance industry in Gibraltar included 28 employers with a total of 196 employees, 123 of which were Gibraltarian, 57 other British, 1 Czech, 1 Belgian, 1 French, 1 Irish, 1 Moroccan, 1 Portuguese and 10 Spanish.

**NO 441 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian), as at each month of the year 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Monthly figures are not available at such short notice. However, as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 the banking sector included 17 employers with a total of 649 registered employees, 452 of which were Gibraltarians, 105 other British, 15 Danish, 5 Dutch, 4 French, 10 Germans, 3 Irish, 1 Italian, 1 Maltese, 3 Moroccan, 1 Portuguese, 36 Spanish, 1 Swedish and 12 Swiss.

As at 31<sup>st</sup> June 2003 the banking sector included 17 employers with a total of 652 registered employees breaking down as 448 Gibraltarians, 111 British, 16 Danish, 5 Dutch, 6 French, 8 Germans, 4 Irish, 1 Maltese, 3 Moroccans, 38 Spanish and 12 Swiss.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 441 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to the first part the Chief Minister said that this was as far the most reliable source, is it the industry itself or is it open contracts in the ETB or some other source?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The source is the ETB and although therefore it is subject to the caveat the figures might be slightly higher than is real because of unregistered deregistrations. The information that I have is that actually the banking and insurance sector are quite good at compliance so there is a high level of confidence. If the hon Member were to

ask me this question about bars or shops then the level of inaccuracy by reason of unregistered vacancies or deregistration would be much higher. So, there is a high level of confidence in these figures but it is still subject to any unnotified cessations.

ORAL

NO 442 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar for each month of 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered with Question No 447 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 443 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in respect of each month of the year 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I will now hand the hon Member a statement giving the information requested.

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

|                        | <u>31-Jan-03</u> | <u>28-Feb-03</u> | <u>31-Mar-03</u> | <u>30-Apr-03</u> | <u>31-May-03</u> | <u>30-Jun-03</u> | <u>31-Jul-03</u> | <u>31-Aug-03</u> | <u>30-Sep-03</u> | <u>31-Oct-03</u> | <u>30-Nov-03</u> | <u>31-Dec-03</u> |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <u>Fund Account -</u>  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| <u>Opening Balance</u> | £6,022,448       | £6,044,449       | £6,086,176       | £6,045,472       | £6,021,006       | £6,091,870       | £6,066,999       | £5,957,739       | £5,902,919       | £5,797,604       | £5,647,235       | £5,613,110       |
| Add                    |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Receipts               | £65,003          | £79,110          | £42,424          | £38,777          | £101,552         | £35,273          | £41,378          | £33,865          | £53,405          | £43,203          | £36,923          | £35,000          |
|                        | £6,087,452       | £6,123,559       | £6,128,600       | £6,084,250       | £6,122,558       | £6,127,143       | £6,108,377       | £5,991,604       | £5,956,325       | £5,840,807       | £5,684,158       | £5,648,110       |
| Less                   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Payments               | (£43,003)        | (£37,383)        | (£83,128)        | (£63,244)        | (£30,687)        | (£60,144)        | (£150,639)       | (£88,684)        | (£158,721)       | (£193,572)       | (£71,048)        | (£58,154)        |
| <u>Closing Balance</u> | £6,044,449       | £6,086,176       | £6,045,472       | £6,021,006       | £6,091,870       | £6,066,999       | £5,957,739       | £5,902,919       | £5,797,604       | £5,647,235       | £5,613,110       | £5,589,956       |

ORAL

**NO 444 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**OFFICE SPACE IN GIBRALTAR**

Can the Chief Minister state what plans, if any, the Government have to address the concerns of professional and business representative bodies as to the shortage of office space in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No 445 of 2004.

**NO 445 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**OFFICE SPACE IN GIBRALTAR**

Can Government state whether it intends to monitor the cost of rental of office space in light of the current shortage?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are confident that the private development market will respond to any shortage in supply that may develop for office space in Gibraltar. In the meantime, I hope that the hon Member will acknowledge that any shortage of office space that he has identified is the result of the Government's successful management and growth of the economy and also inconsistent with his party's frequently expressed pessimism about the performance of the Finance Centre Government have no specific plan to monitor rents because they have no intention of controlling them.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER TO QUESTION NOS 444 AND 445 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will not acknowledge the fact that there is a dearth of office space as anything to do with us being wrong about the Government's economic policy. In fact, will the Chief Minister agree with me that putting a hospital in an office block proves (a) that one does not have enough people coming round to take up offices when one has lots of them and (b) that once one has taken the majority out of the market one then finds oneself in a situation when even the business that we are getting these days does not find a place in which to work.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have some difficulty following the hon member's point. There are still vacant office spaces in Gibraltar but to the extent that there is a shortage it is because demand is growing. If demand for office space in Gibraltar is growing it must be because the economy is growing and if the economy is growing unless the hon Member thinks that the Government have nothing to do with the success of the economy then it has to be because of the successful management and growth of the economy. So, I do not see why the hon Gentleman has to be so ungenerous as not to recognise that the growth of the economy is down to the Government. After all he blames Government when things go wrong, surely he should have the magnanimity to acknowledge that when something is going right it must be the Government who can claim the credit for it. The answer is the same, Government do not intend to monitor rents. Whatever the rents might rise to be I do not think that Government thinks it is appropriate to exercise any form of control over business rentals in the private sector particularly in the Finance Centre.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not the case that in commercial properties the rates follow the rents and move with the market, so, is it not a fact that if the rents are going up the Government itself can monitor it without having to do anything because it is reflected in higher income from rates on business premises?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, eventually that information comes through. Subject to the poundage and ten twelfths and that calculation the higher rents go the higher the income to the Government from rates. It does not enable the Government unless it does a rate payer account by rate payer account, it does not enable the Government to follow how much rents are going up in individual properties unless one analyses each net annual value for rating purposes. So, I did not say that the Government did not have the means to monitor it. I said that the Government was not monitoring it because it was pointless. What is the point of monitoring something if one does not intend to do something about it regardless of the results of the monitoring.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would have thought that the Government would be interested in knowing what was happening in the economy without necessarily requiring to intervene, control or introduce rent freezes. *[INTERRUPTION]* We know that Government believe that we are growing at 6 per cent and that that is enough and we will know whether that is eventually reflected when the figures of the economy eventually come out. Surely the Government knows that in the way that GDP is calculated, rental income is a component of GDP so presumably if rents are going up that will be reflected in the growth rate of the GDP. From the breakdown that Government have provided in the last report they published, would Government agree?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not think that 6 per cent is enough in the sense that Government would not want it to be more and indeed it might be more post 2001. Government have said that 6 per cent is a perfectly respectable rate of growth particularly if it is sustained year on year. Of course it is possible occasionally to get much higher rates of growth but not to sustain year on year at extraordinary rates of growth. Of course, if there is a one off development whilst that project is closed to the economy there will be a bleep upwards. It is not that Government says, *"Ah, the economy is growing at 6 per cent and we can sort of sit on our laurels and not try and generate greater levels of economic growth,"* of course Government tries to generate greater levels of economic growth and indeed we think we are generating probably greater levels. The figures we show and I hope that they will be shown to me and I will be able to publish them soon. Certainly annual growth rates of 12 per cent which I think is what the Leader of the Opposition was promising on a sustained basis is in our view not realistic. One might get 12 per cent for one year or two but on a sustained basis Government do not think that it is sustainable.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do Government have information on unoccupied commercial premises as a result, for example, of the information that they get on rates and is there an indication there of the level of unoccupied property coming down?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have the information and it is not reported to me in that way. As to whether the information is available I cannot be certain but I think it probably can be available because I think the rates are then payable under a different section and I am sure that the LPS computer charges the amount collected to a particular section. There must be a total whether it can be broken down into individual premises. If the total is available then presumably the computer can report anything that went into calculating that total. The information is not presented to Ministers in that way.

**NO 446 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES OMBUDSMAN**

Will the Government, in light of the serious financial loss and associated suffering occasioned to a large number of Gibraltarians and overseas investors in the past year, now consider creating a body with jurisdiction similar to that of the Financial Services Ombudsman in the UK (and elsewhere in the EU) to deal with complaints relating to licensees under the Financial Services Ordinance 1989 and 1998, and with the power to provide redress to complainants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Government are considering this matter.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 446 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am sure the Chief Minister is aware that under the provisions of Section 54 of the 1989 Ordinance there was provision for the making of regulations dealing with compensation and that no regulations had in fact been made thereunder. Whilst the issue of the Ombudsman is under consideration can the Government indicate whether it will be moving regulations under this section of the Ordinance?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not aware of what those regulations provide but certainly Government have no intentions, the matter is not in hand and as far as I am aware is not even under consideration.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In relation to the first answer given by the Chief Minister at what stage is the Government's consideration of this issue of the Financial Services Ombudsman and what more can the Chief Minister share with the House as to the type of creature that the Government are considering creating?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot give the hon Member any details as to the statutory framework because I do not think that a lot of work has been done on it but certainly the issue has been consulted on, the Financial Services Commissioner has expressed his views, I know that he has discussed it with the previous Minister with responsibilities for financial services, that the Ombudsman is keen because at the moment as there is no Ombudsman all the complaints go to him and it is not really his job unless the complaint raises regulatory issues. Very often it does not raise regulatory issues it just raises things such as, *"I went to such and such a bank and they kept me waiting in the queue for three quarters of an hour."* That is not a regulatory issue but it would be the sort of thing that a Financial Services Ombudsman might be interested in. So, the Financial Services Commissioner is keen, the Government are not opposed provided this is not another body that has to be maintained at taxpayers expense. Provided the costs of operating the Financial Services Ombudsman is borne by the industry by some means or other not yet thought about still less decided the Government are not opposed and actually thinks that it is a good idea. I often receive letters in my office of people complaining about the treatment that they may have received. At the end of the day what can one do. The Government cannot get involved in quality of service issues. I think it is a good idea but there will be costs attached and the Government's present thinking is that those costs should be borne somehow by the industry itself.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I urge the Chief Minister in that process of consultation as I will not be consulted further than I get a chance to put my little grain of rice in this particular forum, that if we are to have an Ombudsman we should not fall into the trap of having an Ombudsman again with no teeth and that this particular Ombudsman should have the power, as I say in my question, to provide redress and not simply to make recommendations like the present Ombudsman. The Financial Services Ombudsman would not be dealing with Government so the Chief Minister would have nothing to fear from him but the complainants to him would have the ability if the Ombudsman had teeth to also attain redress from him which I think is the important aspect of the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure that I could consult the hon Member in his professional capacity since I am led to believe that he is no longer the partner of any firm and that he is now a consultant.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Chief Minister give way. I am actually the one and only partner of Picardo and Co.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I see. Well, I understand that there is some sort of special consultancy arrangement with his ex-firm, I hope that that works very well. Speaking for myself I have never understood why people have to leave law firms simply because they are in politics but still that is a matter for the law firms themselves. Nor can I accept the premise of his question and to an extent the remarks that he has made that the Public Services Ombudsman lacks 'teeth'. He very much does not lack 'teeth'. He has very, very, very wide ranging powers to require production to him of almost every piece of Government paper. Indeed all pieces of Government paper that I do not certify, the public interest requires not to be sent to him. I have never exercised that power and I cannot envisage circumstances in which I might have to but I suppose they might. If by not having 'teeth', somebody who has the power to investigate, summon witnesses, require the entire public administration to open its files to him can hardly be said to lack 'teeth' unless by lacking 'teeth' what he means is that he is not a super privy council. So, that when he has formed a view about something he does not have the power to impose his view and require and the elected Government of the day to act according to his view. That would not be to give him 'teeth' that would be to elevate the Public Services Ombudsman, somebody that the Chief Minister designates to a position much more powerful than the combined power and authority of the elected Government and for that matter the elected Opposition in its parliamentary capacity as well. I am not aware of any Public Services Ombudsman anywhere in the democratic world, by which I do not suggest that they do have those powers in the non democratic world but rather that they do not exist at all, that has the power to cause his judgements and his views to be acted on. It is generally accepted in the Ombudsman's model which the Leader of the Opposition will remember is a Swedish creature that the Ombudsman's powers are limited to the powers of persuasion through the publicity that statute entitles him to give to the criticisms that he chooses to levy at the public administration and it forms no part of the role of an unelected Ombudsman that he should have the power to order the elected Government to do this or that if it is contrary to the policy of the Government. So, I do not accept that the Public Services Ombudsman lacks teeth nor am I aware in terms of the Financial Services Ombudsman what sort of powers they normally get into the UK. I would expect our Financial Services Ombudsman when we have one to be the same sort of creature with the same sort of powers and roles as is the norm in the UK which is what we did with our Public Services Ombudsman. We got all the legislation from comparable territories, we based ours on Malta, New Zealand and Ireland primarily to make sure that we were doing more or less what everyone was doing and I assume we will do the same for the Financial Ombudsman too.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As the Chief Minister has said the Ombudsman has the power to investigate, summons witnesses and to obtain copies of pieces of papers to look at files. That is already a power which the Financial Services Commission has in relation to all of the issues which the complainant in my question would be bringing before the Financial Services Ombudsman and that is why I think it is important that we do concentrate on providing an Ombudsman that is able to provide redress and in that respect the Chief

Minister has spoken of a Super Privy Council. Well, then so be it. In fact, recently in the United Kingdom the Financial Services Ombudsman in its capacity as a Super Privy Council made an order against one particular bank where it ordered them to pay a substantial amount back to investors in a product that had been improperly advertised and I would urge that that be the level of power to provide redress that any creature of statute designated as a Financial Services Ombudsman has when the Chief Minister brings legislation to this House to that effect.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I say, I have said that I was not aware the sort of powers wielded by Financial Services Ombudsman. I am familiar with the powers wielded by Public Services Ombudsman because we had to research it at the time that we created ours. I have also said that I am not aware because I am not familiar with the powers that are held by Financial Services Ombudsman but I have said that we would expect ours to have the same power. I presume that if the Financial Services Ombudsman has power to make awards it is limited to loss flowing from regulatory failures rather than contractual situations which are still presumably the province of the courts. We will find out when we get there.

**NO 447 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheet which I now hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 442 of 2004**

The companies formed in Gibraltar in each month of 2003 were as follows:

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| January   | 334 |
| February  | 239 |
| March     | 176 |
| April     | 204 |
| May       | 304 |
| June      | 271 |
| July      | 272 |
| August    | 267 |
| September | 280 |
| October   | 255 |
| November  | 305 |
| December  | 235 |

Total for the year 2003 – 3142 (3470 in 2002)

**Answer to Question 447 of 2004**

The companies removed from the companies register in 2003 were as follows:

Struck off pursuant to Section 267 = 2167 companies

Wound up = 93 companies

Cessation pursuant of Section (10) 3 Re-domiciliation = 161 companies

Total = 2421 companies.



ORAL

NO 448 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Are Government continuing to approve the grant of new Tax Exempt certificates?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 449 and 450 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 449 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates were issued in 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 448 and 450 of 2004.

**NO 450 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Government continue to approve the granting of new tax exempt certificates. There were 1,022 new tax exempt certificates issued in 2003. A total of 989 companies have terminated their tax exempt certificates in 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 448 TO 450 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In relation to the answer to Question No 448 of 2004, the position as to the continuance of the issue of the certificates is as we discussed earlier in relation to the other question, that until the Commission proactively requires us to stop we shall continue to issue them unless we have a different system in place is that right?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. If the hon Member had seen any of these recently he will see that they are all now issued under cover of a letter advising that the Government intends to reform company taxation in Gibraltar and that the validity of the certificate ends when the said reforms are implemented.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Therefore there is no other date on the horizon apart from that which might be set by the Commission by which we have no alternative but to stop. There is no long stop date that we have to be careful of because of the existing aid provisions. We are really in the hands of the Commission in that respect. There is no objective long term date.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The only other date that might intervene is the code of conduct roll back date. This is one of the harmful tax measures identified by the Primorolo Group and as I said earlier in answer to a question by the Leader of the Opposition it is currently understood by the UK and accepted by them that we cannot be expected to roll back the exempt regime until we can replace it with another one. We cannot be without a regime but if that were to change then that is the only other date that might intervene on the horizon that the hon Member has painted.

ORAL

**NO 451 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies are registered in Gibraltar as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No 452 of 2004.

**NO 452 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Are there any applications to form a protected Cell Company pending consideration, or has any application been rejected since the last Question Time in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, one Protected Cell Company is registered in Gibraltar. There are currently no applications to form a Protected Cell Company pending consideration, to my knowledge none have been refused.

ORAL

NO 453 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

How many qualifying companies have discontinued their qualifying status in 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No 454 of 2004.

**NO 454 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many of the qualifying companies which remained as at the end of December 2003 are considered by it to be active or trading?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As far as our records show during the year 2003 no qualifying company relinquished its status. As far as we can ascertain the majority of registered qualifying companies remain active.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 453 AND 454 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Having had the opportunity of going back to the answer to Question Nos 330 and 331 of 2003 where the answer given by the Chief Minister's predecessor as Minister for Financial Services was White Rock Insurance Gibraltar PCC Limited is the only Protected Cell Company that is formed in Gibraltar up to the end of 2002. I suppose that explains the whole of the answer to those four questions. The answer to all of them is one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is the hon Member inviting me to repeat the answer that I have just given him? One is the answer that I have just given him.



**HON F R PICARDO:**

What I am inviting is comment on the fact that there is one Protected Cell Company in Gibraltar, there was one Protected Cell Company in Gibraltar, there is no application for any others and none have gone. It appears that one is the number that came and that is it.

ORAL

NO 455 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attending all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services for the year 2003, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheet which I hand to him.

Answer to Question 455/2004

| CONFERENCE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | SPONSOR/<br>REG. FEES | FLIGHTS | ACCOMM | SUBSIS<br>TENCE | EXPENSES | COURIER | ROOM HIRE/<br>CATERING | TOTAL      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|--------|-----------------|----------|---------|------------------------|------------|
| <b>Institute of Directors' Seminar - 22nd January 2003</b><br>James Tipping - Finance Centre Director<br>Darion Figueredo - E-Business Officer                                                                                                                                  | 0                     | 197     | 330    | 102             | 294      | 0       | 0                      | £ 923.00   |
| <b>Gibraltar Insurance Conference - 5th February 2003</b><br>Keith Azopardi - MTIT<br>James Tipping - Finance Centre Director<br>Guy Canessa - Marketing & Liaison Officer<br>Claire Kelly-Federico - Asst. Finance Centre Director<br>Veena Purswani - Marketing/Admin Officer | 0                     | 1912    | 2364   | 615             | 1489     | 290     | 4520                   | £11,190.00 |
| <b>Euromoney 3rd International Trusts Forum<br/>20th-21st February 2003</b><br>James Tipping - Finance Centre Director<br>Darion Figueredo - E-Business Officer                                                                                                                 | 4000                  | 478     | 846    | 102             | 423      | 13      | 0                      | £ 5,862.00 |
| <b>Gibraltar Funds Conference - 9th April 2003</b><br>Keith Azopardi - MTIT<br>James Tipping - Finance Centre Director<br>Guy Canessa - Marketing & Liaison Officer<br>Maite Mir-Parody - Personal Assistant FCD<br>Brian Morris - Investment Services Supervisor               | 0                     | 1573    | 2243   | 461             | 635      | 145     | 3171                   | £ 8,228.00 |

Cont..

Cont.d Answer to Question 455/2004

| CONFERENCE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | SPONSOR/<br>REG. FEES | FLIGHTS | ACCOMM | SUBSIS<br>TENCE | EXPENSES | COURIER | ROOM HIRE/<br>CATERING | TOTAL       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------|--------|-----------------|----------|---------|------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Gibraltar E-Business Conference - 25th June 2003</b><br>James Tipping - Finance Centre Director<br>Darion Figueredo - E-Business Officer<br>Veena Purswani - Marketing/Admin Officer<br>Paul Canessa - Chief Executive GRA<br>Ian Torrilla - Chairperson ICTA                                      | 0                     | 833     | 2124   | 307             | 188      | 125     | 3602                   | £ 7,179.00  |
| <b>Euromoney 4th Offshore Financial Services Summit<br/>26th June 2003</b><br>James Tipping - Finance Centre Director                                                                                                                                                                                 | 0                     | 153     | 374    | 0               | 99       | 0       | 0                      | £ 626.00    |
| <b>Vermont Captive Insurance Association<br/>5th - 7th August 2003</b><br>Guy Canessa - Marketing & Liaison Officer<br>Darion Figueredo - E-Business Officer                                                                                                                                          | 1805                  | 3514    | 1184   | 1112            | 856      | 1049    | 0                      | £ 9,520.00  |
| <b>Gibraltar Day in London - 20th October 2003</b><br>Keith Azopardi - MTIT<br>James Tipping - Finance Centre Director<br>Joe Macano - Director Licensing Unit<br>Darion Figueredo - E-Business Officer<br>Veena Purswani - Marketing/Admin Officer<br>Maite Mir-Parody - Personal Secretary FCD      | 0                     | 1661    | 1843   | 512             | 614      | 423     | 8561                   | £ 13,614.00 |
| <b>Private Clients' Conference - 12th November 2003</b><br>Keith Azopardi - MTIT<br>James Tipping - Finance Centre Director<br>Joe Macano - Director Licensing Unit<br>Darion Figueredo - E-Business Officer<br>Veena Purswani - Marketing/Admin Officer<br>Maite Mir-Parody - Personal Secretary FCD | 0                     | 1487    | 2248   | 563             | 601      | 175     | 4489                   | £ 9,563.00  |

**NO 456 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION**

In relation to financial services, can the Chief Minister give the dates from March 2003 to date when he or his predecessor with responsibility for Financial Services, the Hon Keith Azopardi, have been away from Gibraltar on Government business, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited, the names of any officials or other persons travelling with the Chief Minister or the Minister and a breakdown of the cost of each visit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheets which I hand to him.

Answer to Question 456/2004

| DATE               | EVENT                                                                                                                           | CITY           | TRAVEL | ACCOMM. | SUBSIS. | EXPENSES | PRESS LUNCH | CONF. | VIP DINNER | TOTAL   |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------|---------|---------|----------|-------------|-------|------------|---------|
| 17-21 March 2003   | <b>Marketing Visits</b><br>The Hon K Azopardi<br>James Tipping<br>Claire Kelly-Federico                                         | Milan & Lugano | 2301   | 2313    | 625     | 969      | 0           | 0     | 0          | £6,808  |
| 7-10 April 2003    | <b>Gibraltar Funds Conference</b><br>The Hon K Azopardi<br>James Tipping<br>Guy Canessa<br>Maite Mir-Parody<br>Brian Morris     | London         | 1573   | 2243    | 461     | 780      | 877         | 3171  | 2119       | £11,224 |
| 11-14 May 2003     | <b>Marketing Visits</b><br>The Hon K Azopardi<br>Guy Canessa<br>Claire Kelly-Federico                                           | Lugano         | 5627   | 1795    | 708     | 592      | 0           | 0     | 0          | £8,722  |
| 10-11 June 2003    | <b>Meetings with Inland Revenue, FCO, HMT, DTI &amp; UK REP at DTI</b><br>The Hon P Caruana<br>Ernest Montado<br>John Reyes     | London         | 2392   | 440     | 0       | 160      | 0           | 0     | 0          | £2,992  |
| 22 September 2003  | <b>Meeting re State Aid Tax Reform at DG Competition</b><br>The Hon P Caruana<br>Ernest Montado<br>John Reyes<br>Michael Llamas | Brussels       | 1943   | 637     | 0       | 348      | 0           | 0     | 0          | £2,928  |
| 13-16 October 2003 | <b>OECD Global Forum Meeting</b><br>The Hon K Azopardi<br>James Tipping<br>Michael Llamas                                       | Ottawa         | 9210   | 962     | 252     | 287      | 0           | 0     | 0          | £10,711 |

Cont.d Answer to Question 456/2004

| DATE               | EVENT                                                                                                                                                             | CITY   | TRAVEL | ACCOMM. | SUBSIS. | EXPENSES | LUNCH | CONF. | VIP DINNER | TOTAL   |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|----------|-------|-------|------------|---------|
| 19-21 October 2003 | Gibraltar Day in London - Financial Services Lunch<br>The Hon K Azopardi<br>James Tipping<br>Joe Macano<br>Darion Figueredo<br>Veena Purswani<br>Maite Mir-Parody | London | 1661   | 1843    | 512     | 1037     | 8561  | 0     | 0          | £13,614 |
| 1-14 November 2003 | Private Clients' Conference<br>The Hon K Azopardi<br>James Tipping<br>Joe Macano<br>Darion Figueredo<br>Veena Purswani<br>Maite Mir-Parody                        | London | 1487   | 2248    | 563     | 776      | 0     | 4489  | 1774       | £11,337 |

**NO 457 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****FINANCE CENTRE DIRECTOR**

What conferences, seminars or events does the Government expect that the Finance Centre Director, or any Member of his staff, will be attending in the next six months, by whom will he be accompanied and what is the expected cost of attendance at each event?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

One of the principal functions of the Finance Centre is marketing and the promotion of Gibraltar as a Financial Services Centre. As such and in close collaboration with the private sector the Finance Centre has over a number of years developed a rolling programme of events and marketing trips that it engages in. This year and more specifically over the next six months we would expect that the Finance Centre would be actively considering the following:-

|             |   |                                                                                                  |
|-------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Geneva      | - | marketing of private client products, funds and insurance                                        |
| Zurich      | - | marketing of private client products, funds and insurance                                        |
| Lisbon      | - | marketing of private client products, funds and insurance                                        |
| San Diego   | - | attendance at insurance conference                                                               |
| Scandinavia | - | insurance marketing                                                                              |
| Luxembourg  | - | attendance at insurance conference                                                               |
| UK          | - | various events including London and Manchester for the promotion of financial services generally |

The above illustration does not take into account specific requests from private sector firms for the Finance Centre to attend and to speak at or co-host events and conferences with them. One such example is an in-house insurance workshop at a major international insurance company in London – attendees would comprise international staff of the company. This is being held in late February. We would also expect to receive invitations from conference organisers inviting the Finance Centre to speak on financial services topics. Generally the personnel at the Finance Centre that are involved in marketing and travel are:-



|                  |   |                                      |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| James Tipping    | - | Finance Centre Director              |
| Joe Macano       | - | Director Licensing Unit              |
| Guy Canessa      | - | Marketing and Liaison Officer        |
| Veena Purswani   | - | Marketing and Administration Officer |
| Maite Mir-Parody | - | Personal Assistant                   |

The actual number of staff attending any one event depends largely on, inter alia, the level of expected attendees at any event, the complexity of the organisation, how many speakers we would wish to put forward, individuals to have available for networking etc. The involvement of staff in marketing travel is also used as a career development and motivation tool. It also provides for a pool of in-house resource and experience to be developed which is crucial for continuity purposes.

As regards costs, average costs have varied from circa £600 for attending as a speaker at a third party conference to approximately £11,000 for the organisation and development by Finance Centre staff of a large conference, for example, on insurance in London with approximately 75 attendees in total. However this does not take into account the fact that the Finance Centre would normally arrange for tag-on events at the same time such as a journalists lunch or similar. This is to ensure value is maximised in respect of the fixed costs such as travel and accommodation costs. Importantly, each and every event is discussed with the private sector on a case by case basis to ensure that broad based support is forthcoming prior to any event being staged.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 457 OF 2004**

#### **HON F R PICARDO:**

I am very grateful to the Chief Minister for that answer which volunteers so much more information than my question sought but looking at my question the only conferences which are planned at this stage appear to be the Geneva, Zurich and Lisbon conferences and everything else is envisaged but not yet programmed is that right?

#### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is overlooking the width and depth of his question. I do not think that there is any extra information in the answer although I agree that if I had drafted the answer I would certainly not have made it so long. Still, I am not able to distinguish between the ones that are firm and the ones that are not, it is not disclosed to me.

**NO 458 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can Government state how much of the amount of the DTI Financial Services budget allocated to marketing, promotions and conferences has been spent as at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, giving a breakdown of the sums expended?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The sum of about £148,000 has been spent from DTI Financial Services budget out of £200,000 which was allocated for the financial year 2003/2004. A breakdown of the sums expended is as follows:

|                                                 |                 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Marketing Conferences and Promotional Materials | £104,143        |
| Travel and Accommodation                        | £ 34,780        |
| Subsistence                                     | £ 3,352         |
| Courier and other miscellaneous expenses        | £ 5,462         |
|                                                 | _____           |
| <b>Total</b>                                    | <b>£147,737</b> |
|                                                 | _____           |

**NO 459 OF 2004****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****VISAS**

What is the total number of visas issued in British Consular Offices in Morocco for non-EU nationals wishing to travel to Gibraltar, on a monthly basis since March 2003 inclusive?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The total of visas for Gibraltar issued in Morocco to no-EU nationals is not available at the moment because the premises which accommodate the British Consular Offices in Tangier and Casablanca have been closed since 15 December 2003. The hon Member may have read in the press that indeed when the Foreign Office conducted a security analysis of its various diplomatic posts around the world these two were identified as being really exposed, high risk locations and therefore they were just closed down overnight. Both offices are pending relocation and officials are temporarily unable to access their records. For the time being, all applications for visas for Gibraltar are being handled by Rabat. The information sought can therefore only be provided in respect of visas issued by Rabat. The total number of visas issued by Rabat on a monthly basis since March 2003 is as follows:

|                                                                 |   |     |   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---|-----|---|
| March 2003                                                      | - | 3   |   |
| April 2003                                                      | - | 7   |   |
| May 2003                                                        | - | 5   |   |
| June 2003                                                       | - | 12  |   |
| July 2003                                                       | - | 20  |   |
| August 2003                                                     | - | 5   |   |
| Sept 2003                                                       | - | 12  |   |
| Oct 2003                                                        | - | 6   |   |
| Nov 2003                                                        | - | 14  |   |
| Dec 2003                                                        | - | 21  |   |
| January 2003 (Up to and including 5 <sup>th</sup> January 2003) | - |     | 3 |
| Total No of visas                                               | - | 108 |   |

**NO 460 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**OFFSHORE BETTING**

Have there been any new applications for a licence to conduct offshore betting since the last question time in this House in March?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Since the end of March 2003, 26 enquiries have been received. Of these, seven, resulted in formal applications, three of which have been rejected and four are under consideration.

**NO 461 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**OFFSHORE BETTING**

Can Government say how many people are employed in the offshore betting industry indicating how many are part-time and how many are full-time as at 30<sup>th</sup> June 2003 and 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003, listing the companies where such persons are employed, how many are Gibraltarians, how many are EU nationals and how many are non-EU nationals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Based on the available information supplied by the gaming operators themselves, as at the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2003, a total of 708 persons were employed by 10 companies. This compares very favourably to the 567 persons employed on the date of the previous detailed return from the gaming operators on the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2003 which was provided in answer to Question No 387/2003. I hand the hon Member the information requested.

Answer to Question 461 of 2004

OFFSHORE GAMING COMPANIES - EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2003

|                                                                      | Gibraltarian | Other British | Spanish   | Other      | Total      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Ladbroke (Gibraltar) Limited - Full Time                             | 8            | 32            | 3         | 0          | 43         |
| - Part Time                                                          | 1            | 0             | 0         | 0          | 1          |
| Sub-Total                                                            | 9            | 32            | 3         | 0          | 44         |
| Victor Chandler (International) Limited - Full Time                  | 41           | 98            | 7         | 40         | 186        |
| - Part Time                                                          | 34           | 30            | 7         | 8          | 79         |
| Sub-Total                                                            | 75           | 128           | 14        | 48         | 265        |
| Bet and Win International Limited - Full Time                        | 8            | 10            | 2         | 13         | 33         |
| (formerly <i>Simon Bold</i> ) - Part Time                            | 0            | 0             | 0         | 0          | 0          |
| Sub-Total                                                            | 8            | 10            | 2         | 13         | 33         |
| Stan James (Gibraltar) Limited - Full Time                           | 4            | 75            | 0         | 8          | 87         |
| - Part Time                                                          | 2            | 6             | 0         | 0          | 8          |
| Sub-Total                                                            | 6            | 81            | 0         | 8          | 95         |
| Trafalgar Betting and Gaming Limited - Full Time                     | 2            | 5             | 0         | 2          | 9          |
| - Part Time                                                          | 0            | 1             | 0         | 0          | 1          |
| Sub-Total                                                            | 2            | 6             | 0         | 2          | 10         |
| St Minver Limited                                                    | 4            | 9             | 0         | 1          | 14         |
| (formerly <i>Gala Interactive</i> ) - Full Time                      | 0            | 1             | 0         | 0          | 1          |
| - Part Time                                                          | 4            | 10            | 0         | 1          | 15         |
| Digibet Limited                                                      | 0            | 0             | 0         | 1          | 1          |
| Eurobet (Gibraltar) Limited                                          | 2            | 4             | 1         | 7          | 14         |
| Carmen Media Group Ltd (formerly <i>Demmysportsbet.com Limited</i> ) | 9            | 9             | 2         | 7          | 27         |
| Cassava Enterprises (Gibraltar) Limited                              | 53           | 73            | 3         | 75         | 204        |
| <b>Totals:-</b>                                                      |              |               |           |            |            |
| Full Time                                                            | 131          | 315           | 18        | 154        | 618        |
| Part Time                                                            | 37           | 38            | 7         | 8          | 90         |
| <b>Overall Total</b>                                                 | <b>168</b>   | <b>353</b>    | <b>25</b> | <b>162</b> | <b>708</b> |

Source: Office of the Financial & Development Secretary

**NO 462 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MERCAMED GIBRALTAR**

Can Government say whether the Gibraltar Mercomed and Spanish Mercomed have now been incorporated in Gibraltar and Spain, and has the Joint Venture Agreement between them now been concluded?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Mercomed (Gibraltar & Los Barrios) Limited has been incorporated in Gibraltar and Mercomed (Gibraltar & Los Barrios) SA is in its final stages of incorporation in Spain. The Joint Venture Agreement remains to be concluded.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 462 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Once the Spanish company is formed and the agreement has been concluded, at what stage will the company be in a position to apply for some kind of special EU status which I think we discussed originally when this issue first came up?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Once they are both incorporated. The status to which the hon Member refers is known as by its acronym EEIG which stands for European Economic Interest Grouping.

**NO 463 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY – BUILDING MATERIALS**

What was the amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since March 2003 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member the information requested

**Answer to Question No 463 of 2004**

|           | £         |
|-----------|-----------|
| March     | 31,163.18 |
| April     | 34,704.48 |
| May       | 36,595.39 |
| June      | 23,858.89 |
| July      | 33,427.59 |
| August    | 29,855.22 |
| September | 38,777.51 |
| October   | 49,530.68 |
| November  | 25,505.68 |
| December  | 18,268.18 |



ORAL

**NO 464 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY – LAND FRONTIER**

How much import duty has been collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the Land Frontier on a monthly basis from January 2002 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 464 of 2004**

| <b>2002</b>  | <b>£</b>           | <b>2003</b> | <b>£</b>           |
|--------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| January      | 8,202.26           | January     | 10,333.14          |
| February     | 8,289.06           | February    | 7,778.02           |
| March        | 8,779.14           | March       | 10,475.08          |
| April        | 9,376.86           | April       | 11,112.26          |
| May          | 10,887.73          | May         | 10,738.90          |
| June         | 8,127.65           | June        | 9,703.13           |
| July         | 9,447.72           | July        | 9,353.91           |
| August       | 7,166.69           | August      | 7,807.14           |
| September    | 10,279.06          | September   | 10,011.31          |
| October      | 10,370.81          | October     | 14,733.74          |
| November     | 11,293.57          | November    | 16,334.66          |
| December     | 15,686.50          | December    | 22,047.79          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>£117,907.05</b> |             | <b>£141,429.08</b> |

ORAL

**NO 465 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8A, SUBHEAD 8(d)**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £200,000 forecast out-turn for 2002/2003 at Head 8A, Subhead 8(d) in respect of private sector fees for legal drafting, showing in each case the legal firm that the amount was paid to, the work done, the date of payment and the amount paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 466 to 471 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 466 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8A, SUBHEAD 8(e)**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £9,000 forecast out-turn for 2002/2003 at Head 8A, Subhead Head 8(e) in respect of publications, showing the amount paid to whom and for what?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 465 and 467 to 471 of 2004.

**NO 467 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8A, SUBHEAD 13**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £780,000 forecast out-turn for 2002/2003 at Head 8A, Subhead 13 in respect of private sector fees for legal advice, showing in each case the legal firm that the amount was paid to, the work done, the date of payment and the amount paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 465 to 466 and 468 to 471 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 468 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8A, SUBHEAD 14**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £1,170,000 forecast out-turn for 2002/2003 at Head 8A, Subhead 14 in respect of Government Lobbying, Hospitality and Travel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 465 to 467 and 469 to 471 of 2004.

**NO 469 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8A, SUBHEAD 22**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £100,000 forecast out-turn for 2002/2003 at Head 8A, Subhead 22 in respect of Research, Development Studies and Professional Fees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 465 to 468 and 470 to 471 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 470 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8A, SUBHEAD 23**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £150,000 forecast out-turn for 2002/2003 at Head 8A, Subhead 23 in respect of National Day?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with question Nos 465 to 469 and 471 of 2004.



**NO 471 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

What was the total cost, with a breakdown per event, of Gibraltar Day in London last October?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No 465 to 467 of 2004**

The extensive and factual information requested by the hon Member is set out in the Schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 468 of 2004**

|                 |             |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Official Travel | £213,460.96 |
| Invited Guests  | £ 16,957.77 |
| Political       | £960,573.39 |

---

**£1,190,992.12**

---

**Answer to Question No 469 of 2004**

|                    |            |
|--------------------|------------|
| Input/Output Study | £22,362.40 |
| IT Review          | £30,088.04 |
| Mr L Edmonds       | £ 8,400.00 |
| Misc               | £56,230.47 |

---

**£117,080.91**

---

**Answer to Question No 470 of 2004**

The information requested by the hon Member is too voluminous and too and too minutely detailed. The hon Member is in effect asking the government to publish a Nominal Ledger of all items charged to the general subheads. It is not appropriate. If he wants subtotals in respect of any particular item of expenditure I will endeavour the information for him.

**Answer to Question No 471 of 2004**

|                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Sea Cadets         | £ 265.00           |
| Piper and Drummer  | £ 140.00           |
| Catering           | £31,711.00         |
| Hire of Guild Hall | £ 6,682.00         |
| Floral             | £ 2,062.00         |
| Printing/Postage   | £ 2,651.55         |
|                    | —————              |
|                    | <b>£ 43,511.55</b> |
|                    | —————              |

Answer to Question 471 of 2004

ANSWER TO QUESTION 465

| <u>FIRM</u>                        | <u>DATE OF PAYMENT</u> | <u>DESCRIPTION</u>          | <u>AMOUNT</u>      |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| HASSANS                            | 30/04/2002             | Tax Reform                  | £19,375.70         |
| HASSANS                            | 09/10/2002             | Tax Reform                  | £10,367.95         |
| HASSANS                            | 09/12/2002             | Telecommunications Licenses | £1,568.47          |
| HASSANS                            | 19/03/2003             | Tax Reform                  | £2,420.05          |
| TRIAY & TRIAY                      | 10/05/2002             | New Tax Legislation         | £4,545.00          |
| BAKER TILLY                        | 27/05/2002             | Tax Legislation             | £8,025.00          |
| KPMG                               | 07/06/2002             | Reform Tax Legislation      | £7,087.00          |
| KPMG                               | 26/06/2002             | Reform Tax Legislation      | £6,902.22          |
| KPMG                               | 29/08/2002             | Reform Tax Legislation      | £7,275.00          |
| KPMG                               | 27/01/2003             | Reform Tax Legislation      | £10,842.37         |
| MICHAEL LLAMAS                     | 26/06/2002             | Eurovote                    | £10,710.00         |
| MICHAEL LLAMAS                     | 23/08/2002             | Advice icw ECHR             | £12,580.00         |
| MICHAEL LLAMAS                     | 11/12/2002             | Civil Aviation              | £15,300.00         |
| MICHAEL LLAMAS                     | 28/01/2003             | Eurovote                    | £2,890.00          |
| MICHAEL LLAMAS                     | 28/01/2003             | Consumer Credit             | £9,690.00          |
| CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, STEEN & HAMILTON | 22/11/2002             | Tax Reform                  | £54,065.84         |
|                                    |                        |                             | <u>£183,644.60</u> |

Cont.....

ANSWER TO QUESTION 466

| <u>FIRM</u>                         | <u>DESCRIPTION</u>                                                                                                             | <u>AMOUNT</u>    |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £764.50          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £144.50          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Legislation Direct OnLine                                                                                                      | £2,500.00        |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £149.00          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £229.00          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £149.00          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £149.00          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £149.00          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £555.00          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £289.00          |
| BUTTERWORTHS TOLLEY                 | Halsbury Statutes                                                                                                              | £159.00          |
| INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION | SAR Convention (revised)<br>IAMSAR Vols 1 - 3                                                                                  | £134.00          |
| INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION | Solas (Consolidated Edition 2001)<br>Solas Amendments 2000<br>Marpol 73/78<br>International Convention<br>1997 Marpol Annex VI | £181.00          |
| CONTEXT Ltd                         | Subscription Renewal                                                                                                           | £1,250.00        |
| W H EVERETT                         | Official Journal Of European Communities<br>Common Market Law Reports<br>Common Market Law Review                              | £2,130.05        |
| HAMMICKS BOOKS                      | Subscription Renewal                                                                                                           | £127.00          |
|                                     |                                                                                                                                | <u>£9,059.05</u> |

Cont.....

ANSWER TO QUESTION 467

| <u>LAW FIRM</u>                   | <u>DATE OF PAYMENT</u> | <u>DESCRIPTION</u>                                               | <u>AMOUNT</u>            |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| CLEARY, GOTTLIB, STEEN & HAMILTON | 29/04/2002             | Tax Reform/State Aid<br>Aviation/Single European Sky             | £59,230.51<br>£32,913.49 |
| CLEARY, GOTTLIB, STEEN & HAMILTON | 27/06/2002             | The Licensing of Datatronics T/A Call Direct                     | £16,575.96               |
| CLEARY, GOTTLIB, STEEN & HAMILTON | 28/06/2002             | Tax Issues                                                       | £32,063.30               |
| CLEARY, GOTTLIB, STEEN & HAMILTON | 30/08/2002             | Professional Services icw Gib Telecommunications (Licensing) Reg | £8,264.32                |
| CLEARY, GOTTLIB, STEEN & HAMILTON | 15/11/2002             | CGSH Telecommunications Bill                                     | £11,572.37               |
| HASSANS                           | 30/04/2002             | Planning Appeal & Enforcement                                    | £4,895.51                |
| HASSANS                           | 10/05/2002             | Nautilus IV - Hearing costs                                      | £2,925.00                |
| HASSANS                           | 14/05/2002             | Gardiners House Management Ltd - appeal                          | £675.00                  |
| HASSANS                           | 20/05/2002             | Prata Ltd - appeal iro Trade Licensing Authority                 | £5,100.00                |
| HASSANS                           | 30/05/2002             | Waste Licences - advice                                          | £750.00                  |
| HASSANS                           | 07/06/2002             | Gibnet Ltd - Interim payment                                     | £2,575.00                |
| HASSANS                           | 06/12/2002             | Telecommunications Guidance Notes                                | £2,252.00                |
| HASSANS                           | 28/06/2002             | Telecommunications Legislation & Datatronics Licence Application | £5,016.00                |
| HASSANS                           | 20/08/2002             | Agrani Satellite Communications                                  | £2,150.00                |
| HASSANS                           | 29/10/2002             | 13/21 John Mac Square - Building Application appeal              | £4,125.00                |
| HASSANS                           | 25/10/2002             | Telecommunications - GECSJ Satellite Project                     | £8,605.00                |

Cont.....

Cont'd Answer to Question 467

|               |            |                                                                                     |                        |
|---------------|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| HASSANS       | 31/10/2002 | Advanced Business Comm (Europe) Ltd                                                 | £24,313.50             |
| HASSANS       | 17/12/2002 | Connect Iberia<br>16 Prince Edwards Rd - Dev & Planning Commission                  | £8,192.50<br>£5,992.00 |
| HASSANS       | 30/01/2003 | Gibraltar Homes                                                                     | £950.00                |
| HASSANS       | 05/02/2003 | The Agrani Project/Amendments Telecom (Licensing) Reg 2001/Licensing of Datatronics | £46,655.00             |
| HASSANS       | 01/03/2003 | 16 Prince Edwards Rd - Dev & Planning Commission                                    | £6,644.00              |
| ISOLA & ISOLA | 10/05/2002 | Nautilus IV - Costs awarded                                                         | £17,887.24             |
| ISOLA & ISOLA | 30/05/2002 | Nautilus IV - Costs awarded                                                         | £1,132.96              |
| ISOLA & ISOLA | 23/08/2002 | MTT & HM AG -v- Isola & Isola                                                       | £16,537.50             |
| WHITE & CASE  | 10/05/2002 | Professional Services Feb & March 2002                                              | £5,853.00              |
| WHITE & CASE  | 19/06/2002 | Professional Services April 2002                                                    | £4,626.00              |
| WHITE & CASE  | 16/07/2002 | Professional Services May 2002                                                      | £3,238.00              |
| WHITE & CASE  | 29/07/2002 | State Aid                                                                           | £89,537.87             |
| WHITE & CASE  | 29/08/2002 | Professional Services June 2002                                                     | £2,708.71              |
| WHITE & CASE  | 16/09/2002 | Professional Services July 2002                                                     | £3,480.24              |
| WHITE & CASE  | 11/10/2002 | State Aid Litigation                                                                | £7,319.36              |
| WHITE & CASE  | 22/11/2002 | Professional Services August 2002                                                   | £941.00                |
| WHITE & CASE  | 05/12/2002 | Professional Services Sept 2002                                                     | £4,287.00              |
| WHITE & CASE  | 17/12/2002 | Professional Services Oct 2002                                                      | £5,687.00              |

Cont.....

Cont'd Answer to Question 467

|                         |            |                                                              |            |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| WHITE & CASE            | 20/01/2003 | Professional Services Nov 2002                               | £4,368.01  |
| WHITE & CASE            | 31/03/2003 | Professional Services Dec 2002                               | £4,351.43  |
| L W TRIAY & PARTNERS    | 30/05/2002 | Vexatious Litigant Order & Bankruptcy - Mr D A Schiller      | £29,849.20 |
| TRIAI & TRIAY           | 19/09/2002 | GTA & Others Appeal against Transport Commission             | £39,201.20 |
| TRIAI & TRIAY           | 09/10/2002 | Tobacco - Public Interest                                    | £7,500.00  |
| TRIAI & TRIAY           | 29/10/2002 | Reorganisation Of Housing Dept                               | £28,913.00 |
| TRIAI & TRIAY           | 27/01/2003 | Mercomed Gib & Los Barrios SA/Mercomed,Gib & Los Barrios Ltd | £8,989.50  |
| TRIAI & TRIAY           | 13/02/2003 | M H Bland & Co Ltd - Cable Car Top Station                   | £4,810.00  |
| TRIAI, STAGNETTO, NEISH | 30/07/2002 | Sir Herbert Miles Road - Catalan Bay Plot                    | £1,000.00  |
| TRIAI, STAGNETTO, NEISH | 31/10/2002 | Toyota Gib Stockholdings Ltd                                 | £5,050.00  |
| TRIAI, STAGNETTO, NEISH | 29/01/2003 | Sale of Multi-let residential properties                     | £1,500.00  |
| ATTIAS & LEVY           | 25/10/2002 | Development & Planning Comm - 8 Bright Cottage               | £2,415.00  |
| ATTIAS & LEVY           | 13/12/2002 | Bahia Caterers Ltd -v- AG                                    | £6,636.25  |
| BUDHRANI & CO           | 29/07/2002 | Cotran (Gib) Ltd -v- Ship Agents Board                       | £1,200.00  |
| <b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>    |            |                                                              |            |
| THE HON M BELOFF QC     | 07/06/2002 | Gibraltair Tax -v- The UK                                    | £12,875.00 |
|                         |            | Gibraltair Open Sky -v- The UK                               | £935.00    |
| THE HON M BELOFF QC     | 28/06/2002 | Jury Service                                                 | £12,500.00 |

Cont.....

|                          |            |                                         |                        |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------|
| THE HON M BELOFF QC      | 03/10/2002 | Gib Olympic Comm & GFA -v- UEFA         | £18,930.00             |
| THE HON M BELOFF QC      | 06/02/2003 | Gib Olympic Comm & GFA -v- UEFA         | £9,500.00              |
| DR STEPHANIE PALMER      | 07/06/2002 | Gibraltar Tax -v- The UK                | £1,850.00              |
| MR JAVAN HERBERG         | 28/06/2002 | Jury Service                            | £3,500.00              |
| THE TOURISM COMPANY      | 10/07/2002 | Museum/Attractions Access               | £2,878.75              |
| MLLAMAS                  | 24/07/2002 | GOG -v- EC Commission/EC Aid Litigation | £19,890.00             |
| MLLAMAS                  | 03/10/2002 | Gib Olympic Comm & GFA -v- UEFA         | £9,690.00              |
| MLLAMAS                  | 06/02/2003 | GKC -v- FIG<br>GFA -v- UEFA             | £5,950.00<br>£3,740.00 |
| MLLAMAS                  | 18/03/2002 | M H Bland -v- HM AG                     | £12,170.00             |
| SARAH PELLET             | 31/07/2002 | Constitutional Law                      | £617.36                |
| MR A PELLET              | 31/07/2002 | Constitutional Law                      | £9,579.14              |
| MR NICOLAS GREEN QC      | 04/09/2002 | Gibnet Ltd -v- HM AG                    | £800.00                |
| MR ADAM LEWIS            | 09/10/2002 | Gib Olympic Comm & GFA -v- UEFA         | £17,983.00             |
| MR ADAM LEWIS            | 06/02/2003 | Gib Olympic Comm & GFA -v- UEFA         | £18,985.00             |
| DE PFYFFER & ASSOCIES    | 11/10/2002 | Gib Olympic Comm & GFA -v- UEFA         | £17,397.42             |
| GIB FOOTBALL ASSOCIATION | 18/11/2002 | Arbitration GFA -v- UEFA                | £10,852.81             |
| STEPHEN BOSSINO          | 20/01/2003 | S Harrison - Magistrates Ct Proceedings | £1,850.00              |

£791,828.41



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 465 TO 471 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the answer given to Question No 468 of 2004 which asked for a breakdown of the £1.17 m spent on Government lobbying, hospitality and travel, there is an entry in the answer which says political and the amount spent on that is £960,573.39, can the Chief Minister clarify or give an indication of the kind of political event or activity that would fall under that item of expenditure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot give him details of any specific event but that is the general head to which all politically related expenditure is booked.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When it is travel it would presumably come under official travel which is £213,000, then there is another for inviting guests which has its own subheading which is £16,900 and then there is a third one which is political which is the largest of the three which is over £960,000, it is that third one that I am asking what kind of activity would come under that kind of expenditure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Any Government expenditure in respect of Government lobbying, hospitality and travel. The breakdown that the hon Member has had is not broken down into hospitality, travel and lobbying but rather into official travel, invited guests and political. So, the breakdown does not coincide with the title of the subhead in the accounts expenditure. All expenditure that is political I cannot think what might be there as opposed to elsewhere but that is what the head is for and I am afraid I do not have a breakdown by events that I could glance at just to give the hon Member the flavour of the sort of expenditure that it might be but I will have it looked into and I will drop him a line just giving him an indication of the sort of things that are involved there.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If the Chief Minister could do that I would certainly be very grateful. In relation to Question No 469 of 2004 which asks for a breakdown of the £100,000 forecast out-turn in terms of research, development studies and professional fees there is one entry of £30,088.04 and the name of the item is IT review can the Chief Minister give an indication of what that item of expenditure refers to?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am afraid I cannot. A review of information technology but precisely of what and by whom I do not know.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Could I ask the Chief Minister if he could perhaps write to us in the same way as he will do with the other subhead. In relation to Question No 470 of 2004 where the answer is that the information asked for is too voluminous but subtotals in respect of a particular item of expenditure would be given, can I ask them for that breakdown of subtotals if the Chief Minister has it or if not could he write to us with that information? This is the question in respect to the expenditure on National Day.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Moving on to the total cost with a breakdown per event of Gibraltar Day in London which is Question No 471 of 2004, the total cost shown here is £43,511.55 but I seem to remember other associated events which take place at the same time in London. One which is mentioned here which is paid by the Finance Centre budget of £13,614, and events organised by the Tourism Industry.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There were none last year.

**NO 472 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LAND RECLAMATION WITHIN THE HARBOUR**

Has the final report on land reclamation within the harbour now been submitted to the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 472 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister tell the House what the general conclusions of the report are?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The report is an investigative works and conceptual design report on the project. It invites three options for the possible land allocation and usage within the reclamation areas that would be created. Government are presently considering which of these three options to choose based on economic and engineering considerations. The final choice is dependant on MOD negotiations as to the reprovisioning of facilities in the area. Not so much on the final choice it is between the three options but proceeding on any of them is dependant on the completion of negotiations with the MOD to reprovision the facilities in No 4 dock. It is no longer called the Army Watermanship Training Centre.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are Government in a position to elaborate as to the three options they are considering for land allocation and usage?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We are in a position to elaborate in the sense that we have the information with which to do it. We do not think it is appropriate at this stage simply to speculate. It is just different configurations and mixes of use, it is no greater deal. It invites the Government to just consider whether it just wishes to locate some of its projects here or elsewhere, for example, the hon Member knows that the Government have plans at some stage to build a new first and middle school in the area. It would be possible to do it on this site if that is what the government chose to do. It would be less for housing some of it would be part for the road as he knows the Government wants to drive through there to Queensway. I do not think it is really appropriate to set out in detail what various permutations for land use are.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say how many square metres of land they are talking about if this reclamation went ahead?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Depending on the option figures ranging from 21,000 square metres through to 34,000 odd square metres. The hon Member should bear in mind that some of that would have to be dedicated to reprovisioning the Yacht Club although we would then gain the area where the Yacht Club is presently situated.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The reclamation would take in the area in front of the Yacht Club and the No 4 Dock is that it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Yacht Club, Rooke and it would link up in effect with the existing reclamation where the Calpe Rowing Club and the Mediterranean Rowing Club are. So, it would link the Coaling Island reclamation where the skate park is straight across to the existing reclamation.

**NO 473 OF 2004****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****HEAD 8A, SUBHEAD 14**

Further to Question Nos 393 of 2003 and 1056 of 2002 can Government provide a breakdown of each of the following:

|     |                 |   |              |
|-----|-----------------|---|--------------|
| (a) | official travel | - | £133,288.51  |
| (b) | invited guests  | - | £ 8,718.10   |
| (c) | political       | - | £336,116.95? |

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This is the answer that I have given the hon Member on the last two occasions that he has asked this question. The information requested by the hon Member is too voluminous and too minutely detailed. The hon Member is in effect asking the Government to publish a Nominal Ledger of all the items charged to general subheads. It is not appropriate. If the hon Member wants sub totals in respect of any particular item of expenditure I will endeavour to obtain that information for him.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 473 OF 2004****HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Question No 393 of 2003 was actually a different question in the sense that it asks who the money was paid to and the purpose of the expenditure which is what I have interpreted as being what made the question too voluminous to give an answer. That was why the question was narrowed down when it was presented this time thinking that perhaps this information could be provided without saying who it was paid to and what the purpose of the expenditure was.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is not what the question asks. The question as asked in respect of those three items in effect requires the Government to hand over its accounting books for the hon Member, the Nominal Ledger, we might as well just give the hon Member the Government's books and ask them to look at them. I know that we practise enlightened policies of transparency and that certainly no House of Assembly in Gibraltar has ever received volume of detailed information that we provide but that would be taking it a smidgeon too far.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I ask for the information in terms of established subheading will that be a problem, because in order to arrive at these figures there must be subheading into which the expenditure items are placed, no?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is intended to say to the hon Member, for example, if the hon Member wanted to know how much does the Chief Minister spend travelling? I would then try to find out the answer to that question. How much have Government spent in MP visits to Gibraltar? Then I would try to find it because that does not require me to just hand him over the books it means that I can just get specific information out of the books to answer whatever specific interests the hon Member may have as opposed to just giving him the books of the company for him to peruse it at his leisure which is not really answering questions, simply sharing the Government's financial accounts with him. So, the hon Member really needs to decide what is the information that he wants, formulate a question around it and then we will try to provide that information for him.

**NO 474 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PROPOSED REFORM OF BUSINESS TAXATION**

Have the Government now received legal advice on whether it is possible to supply copies to the Opposition on a confidential basis of the submissions made by the UK and Gibraltar Governments to the European Commission regarding the State Aid investigation into the proposed reform of business taxation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are advised that it is free to provide its own submission. As to UK's submission, the Government do not feel at liberty to disclose it to the hon Member without HMG's agreement which we are seeking on his behalf. I hope to be able to write to the hon Member shortly on this matter.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 474 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Will the Chief Minister be supplying us with the Gibraltar Government's submissions independently of the UK's reply or will he wait for a reply from the UK before he does that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We are going to wait if the hon Member does not mind because there may be a need to edit ours if the UK objects because I think there is an element of cross referral and that we refer in ours to some of the arguments. If the UK really says, "*No you may not tell him anything of what we have said,*" we may have to blank out one or two paragraphs and if they agree we will just send both.

**NO 475 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**LAND MEMORANDUM**

Has there been any negotiation between Government and the MOD or HMG on the terms of the Lands Memorandum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 475 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Lands Memorandum something that is on the agendas as having to be revisited or is it not a priority?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is certainly a priority for the MOD who are very anxious that there should be a renegotiation of the Lands Memorandum.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are they?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

.....Government remains in the position that the Leader of the Opposition is familiar with, however, we have indicated that we would be willing to take part in a wide ranging negotiation with the MOD were everything that we want from them is on the table and everything that they want from us is on the table and we can then take a sort of holistic approach and see what deals can be done regardless of a renegotiation of the Lands Memorandum and saving the principles of our position on the Memorandum.

**NO 476 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD PROPERTIES**

Which MOD properties or sites have been released to Government in the financial years 2001/2002 and 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The following properties/sites have been transferred by the MOD to the Government in the period 2001-2003.

- |   |                                                                                         |   |            |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|------------|
| 1 | Northern Defence Tunnels                                                                | - | March 2001 |
| 2 | Parking Bays at entrance to Coaling Island<br>Queensway                                 | - | May 2001   |
| 3 | Strip of land at North Dispersal<br>(next to and for the extension to the Air Terminal) | - | June 2003  |

**NO 477 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD PROPERTIES**

Can Government state whether there are any MOD properties or sites pending transfer by the MOD to Government in respect of which the MOD is seeking payment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There are no pending transfers of MOD held properties in respect of which MOD is seeking payment. The MOD may have its own list of pending transfers but we have not been made aware of any.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 477 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have there been any properties then which have been discussed as possible sites for transfer where the transfer has not materialised because the MOD was seeking payment?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are some notorious and historical examples of that, they date right back to the Leader of the Opposition's date of office. Cumberland Road and Tower Buildings the two properties that were demolished, there are still issues. Those lands I think are still not formally transferred. There used to be 'H' block or whatever it was called in the Old Naval Hospital Road but they have now developed that themselves for their own use. There is Edinburgh House which has been transferred and which on a technical and strict application of the Lands Memorandum requires a payment on the sum of £2.4 m which has not been paid pending a final resolution of all these sorts of matters.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is that strict interpretation a reference to the continuing use, the criteria that there used to be in the 1985 memorandum?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The reference to strict interpretation is somewhat to overstate our case. By almost any interpretation the payment is due it is just that we have invited the Ministry of Defence to take the view that it would not be right to charge. They have not accepted that position but they nevertheless went on to transfer and left the matter of payment pending. Certainly, as far as the MOD is concerned and indeed I believe the UK Treasury that the payments were due, they have just been left in permanent abeyance until the memorandum can be restructured, hopefully on terms that will no longer require the payments even retrospectively.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

As I recall the 1985 Lands Memorandum, there were two elements in it. One was the question of reclaimed land and freehold properties and the other was buildings which had an unexpired use and there was a formula related to the number of years left out of a potential 60 year, is that the one that produces this evaluation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In the case of Edinburgh House yes. In the case of the other two properties, the one at Tower and Cumberland, that is a question of the freehold issue rather than the Lands Memorandum.

ORAL

**NO 478 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Do Government believe that there is still a need to grant development aid to make residential property development in Gibraltar sufficiently attractive to investors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Probably not, but Government have not addressed or studied the issue.

ORAL

**NO 479 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**POBJOY MINT**

Has there been an increase in the cost of minting circulating coinage since the financial year 2001/2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No 480 of 2004.

**NO 480 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**POBJOY MINT**

Has there been a drop in the sales of commemorative coinage by Pobjoy Mint since the financial year 2001/2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There has been no increase in the cost of minting circulating coinage since the financial year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2002. The increase in expenditure on the purchase of circulating coinage is attributable to the increase in the number of coins purchased. As regards sales of commemorative coins, information on actual sales value of commemorative coins has not been made available to the Government by Pobjoy Mint. Royalties paid by Pobjoy Mint have declined since the financial year 2001/2002. However, under the contract with Pobjoy Mint, these royalties are based on the number of coins sold irrespective of face value or sales price. This anomalous situation has been regularised under the terms of the revised contract with the current supplier of coins – Tower Mint, with royalties now being directly linked to the sales value of coins sold.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 479 AND 480 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the decline since would be because there have been less coins sold even though they may have been of a higher value coin. In the case of the answer to Question No 479 of 2004 the answer given is that the purchase of the circulating coin reflects more coins, however if the Chief Minister looks at Appendix 'L' in the Approved Estimates of Expenditure Page 133 it shows that the issue of coins in 2001/2002 was £705,000 and the cost of the purchase of these coins was £85,000 and in the following year the issue of the coins is £700,000 that is £5,000 less and the cost is £175,000 which is £90,000 more. The actual figures in the account show £5,000 less

of coins and £90,000 more of cost that is why I asked whether the cost of minting had increased?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I can only speculate but it is only speculation that it is the configuration of the coins involved presumably £1 coins cost more than 20p coins so one can have higher value but lower cost depending on the volume of the coins that have been purchased. It can only be that if the answer that I have been given here that the cost has not increased is correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister has got his arithmetic the wrong way round because if one has the value of the coin the more £1 coins we produce (*INTERRUPTION*) therefore the gap between the cost and value of circulating coins is bigger for the higher value than the lower value so if that was indeed the explanation it would mean that we were minting lots of pennies and very few pounds. I put it to the Chief Minister that we lose money on the pennies and the five penny coins money is only made from 20p up from my recollection of what it used to cost and what the value was this is why I always encourage people to use English pennies and Gibraltar pounds in my time. A policy I recommend. Perhaps the Chief Minister would go back and check because it does not seem to tie up with the figures that we have got in the House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will.



ORAL

NO 481 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

Can Government state what is the latest forecast out-turn for the Gibraltar Development Corporation?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No 482 of 2004.

**NO 482 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FUND**

Can Government state what is the latest forecast out-turn for the Social Assistance Fund?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The forecast out-turn relates to a completed financial year. The latest Gibraltar Development Corporation and Social Assistance Fund revenue and expenditure for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 is set out in the schedule I now hand the hon Member. If the hon Member is intending to refer to expenditure during the current financial year, that will be published with the Estimates of Revenue of Expenditure for next year and as discussed yesterday this is the time of year were the forecast out-turn for the current year is just being calculated.

**Answer to Question 482 of 2004**

**GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (EMPLOYERS INSOVENCY FUND)**  
**ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2003**

**RECEIPTS**

|                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Miscellaneous Receipts | £2,085,247.74        |
| Interest Earned        | £37,795.88           |
|                        | <u>£2,123,043.62</u> |

**PAYMENTS**

|                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Miscellaneous Payments | (£55,579.72)         |
| Net Receipts           | <u>£2,067,463.90</u> |

**INVESTMENT ACCOUNT**

**INCREASE IN INVESTMENTS**

|                             |                      |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Net Purchase of Investments | £2,029,668.02        |
| Interest Earned             | £37,795.88           |
|                             | <u>£2,067,463.90</u> |

**DECREASE IN INVESTMENTS**

|                             |                      |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Net Increase in Investments | (£0.00)              |
|                             | <u>£2,067,463.90</u> |

**BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31 MARCH 2003**

**ASSETS**

|                                             |                      |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Investments on 1 April 2002                 | £0.00                |
| Net Increase in Investments during the year | £2,067,463.90        |
| Investment Account on 31 March 2003         | <u>£2,067,463.90</u> |

**FINANCED BY**

|                                       |                      |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Account Balance on 1 April 2002       | £0.00                |
| Net Receipts during the year          | £2,067,463.90        |
| Fund Account Balance on 31 March 2003 | <u>£2,067,463.90</u> |

**Cont'd Answer to Question 482 of 2004**

**GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**  
**ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2003**

**EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**RECEIPTS**

|                                          |  |                      |
|------------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Training Levy                            |  | £2,082,125.52        |
| Contribution by the European Social Fund |  | £419,372.00          |
| Contribution from the Consolidated Fund  |  | £1,400,000.00        |
| Miscellaneous Receipts                   |  | <u>£52,797.18</u>    |
|                                          |  | <u>£3,954,294.70</u> |

**PAYMENTS**

**Personal Emoluments**

**Employment:**

|                          |                   |             |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Salaries                 | £385,446.37       |             |
| Overtime                 | £8,514.50         |             |
| Allowances               | £8,099.75         |             |
| Employer's Contributions | <u>£61,968.57</u> |             |
|                          |                   | £464,029.19 |

**Training:**

|                          |                   |                    |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Salaries                 | £202,171.23       |                    |
| Overtime                 | £1,013.94         |                    |
| Employer's Contributions | <u>£26,867.48</u> |                    |
|                          |                   | <u>£230,052.65</u> |

Total Personal Emoluments £694,081.84

**Training and Development Courses:**

|            |                    |               |
|------------|--------------------|---------------|
| EU Funding | £348,851.69        |               |
| Others     | <u>£990,970.50</u> |               |
|            |                    | £1,339,822.19 |

**Vocational Cadets:**

|            |                   |             |
|------------|-------------------|-------------|
| EU Funding | £967,837.77       |             |
| Others     | <u>£14,674.20</u> |             |
|            |                   | £982,511.97 |

**Construction Training Centre Expenses:**

|            |                   |             |
|------------|-------------------|-------------|
| EU Funding | £121,682.23       |             |
| Others     | <u>£99,239.59</u> |             |
|            |                   | £220,921.82 |

**Wage Subsidies:**

|            |                   |            |
|------------|-------------------|------------|
| EU Funding | £23,481.44        |            |
| Others     | <u>£10,015.00</u> |            |
|            |                   | £33,496.44 |

**Our Lady Of Europe Training Centre Expenses**

£4,106.50  
£3,274,940.76

**Reimbursement of Consolidated Fund Expenditure:**

Annual Training Expenses £501,461.69

(£3,776,402.45)

Net Receipts

£177,892.25

2

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question 482 of 2004**

**GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**  
**ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2003**

**OTHER**

**RECEIPTS**

|                                                          |               |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Contributions from the Consolidated Fund:                |               |
| Tourism and Transport:                                   |               |
| Tourism Sites                                            | £828,098.42   |
| Gibraltar Tourism Board                                  | £829,590.43   |
| Traffic Management                                       | £436,743.25   |
| Port                                                     | £58,891.93    |
| Apes Management                                          | £50,228.36    |
| Traffic Inspection                                       | £49,676.23    |
| Ship Registry                                            | £1,348.07     |
| Trade and Industry:                                      |               |
| Finance Centre Division                                  | £231,818.73   |
| Business Advisory Unit                                   | £79,667.30    |
| Inward Investment and Land                               | £62,443.18    |
| Europa Business Centre                                   | £41,221.92    |
| Planning and Heritage Division                           | £23,456.00    |
| Housing:                                                 |               |
| Housing Administration                                   | £102,984.40   |
| Environment:                                             |               |
| Environmental Monitoring                                 | £70,359.99    |
| Social Affairs:                                          |               |
| Social Security                                          | £79,823.95    |
| Disability Awareness                                     | £5,188.82     |
| Employment and Consumer Affairs:                         |               |
| Community Advisory Service                               | £43,139.03    |
| Treasury:                                                |               |
| Central Arrears Unit                                     | £29,624.62    |
| General Office                                           | £25,908.83    |
| Secretariat:                                             |               |
| Personnel                                                | £29,244.21    |
| Urban Renewal Development Project                        | £25,262.46    |
| Madrid Office                                            | £18,536.29    |
| Legislation Support Unit                                 | £11,530.51    |
|                                                          | <hr/>         |
|                                                          | £3,134,786.93 |
| Contributions from the Improvement and Development Fund: |               |
| Trade and Industry: Small Business Board                 | £28,009.89    |
|                                                          | <hr/>         |
|                                                          | £3,162,796.82 |
|                                                          | Cont.....     |

carried forward

3

Cont'd Answer to Question 482 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**  
**ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2003**

|                          |                 |                    |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
|                          | brought forward | £3,162,796.82      |
| <b><u>PAYMENTS</u></b>   |                 |                    |
| Personal Emoluments:     |                 |                    |
| Salaries                 | £1,995,433.60   |                    |
| Overtime                 | £246,135.01     |                    |
| Allowances               | £85,558.52      |                    |
| Gratuities               | £50,000.00      |                    |
|                          |                 | £2,377,127.13      |
| Wages:                   |                 |                    |
| Basic                    | £211,165.26     |                    |
| Overtime                 | £38,425.24      |                    |
| Allowances               | £11,512.67      |                    |
|                          |                 | £261,103.17        |
| Other:                   |                 |                    |
| Employer's Contributions | £292,348.52     |                    |
|                          |                 | (£2,930,578.82)    |
|                          | Net Receipts    | <u>£232,218.00</u> |

**BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31 MARCH 2003**

**ASSETS**

|                            |                  |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Advance to Liquid Reserves | <u>£8,367.96</u> |
|----------------------------|------------------|

**FINANCED BY**

|                                       |                    |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| General Fund Balance on 1 April 2002  | (£401,742.29)      |
| Net Receipts during the year          | <u>£410,110.25</u> |
| General Fund Balance on 31 March 2003 | <u>£8,367.96</u>   |

**Cont'd Answer to Question 482 of 2004**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FUND**  
**ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2003**

**FUND ACCOUNT**

**RECEIPTS**

|                                               |                      |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Transfer from the Consolidated Fund of Import |                      |
| Duty Collections                              | £6,600,000.00        |
| Interest Earned                               | £48,129.65           |
| Recovery of Maternity Allowance misallocated  | £120,752.85          |
|                                               | <u>£6,768,882.50</u> |

**PAYMENTS**

|                                                              |                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Contribution to the Gibraltar Health Authority in respect of |                        |
| Social Assistance to Unemployed Persons                      | £3,500,000.00          |
| Contribution to the Elderly Care Agency                      | £54,000.00             |
| Social Assistance Payment                                    | £821,649.86            |
| Child Welfare Grant                                          | £775,377.53            |
| Minimum Income Guarantee                                     | £466,195.85            |
| Rent Relief                                                  | £444,860.88            |
| Elderly Persons Allowance                                    | £96,682.60             |
| Retirement Allowance                                         | £38.30                 |
| Miscellaneous Expenses:                                      |                        |
| Management Charges                                           | £337,000.00            |
| Dr Giraldi Home Expenses                                     | £82,156.20             |
| Respite Care Services                                        | £32,775.21             |
| Employment Injuries Insurance Contributions                  |                        |
| in respect of Community Care Limited Officers                | £3,130.40              |
|                                                              | <u>£455,061.81</u>     |
|                                                              | <u>(£6,613,866.83)</u> |
| Net Receipts                                                 | <u>£155,015.67</u>     |

**INVESTMENT ACCOUNT**

**INCREASE IN INVESTMENTS**

|                             |                    |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Net Purchase of Investments | £106,886.02        |
| Interest Earned             | £48,129.65         |
|                             | <u>£155,015.67</u> |

**DECREASE IN INVESTMENTS**

|                             |                    |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
|                             | <u>(£0.00)</u>     |
| Net Increase in Investments | <u>£155,015.67</u> |

**BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31 MARCH 2003**

**ASSETS**

|                                             |                    |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Investments on 1 April 2002                 | £121,846.72        |
| Net Increase in Investments during the year | £155,015.67        |
| Investments on 31 March 2003                | <u>£276,862.39</u> |

**FINANCED BY**

|                                       |                    |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Fund Account Balance on 1 April 2002  | £121,846.72        |
| Net Receipts during the year          | £155,015.67        |
| Fund Account Balance on 31 March 2003 | <u>£276,862.39</u> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 481 AND 482 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it the forecast outturn for the financial year 2002/2003 the information that is being provided?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it is being handed to me in answer to the question of forecast out-turn for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 is the financial year 2002/2003, whether it is by now more than that or whether it has been confirmed .....by now I would expect those figures to be firm and not just forecast given that it is nine months on from the date.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Not just that but the law requires that the accounts should have been closed in December and handed over to the Auditor. The forecast out-turn for that year is already in the published estimates that we have got. There is no date in my question but obviously I am talking about the current financial year as an indication of what the expenditure is to-date perhaps I should have asked the Chief Minister for the actual expenditure up to December but certainly I cannot assume that this must still be the forecast out-turn because.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I must assume it is firm by now.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would have thought this were the figures that have been finalised and handed to the Audit.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course.



**NO 483 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government confirm whether it has been given any advice or indication by HMG that Development Aid could be in conflict with EU rules on state aid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No. Development Aid was originally listed by the Code of Conduct Group as a harmful measure, but that was not pursued.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 483 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The fact that it was not pursued effectively is the same as if it got the green light?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. They have never chased that up nor is State Aid Rules the only criteria for measuring harmfulness for the code purposes.

ORAL

**NO 484 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOLIDAY ON 2<sup>ND</sup> JANUARY 2004**

Can Government confirm whether employees in Government-owned and Joint Venture Companies and public sector employees and other persons indirectly employed by Government received an extra days holiday on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

All employees in Government-owned companies and Joint Venture Companies (by which I mean Gibtel, Nynex, and Aquagib) and public sector employees, were either released from duty on Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2004, or were allowed to bank an extra day's annual leave to be included in their 2004 annual leave entitlement.

**NO 485 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOLIDAY ON 2<sup>ND</sup> JANUARY 2004**

Can Government say whether employees providing services contracted out by the Government were entitled to a paid holiday on the 2<sup>nd</sup> January?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In the previous question the Leader of the Opposition used the more correct phrase of received an extra holiday, here he uses the word entitled. There is no question of entitlement in either category but in any case I do not know, Government are not accountable for the decisions of other employers. These are not government employees directly or indirectly, they are the employees of contractual companies so I cannot say whether any followed the Government suit.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 485 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would imagine that if people have got contracted services into which the cost per worker that they provide takes into account the leave that they get anybody that is providing people permanently to the Government on a contract would pass on the bill to the Government so if Government do not know it has presumably not happened.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They pass on the bill to Government eventually not on the morning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> of January so we would not have found out yet. Certainly if they gave a days leave to which they were not entitled we might wish to query whether the contractor is entitled to recover the cost of it under its contract with Government. These are not employees that are provided to the Government by a contractor it is the service that is contracted not the staff to the Government.

ORAL

NO 486 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government say whether the Savings Bank is still expected to have a surplus of £520,000 in the current financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 487 and 488 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 487 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government say whether the actual out-turn of the Savings Bank for the financial year 2002/2003 was nil surplus?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 486 and 488 of 2004.

**NO 488 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government say whether the level reserves in the Savings Bank as at the end of the financial year 2001/2002 was 10 per cent of the non-Government deposits?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The level of reserves in the Savings Bank as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2002 was £9.04 m, representing 9.5 per cent of non-government deposits. Although there was a recurrent account surplus of around £1 m during the financial year 2001/2002 this was more than offset by a reduction of £1.2 m in the reserve account due to a decline in the market value of investments. The overall level of reserves therefore decreased during the year by £0.2 m. During the financial year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 the recurrent account surplus was £0.6 m and there was also an increase in the reserve account of £1.4 m as a result of an increase in the market value of investments. The total increase in the reserve account during the financial year was, therefore £2 m bringing the level of reserves to £11 m. However, because of the increase in non-government deposits during the year, which stood at £112 m at the year-end – representing an increase of 18 per cent over the previous year – none of the surplus was transferred to the Consolidated Fund. The £520,000 expected to be available for transfer to the Consolidated Fund during the financial year 2003/2004, is not now expected because of the downturn in the value of investments and the continued increase in the level of non-government deposits – currently at around £128 m compared with £112 m at the beginning of the year (a further increase in deposits of 14 per cent).

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 486 TO 488 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there any surplus expected in the current financial year available for transfer or will it all be required for the reserve on the basis of the figures that the Chief Minister has given us?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not clear it does not say whether all of the £520,000 that will be available or none of it. I suppose that the Leader of the Opposition is hoping that there will be none of it so that there will be less to spend on other things.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is totally uncalled for Mr Speaker I keep on telling the Chief Minister how to do things to get more money and he accuses me of the opposite.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes but the Leader of the Opposition wants me to get more money and leave it there and not be able to spend it so this is why he was smiling when I was telling him that there were increasing reserves but we could not use it because of the increase in deposits I will find out if it is all or part of the £520,000.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No. The Chief Minister is attributing a motive which is totally unjustified and incorrect. I was smiling because the figures that the Chief Minister gave reflected the seesaw in the value of the investments which went down by £1 million, up by £2 million and then down by £1 million. It reminded me of the lottery and that is why I was smiling. Nothing to do with wanting him to spend money or not spend money. I want the Chief Minister to spend money on some things and not on others.

**NO 489 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**RGP – OVERTIME PAYMENTS**

Can Government confirm that it has received a claim for the recalculation of overtime by Police Officers, based apparently on an incorrect application of the parity agreement with UK in the early eighties and if so, when was the claim received and what steps have been taken to establish whether there has been underpayment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not government policy to comment on outstanding claims. Government are in receipt of several claims by the Royal Gibraltar Police and these are under consideration. There is a claim which more or less meets the description in the question.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 489 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that in the month of November the information that reached us which we were not able to confirm as we were no longer Members of this House, was that officers were being told in the police force following the election of a new Government the claim would be met and officers were being given order of back payments that they were likely to get, is this a reflection of an imminent announcement by the Government or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think so. There are discussions taking place between the Chief Secretary and the Police of which I am actually not aware where the negotiations are at this point and I am certainly not aware of it before the elections. I am aware that the hon Member met with someone with a recent link with the RGP and that all sorts of promises were made to them. Perhaps they thought that they were just mirroring the promises that he assumed that we had made. We had not made any such promises,



there was none. Anything that the Leader of the Opposition has heard was being calculated and said was certainly not by us or on our behalf. Government have resisted the claim as it has been formulated which regardless of how it is arrived at is contrary to pay agreements that have been signed off by the Police Council in the past. There are several claims, they are being looked at, they are being discussed, the Chief Secretary is to put to me things for policy decisions shortly but I am not aware now so I could not have been aware before the elections what the basis of the negotiations are still less have promised any offer in the event of there not being a change of Government which we did not think would depend on saying things of that sort.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Apparently some people thought that they did depend and that they were being told those things. I can tell the Chief Minister that when that information was passed onto me by some officers still within the force who claimed to have had first hand knowledge of what was circulating within the force, I made an attempt to obtain a correct version before I reacted in anyway from the Police Council and the Police Council were not interested in a meeting to tell me what the correct version of events was and therefore we just ignored what had reached us because obviously we were not going to react to something that could not be established and therefore this is the first opportunity in this House to establish because frankly, I was surprised that something going back to the initiation of parity should have been there sort of accumulating as a potential liability with us passing heaven knows how many budgets and no inkling that this was ticking away in the background. That is how the story reached me. I am trying to get some confirmation or denial of the versions that have reached me since I could not get it from the Police Council because they were not interested in giving us their version of things so I ask the Government.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I can certainly reassure the Leader of the Opposition that no pre-electoral offer was made to the Police Council and indeed has not been made. The opposite is true. The Government have resisted this claim it has not been going on for that long. A new or recent last but one committee before this one spotted it and raised it back. It is not really our style to make specific pre-electoral offers of this sort and I think we are justified in the view that we were right to think that the election outcome would not have depended on that. I think that the elections have shown that targeting tailor made offers of this sort to individual sector groups in the community does not have the effect of altering the results of elections as the last two elections have demonstrated.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know perhaps it is the question on the basis of the information that reached me of whether there is too much targeting or too little targeting because the information that reached me was that the targeting was down to the last penny and the individual's name saying, "*Mr so and so you would get £x,000.*" So that is how targeted I was told it was. Maybe it worked after all.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I regret that the Leader of the Opposition was misled by people who were perhaps hoping to extract a commitment from him in the forlorn hope that he might have won the election and then been saddled with the commitment around his neck. *[INTERRUPTION]* It is certainly not what I heard and it is certainly not the story that was circulating. If we are talking about *[INTERRUPTION]* circulating stories let me tell him that the stories that are reaching us was that he had promised to meet the claim down to the last penny. I hope somebody has told him how much meeting the claim down to the last penny will cost because he will not be in a position to honour it.

ORAL

NO 490 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**WIDOWS AND ORPHANS PENSION SCHEME**

Have civil servants currently in employment given any indication to Government that they wish to reinstate the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

No.

ORAL

NO 491 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS' ASSOCIATION**

Have the Government received representations from the Government Pensioners' Association seeking the reinstatement of the Widows and Orphans Pension Scheme?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 492 and 493 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 492 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS**

Have the Government received representations from the Government pensioners who retired before the pay parity with the UK for their pensions to be reassessed on the basis of pay on the introduction of the parity rate as opposed to their actual pay pre-parity?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 491 and 493 of 2004.

**NO 493 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT PENSIONER'S ASSOCIATION**

Have the Government received representations from the Government Pensioners' Association seeking the revaluation of their public service pensions retrospectively by the difference between 2 per cent and the rate paid in the years when inflation was below 2 per cent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

During the General Election campaign the party of Government, the GSD, received the same letters from this new Association as were received, I believe, by all parties contesting the Election. I am not aware that any claims or representations have been submitted to the Government as such since the election.

**NO 494 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can the government state whether the new accounting arrangements for the Gibraltar Electricity Authority now being put in place and, if so, what is the forecast out-turn for the revenue for the sale of electricity, Head 6 subhead 23?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The new accounting arrangements are not yet in place.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 494 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So for the figures that appear at the end of this financial year at the end of March it will still be as was provided in the original Approved Estimates, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Some employees technically have transferred to the Authority during the financial year so a way would have to be found to reflect the fact that those salaries were paid out by the Authority and not as emoluments to civil servants but what I mean by the accounting arrangements not being in place is that the revenue and the other items of expenditure have not been desegregated from the Consolidated Fund. We hope to do that as from the 1<sup>st</sup> April so all the planning work has been done during this last quarter so that we can start the financial year on the right footing. Now, whether that is going to be done quickly enough for it to be reflected in the estimates we cannot be certain but what we can do is if we are not ready for the estimates so that the estimates once they have to be published by the end of April are not yet ready, we could during the course of the year Table in the House a proforma reassessment as from the date when this might happen. We are trying for to be ready in time for the publication of the estimates booklet which is due by the 30th April.

**NO 495 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**IMPORT DUTY**

Can Government state whether it still expects to achieve a £2.5 million increase in receipts from import duty in the current financial year compared to the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, the latest estimate of import duty revenue for financial year 2003/2004 is £29 million.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 495 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a particular explanation for this because it is a repetition of what happened last year. There was £29 million nearly £30 million in 2001/2002. In the 2002 budget Government was projecting £31 million which perhaps might not have been unreasonable because it might have been going up from £30 million but the outcome turned out to be £29 million and I remember that at the time of the budget given that they had not achieved the £31 million the year before and that normally the Treasury works on the basis of what is achieved in terms of projecting what is anticipated, why the £2.5 million extra now we seem to have repeated the exercise of the previous year. We put in £2.5 million and then we finish up not getting it and it has been done two years in succession which is not normal. Normal estimating in this area is reasonably accurate.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot say whether it is just wishful thinking on the part of the estimators or whether there is a genuine hope and expectation that with inflation in prices and the increase price in goods that they can factor some level of increase given that duty is charged



against the landed cost of the item. Whether there is an assumption that in a growing economy the receipts from import duty can be expected to increase I cannot say why but certainly I agree with him that what he has just described is correct. It has happened two years in succession. It very much depends on one or two particular commodities I am sure the Leader of the Opposition can imagine and it is just coincidental that it has come in again at the same figure. Unless the Government were to introduce or announce some increase in the duty rate on significant items I think they will probably now accept that the £29 million is the correct estimate.

**NO 496 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SALE OF LAND AND PROPERTIES**

Can Government state how much was raised by sales of land and properties and credited to Government owned property companies in the financial years 2001/2002 and 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Revenue raised by sales of land and buildings, credited to Government owned companies were as follows:

|           |              |
|-----------|--------------|
| 2001/2002 | £1.1 million |
| 2002/2003 | £9.3 million |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 496 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the £9.3 million a reflection of the sale of the Government in 50/50.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Entirely. There may be one or two flats that were sold in Sir William Jackson Grove I cannot remember on which side of the Financial Year. I remember some flats were of people who had been re-housed, four or five flats, they might be included. All the others were certainly 50/50.

**NO 497 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SALE OF LAND AND PROPERTIES**

Can Government state how much was raised by sales of land and properties and credited to the Improvement and Development Fund in the financial years 2001/2002 and 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Revenue raised by sales of land and buildings, credited to the Improvement and Development Fund was as follows:-

|           |              |
|-----------|--------------|
| 2001/2002 | £2.6 million |
| 2002/2003 | £1.6 million |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 497 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In this case are we talking about predominantly land for development or are we talking about sales of residential properties.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it should be predominantly the latter. I cannot imagine there is any significant development premium in that. There might be some lease extensions, the 99 year extension of expiring long leases, but from the figures it does not seem that there is any significant development premium there.

**NO 498 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PUBLIC DEBT**

Can the Government confirm whether it has been told by HMG that the level of Gibraltar's public debt has to be agreed to by the UK?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Gibraltar Government have not been told these things specifically in relation to Gibraltar, but the Gibraltar Government are aware that this is HMG's position in respect of all Overseas Territories. Chief Ministers were reminded of this at the recent meeting of the Overseas Territories Consultative Council.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 498 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are Government aware that in Gibraltar's case, I do not know what it was like in the case of the other territories, this was not the case when the £100 million existing ceiling was legislated by this House when the decision was entirely that of the Gibraltar Government there was no question of agreement by the UK.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think that is strictly true. The £100 million ceiling which cannot be exceeded is in effect the level that HMG has approved for Gibraltar.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is the whole point. It was not approved by the UK for Gibraltar, is the Chief Minister aware of that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is the de facto level that has been approved whether it was or not at the time because to change that now would require new legislation from which they could either withhold Royal assent or exercise the powers of disallowance. So, de facto now we could not borrow more without some sort of understanding with HMG. Let me say to the Leader of the Opposition that the Treasury who is leading on this area because of their concerns about contingent financial liability are not just saying, "*We have to agree the levels and so apply to us...*" there are guidelines and they are actually quite normal guidelines, the sort of borrowing guidelines that one might expect to see in a prudent independent country. The same sort of criteria. Because they think that in some territories GDP is not very well calculated where it says 35 per cent of GDP they have invented another formula to prevent that. Gibraltar could borrow substantially more even within the guidelines that they have established for approved and borrowing limits for the Overseas Territories, much more.

**NO 499 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NEW CONSTITUTION**

Can Government state whether it has now taken a policy decision on how it intends to proceed with regards to the establishment of a process of negotiation with HMG to agree a new Constitution for Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, but I hope to invite the hon Member to take tea or coffee with me at No 6 Convent Place shortly in order that we might discuss this very issue ahead of Government making a decision. I do hope that he will accept my invitation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 499 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am quite happy to meet the Chief Minister anytime as happy as he is to meet the Spanish Foreign Minister provided there are no strings attached and we can reach an agreement. I think having agreed the Constitution my view is that we should pursue the matter together but we will have to see to what extent we are both in tune.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He will get at the very least a cup of tea or coffee and for the rest of it it depends on whether his expectations are realistic but he knows what my thinking is on that in terms of involvement of the Opposition.

ORAL

**NO 500 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government explain why the calculation of the value of imports and exports in the GDP calculation for 1999/2000 using the expenditure method differed from the value obtained for the same year using the input/output methodology?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 501 to 503 of 2044.

ORAL

**NO 501 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state whether the method of calculating the value of imports and exports in the expenditure method of calculating GDP was changed in the year 1996/1997 and if so how did it differ from the method used in prior years?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 500, 502 and 503 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 502 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government give a breakdown of the composition of GDP using the income and expenditure methods for 1994/1995 and 1995/1996?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 500, 501 and 503 of 2004.

**NO 503 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the calculation for GDP using the expenditure method for the financial year 1994/1995 and 1995/1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The calculation of the value of imports and exports for GDP and for Input/Output purposes can never be identical. For the purposes of GDP, the calculation regarding the value of goods is based on the trade statistics produced by the Customs Department and that for the value of services is based on Family Expenditure Surveys and other secondary data. The Input/Output Estimates are calculated by grossing up the imports recorded by each business sector. The calculation takes account of the split between the value of goods and services. The method of calculating the value of imports and exports in 1996/1997 was changed to that used previously as a result of the recommendations of the Mansell review on the compilation of the accounts. These changes basically encompassed the following:

- (a) The deduction of the value of notes, coins and monetary gold from the import figures.
- (b) An adjustment to take account of the value of tobacco and cars re-exported.
- (c) The inclusion of financial and maritime services as export income.

Finally I will hand over to the hon Member a schedule containing the GDP breakdown using both the income and expenditure methods for 1994/95 and 1995/96.

**Question Nos: 502/2004 to 503/2004**

| INCOME METHOD                                   | * 1994/95 | 1995/96 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| INCOME FROM EMPLOYMENT                          | B 185.29  | 167.94  |
| INCOME FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT                     | C 28.66   | 28.24   |
| GROSS TRADING PROFITS OF COMPANIES              | C 55.83   | 40.93   |
| GROSS TRADING SURPLUS OF GOVERNMENT ENTERPRISES | A 5.62    | 8.37    |
| RENT                                            | C 51.74   | 51.88   |
| TOTAL DOMESTIC INCOME                           | B 328.93  | 328.06  |
| LESS STOCK APPRECIATION                         | C -0.32   | -0.33   |
| GDP (FACTOR COST)                               | B 328.61  | 327.73  |
| NET PROPERTY INCOME FROM ABROAD                 | C -3.33   | -2.43   |
| NET FACTOR INCOME FROM ABROAD                   | B -12.77  | -13.98  |
| GNP (FACTOR COST)                               | B 310.61  | 311.32  |

| EXPENDITURE METHOD              | * 1994/95 | 1995/96 |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| CONSUMERS' EXPENDITURE          | B 221.94  | 226.43  |
| GOVT. FINAL CONSUMPTION         | A 47.62   | 58.91   |
| GROSS DOMESTIC FIXED CAP. FMTN  | C 20.61   | 21.64   |
| TOTAL DOMESTIC EXPENDITURE      | C 290.07  | 306.98  |
| EXPORTS OF GOODS AND SERVICES   | C 367.06  | 408.26  |
| IMPORTS OF GOODS AND SERVICES   | B -401.77 | -406.76 |
| RESIDUAL ERROR                  | 113.62    | 57.29   |
| GDP (MARKET PRICES)             | B 368.98  | 365.78  |
| SUBSIDIES                       | C 5.15    | 5.22    |
| TAXES ON EXPENDITURE            | A -47.52  | -43.27  |
| GDP (FACTOR COST)               | B 328.61  | 327.73  |
| NET PROPERTY INCOME FROM ABROAD | C -3.33   | -2.43   |
| NET FACTOR INCOME FROM ABROAD   | B -12.73  | -13.98  |
| GNP (FACTOR COST)               | B 310.65  | 311.32  |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 500 TO 503 OF 2004**

HON J J BOSSANO:

From the answers that I have been given I deduce that in the expenditure method that I am being provided with for 1994/1995 and 1995/1996 the figures that will be shown there for exports and imports of goods and services will therefore be before the changes of the months of review, that is to say it will include the things that I have been told have been excluded and it will exclude what is now being included which was the inclusion of financial services and maritime activities, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Deduction of notes, coins and gold from the import figure, adjustment to take account of tobacco and cars re-exported and the inclusion of financial and maritime services as export income. I say yes, I do not know, but it would be extraordinary if these figures had been recalculated ex postfacto applying the new principles to previous years without that having been noted in the answer that I gave the hon Gentleman. He should assume that the premise of his question is correct unless I confirm to him tomorrow differently.

ORAL

NO 504 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INPUT/OUTPUT STUDY**

Can Government say whether the Input/Output model is now available for access by interest parties in the business community?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 505 to 507 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 505 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INPUT/OUTPUT STUDY**

Can Government confirm that the continued training of civil servants via internet on the Input/Output model has taken place and is this available to others outside the civil service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 504, 506 and 507 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 506 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INPUT/OUTPUT STUDY**

Can Government state when it will provide the unpublished parts of the Input/Output study report to the Opposition on a confidential basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 504, 505 and 507 of 2004.

**NO 507 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INPUT/OUTPUT STUDY**

Can Government state what has been the cost of the Input/Output Study report to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The process of updating the Input/Output Study on a bi-sector basis will commence shortly as originally agreed with the consultants. This will entail conducting further business expenditure surveys together with the inclusion of more recent data currently available to Government to ensure that the model's forecasting capability is maintained. There will also be a revision of classification by industry to make the model more user friendly and relevant to Gibraltar's particular circumstances, for example, the reclassification of financial services. The hon Member will recall that the model uses United Nations sector classification which puts some of the things that we regard as financial services in the business and real estate United Nations category so that when one is actually wants to know and extract financial services measures from the model one cannot just look at the financial intermediation section. One has to look at the financial intermediation section and bits of the business and real estate section and that is going to be restruct so that the categories better follow without destroying the model as a sub report representing the same information but by classifications that better follow the local labelling rather than the United Nations. Once this process is underway persons and organisations within the business community who wish to make use of the applications of the model will be able to submit in writing relevant enquiries for subsequent evaluation and reply. It is not the intention at present to make the model itself openly available for general use, by which I understand that one will have indirect access to the calculations that the model is able to throw up rather than access directly to the model in terms of here it is take it and use in one's own office. As the model is updated and developed further training will become available to the civil servants charged with the running of the model. Government can confirm that the statisticians have already undergone a period of training in the United Kingdom in July last year. Training will not be extended to others outside the civil service. As regards the provision of the full report to the Opposition the Chief Secretary in his letter of the 29<sup>th</sup> September 2003 invited the Leader of the Opposition at my suggestion to pursue this possibility directly with



my office. I have not yet received any such request from the Leader of the Opposition. The cost of the Input/Output Study was £46,335. I should add that the hon Member should not think that there are different versions of the report, one of which he has, the published version and the other which he has not which is markedly different. The real difference is in the transaction tables and technical coefficients which are not contained in the published version but which he has already had confidentially. Those are the main differences between the published and unpublished versions of the report. So, getting the bits that the hon Member thinks he has not yet seen is actually I believe a very, very small element. If the hon Member thinks that there are very large chunks of the report et cetera, et cetera mainly to things that he has already had confidentially from us, the coefficients and transaction tables, there are more detailed transaction tables that give away information of the sort that he knows we avoid publicising.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 504 TO 507 OF 2004**

##### **HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes I do not want the Chief Minister to make publicise things that it is better not to but when I wrote to the Administrative Secretary in the course of the previous correspondence I was told that he only had authority to give me the table of the transactions and I asked him to obtain the authority from the Chief Minister who is only two yards away from him and the reply was that I should write to his Office. As far as I am concerned if one is only two yards away from the other I would have thought I was already writing to his office. Given the fact that the Chief Minister volunteered to provide this in the budget of 2002 and said that it was the Government's intention to publish the report in full and that if there were any bits that they thought it was better not to publish in full they would be provided. I would have thought that since I do not know what bits have not been published it is not very easy for me to ask for this or that other bit. I would have thought that when I was being provided with the transactions tables it would mean that that was the only thing there was to provide me with and would the Chief Minister not accept that subsequent to that I started asking if there was something else that I had not been provided with because the published report gives the effects of changes in the tourist industry, financial services and in different sectors of the economy and the impact of employment. Nothing the Chief Minister has given me and nothing that is published explains at how one arrives on the impact on employment and I therefore asked what for me is a natural question, Is there such a thing as an employment multiplier table which there was in the two previous studies and was made public in the two previous studies?

##### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That does not fall into the category of things that the Government would have wished to suppress publication of either publicly or still less to give it to the hon Member confidentially. So, I will double check before giving him a categorical answer but if it is not in the public version it must be that there is not but I will check and tell him authoritatively. On the question of writing to me directly there is a view which I am told is based on convention which I think is worth preserving is that when Members of the Opposition want things out of the Government they should write at a political level

to the Minister rather than dealing directly with officials. In this issue of the model the Chief Secretary had my authority to answer the hon Member's technical question which he has been doing in correspondence which frankly I have not been following in detail but I suppose he has been giving the hon Member answers to the technical questions that he has been asking. I think that the Chief Secretary has been correctly taking the view that publication or provision to him of documents that have not been published is not the provision of technical details but requires a political issue that he should write to me about and I see I have here a copy of the letter from the Chief Secretary to him saying I suggest therefore that you should address your request for a full copy of the report to the Chief Minister direct. That was in September last year it might have been overtaken by elections and things of that sort. I would prefer it if it is not too inconvenient to the hon Member that he should just drop me a two line letter just asking for that because that gives me the opportunity to send it to him under cover of a letter which will make clear what the constraints attached to it and in relation to what because there may be things in the report which I would not mind if he used them publicly and I would not wish him to feel bound by confidentiality except in respect of issues that we specifically identified in that reply which are things that relate to things that he knows that they will relate to.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am grateful for that. In relation to some other questions, when the report was made public and there was a press conference, there was no indication given that the model would require further work on it before it was accessible to people who might want to use it in respect of their business activities. It said, "*The model built following United Nations standards to make it universally accessible and understandable to any economist.*" That is what they said in the press conference and they went on to say that the local business would be given the opportunity. All I wanted to know was whether that had already happened. Apparently it has not happened.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think it has happened, I do not think anybody has written to the government from private businesses saying "*please may I use the model?*" The point that is being made is that there are two aspects of the model that perhaps make it less useful than it might be to private business as opposed to economists. One is that it is based on information from 2000 or 1999 and whilst the model contains the ability to project, that forecasting capacity is more accurate the more recent the data that it contains. The second which I think is probably a more relevant one, given that in respect to the first one the accurate forecasting capacity one will recall probably stretches to five or six years forward that the forecasting becomes less reliable and we are not into that area of time yet. The other aspect that makes it a little less useful to business is that the categorisation is not recognisable so if one is in financial services and one wants to know the effect that this or that investment is likely to have it is not very useable in that sense because one is stuck with UN categorisation that may not correspond with the sort of categories that local businessmen will find useful. That is why they have decided to restrike a version of the model which, leaving the original version intact, which is not UN categorisation compliant but maybe notwithstanding that more useful to businessmen locally who will be able to recognise the labels and the sectors that we tend to follow in Gibraltar in our economic and commercial debating but in strict answer to the hon Member's question I am not aware that there is anything in the model as it is at the moment that

would prevent it from being used albeit indirectly by somebody who wants to use it now. In its present condition, and with its present vintage of information and with those drawbacks of labelling of categories, the answer is no.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

He has used twice the example of the categorisation of the Financial Services which I think was made clear initially in the report. It said in the press release conference that was used when the report was made public, if this point was particularly drawn attention to where it said that people like accountants and lawyers and so on that we might normally think of as being part of the activities of the finance centre were not classified as such in the model. I am thinking more as for example, the retail trade, which is a very big chunk of our economy and if the model does what is expected of it people might be interested to find what shifts in either the pattern of origin of tourists or the levels of expenditure might be an indicator of possible demands for goods which they would be interested in exploring in terms of their business development. That presumably would not be altered by what we have been told by UN classification I would imagine no?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The model does precisely that. I do not suppose a small shopkeeper might want to do it but if a large retailer in Gibraltar wanted to know whether his type of business is better served by more cruise passenger and less cross frontier visitors or more British cross frontier visitors this is precisely the sort of economic management, forecasting and planning tools that the model works. I cannot tell him the extent of the re-classification, what I know is that they are re-classifying the industries to make the model more user friendly and relevant to Gibraltar's particular circumstances. The reclassification of the financial services is cited to me only as an example which leads me to believe that it is not the only one that they are doing but as to the extent of the reclassification I could not tell him indeed it is that they have not made their decisions themselves again.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of what is available on the internet in order to become conversant with what needs to be done to use the model when the Chief Minister says that it will only be available on the internet in order to become conversant with what needs to be done to use the model. When the Chief Minister says it will only be available to civil servants is he saying that the Government will not pay for the use of this or is the Chief Minister saying that it is not available to anybody who may want to have access to it from Bournemouth University.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know what the Government decides what distant learning or courses are available but when I say access I am not sure whether the hon Member is referring to access or training?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Training.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Training for use of. There is a distinction to be drawn there between training in the actual hands on operation of the model which I think is what is being said is going to be limited to those who are actually going to be doing the actual operation of the model as opposed to a sort of training which I think at some stage if this is going to be useful in the private sector has got to be made available. That is not training as how to actually operate the model but at least courses or seminars "training" as to private sector businesses and others so that they understand the potential uses that this has for them. The sort of questions that they can ask it albeit indirectly through the Government operators because otherwise no one is ever going to make a use of this is there is not some sort of coaching to familiarise people with what it can do for their business, how they can access it being done for their business, whether they have or do not have to pay for something, unless that happens no one is ever going to use this model and it will just be limited to an in-house Government public sector economic forecasting tool and it would be a pity because we would then be giving away a large amount of the potential value of this exercise.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the cost of this exercise can the Government say what has been the cost of asking Dr Fletcher to provide the answers to my questions which the Government at one stage said they were prepared to pay for and I thought should not have a cost attached but I am interested to find out if there has been?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Without wishing to encourage the Chronicle to repeat this morning's headlines I think it would be unrealistic for the hon Member to think that Dr Fletcher will work free of charge for the Government answering as many as the hon Member's questions and for as long as the hon Member chooses. I may have a duty to stand here debating these issues with the Leader of the Opposition but Dr Fletcher does not and he takes the view that if he has to he is entitled to be paid for his time. I know it is not an excessive amount but there is a charge. I could not tell him what it is but I can find out.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am certainly interested because it is my view that since the questions were all of a technical nature dealing with things that I think people were entitled to ask the person that constructed the model and I can tell the Chief Minister that if I had been able to meet up with Professor Fletcher here he would probably have been able to deal with them on the spot. The questions that I had were all designed to clear up things that by themselves are not clear from reading the published report or indeed the additional information the Government was good enough to provide me with. So, I am interested in finding out what he has charged because I do not think that he should have charged.

ORAL

NO 508 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**MOD**

Can Government state what is the MOD budget for Gibraltar in the current financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No 509 of 2004.

**NO 509 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD**

Can Government state what is the MOD complement in the current financial year in respect of (a ) military posts and (b) civilian posts, giving a breakdown for UK based and locally entered?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The hon Member will understand this is not Gibraltar Government information and therefore all I am doing is providing to the Leader of the Opposition the information provided to me by the Ministry of Defence.

I am advised by the Command Secretary that the MOD budget for Gibraltar in financial year 2003/2004 is £92.177 million. There are, as at 31 December 2003, 418 Military Service posts plus 389 Royal Gibraltar Regiment posts, the latter includes TA. United Kingdom based posts total 58 and there are 1027 Locally Entered Civilians.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 508 AND 509 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have Government been given any advanced notice by the MOD or by Her Majesty's Government of any reduction in the budget in the next year or so?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. The Government have only seen a press release or bulletin to its employees I am not quite sure which that was put out several weeks ago by the Ministry of Defence itself alluding to their need to work to an increasingly tight budget in future

years. We have had not information and we have no reason to believe that there is. We know that the MOD generally not just in Gibraltar that all MOD budgets across the MOD worldwide are operating to increasingly budgetary limitations. The impact that that may have on the Gibraltar budget over the immediate future years is not something that the MOD has yet raised with the Gibraltar Government.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Government will of course be aware about the public exchanges that have taken place in relation to the proposed cut of part of their TA and that is apparently an economy move, is that something that the Government have raised with the MOD?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is obviously something that Government raised with the MOD when we saw the press reports and we have asked the MOD to confirm whether or not the reports of the imminent cutting of the TA Company is true, to which we have had a response, that no such decision has yet been made, that is what they have confirmed to us in writing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Which is the same as they said publicly is that not the case, when the Government asked was it after they had come out saying that no decision had yet been made?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Simultaneous, the day before, same morning came out in the afternoon that sort of thing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are Government aware that they are engaged in a policy regarding the civilians in which they have invented a new concept which they call regeneration of the workforce in which they say they [INTERRUPTION]. Apparently from the information that has come back to me it is not intended to replace one for one, have Government any knowledge of that, that is I have got fairly reliable sources telling me that when they are talking, for example, of introducing early retirement which makes sense if they have got as they claim to have and that is probably the case because they have not recruited people for a very long time, they may have a lot of people who if no action is taken would all be retiring at the same time and that therefore rather than have say for example, 200 people leaving in one year they may want to take action to give early retirement to some people in order to phase the regeneration of the workforce over a number of years but it appears that what is intended in the process is not to replace one for one but to maybe retire two and recruit one, has the Government any knowledge of that because that would of course involve a reduction in the numbers and that would not be good news for Gibraltar or for Government finances?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are aware of the existence of the regeneration policy. It has no knowledge of the mathematics that applies to the process. If it were as the hon Member is saying then this is not so much a policy of regeneration but rather a process of staff cuts disguised as a policy of regeneration which the Government would obviously oppose. However, I have to say that I would not support a process of regeneration in principle. I can see that there may be a limited legitimate use for it to manage as the hon Member has said a particular agglomeration of retirees in one year. But, keen as we all are in this House to ensure that there are jobs for our youth and people at the bottom end of the labour market it is not the policy of the Government and therefore I would not wish it to be the policy of the MOD either that this should be at the expense of removing people from the labour market at the top end before they are ready to be removed from it. A lot of these people still have the need to earn money. When the rest of Europe is talking about extending the working life of people as a means of controlling the pension bills and the social security bills it would not be helpful that we were here moving in the opposite direction, in other words, dumping people into the labour market at a time when they still have a need for earned income and at a time when they are at their most vulnerable in terms of their ability to find alternative employment because people do not normally like employing people aged 53 or 54 years old. In terms of social engineering it is in principle a non desirable policy for wide application without prejudice to the fact that in limited it may be a valid tool for limited application to specific and restricted factual circumstances such as the ones as the Leader of the Opposition described in his question.



**NO 510 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**WESTSIDE 1 PHASE 2**

Can Government say whether it has proved necessary to apply the alternative method of charging the market value as lower than 4 per cent annual increase on the original cost price to the sale of the Government's share of any co-ownership flats at Westside 1 Phase 2?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes, out of a total of 180 sales in Westside 1 Phase 2 there were two cases where the "*50 per cent of Market Value*" option was lower than the "*4 per cent annual increase*" option and this was applied accordingly.

**NO 511 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU SAVINGS TAX DIRECTIVE COMMITTEE**

Can Government state how many times since March 2003 the joint working committee formed between Government, the Finance Centre Division, people in the Government and representatives of the Finance Centre Council and the Banker's Association has met, providing the names of the individuals who make up the committee, the dates on when the committee has met and whether it has now completed the review on listing the bits of the EU Directive on Disclosure of Information on the Income from Savings that would apply and the business that would be affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The EU Savings Tax Committee met five times in 2003. It met on the following dates:

Wednesday 26<sup>th</sup> February 2003  
Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> March 2003  
Wednesday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2003  
Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> March 2003  
Monday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2003

Outside of these formal meetings the Committee has kept in regular contact by e-mail. In addition, Paul Tipping, a Director of the British Bankers Association gave a lecture on the EU Savings Tax directive at the Finance Centre conference room on the 19<sup>th</sup> March 2003. the lecture was open to the whole industry. The members of the Committee are as follows:

Chairman of the Bankers' Association, Chairman of the Bar Council, a representative of the Gibraltar Society of Chartered and Certified Accountancy Bodies and of the Society of Trust and Estate Practitioners. A second representative of the Bankers Association, representatives of Barclays Bank, Credit Suisse, Lombardi Odier Hentsch, Jyske Bank, the Finance Centre Director Mr James Tipping and the Finance Centre Officer Mr Guy Canessa. This Committee has completed the review of the situation as it stands and is monitoring on-going developments. In particular,

the EU Savings Tax Directive will not commence until agreement is reached between the EU and third countries. The Committee was scheduled to meet again on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2004.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 511 OF 2003**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister has covered everything except the last bit of the last sentence the business that will be affected. I take it that that has also happened?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The directive is clear as to what it applies and what it does not apply to. Whether business of the sort that it applies to is being done in Gibraltar or not and will therefore be affected by it depends very much on an operator by operator basis. Some operators will be doing a lot of business that is affected and others will be doing less of it. There is no way of assessing what the overall effect will be. It is bound to affect some more than others but depending on the kind of profile of the business being done would each operator be able to assess that now. But everybody understands in detail the scopes and bits of application and non application of the directive and are now able to run this past their own business base and assess for themselves the extent to which they are going to be affected by it whether the bits of their business that is affected by can somehow be restructured in a way that may put it on the right side of the line and not be affected by the extent to which the business that is affected and cannot be saved the extent to which it is going to be lost altogether, they will keep it notwithstanding the impact of the directive, all those things are now clear in people's minds and each business will be making their own assessments of the situation. I personally have no doubt that there will be an impact, that there will be overall in the Finance Centre a loss of business, I think that the impact will be strongest in what I call the unstructured small depositor business. Small to medium sized bank deposits where placing the asset inside a corporate or trust structure is uncost effective or cost and ineffective one or the other.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it that this exercise is being done on the assumption that we are stuck with the situation where we will have to follow the UK and not be able to be taking advantage of the transition alternative of deducting at source which is going to be available to other competitors and that that has been factored into the effect as well by the people who have done the work?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it has been done on that basis.

**NO 512 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU – DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION**

Can the Government now confirm that for the EU Directive and Disclosure of Information on the Income from Savings to apply between Gibraltar and the United Kingdom, it would require a policy decision on the part of the Gibraltar Government to enter into a reciprocal arrangement between Gibraltar and the UK, as if the UK and Gibraltar were separate Member States?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The directive itself only applies as between different Member States. It cannot therefore apply as between the United Kingdom and Gibraltar except pursuant to some arrangements extraneous to the directive itself.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 513 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the answer is yes to the question is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is drafted as it is because a policy decision of the Gibraltar Government are not the only conceivable way in which the result can be brought around. The others would be extremely constitutionally difficult but theoretically possible.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am taking it as read that the policy decision to which the question referred would not be a policy that would enjoy the support of the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not something that the Government would do as a matter of policy choice.

**NO 513 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**OCCUPATIONAL PENSION SCHEMES**

Can Government now say, in respect of the period since the first of April 2003, how many private sector employers were operating approved occupational pension schemes and give a breakdown into money purchases and final salary schemes and the number of employees in each category in the last tax year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The position remains as stated in answer to Question No 421 of 2003. The information requested is unavailable and would require considerable manual administrative effort to produce which is not being invested.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 513 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

At the last meeting I asked this question and was given this answer. The exchanges ended with my suggesting that given the problem of finding the historical position as a matter of policy it might be a good thing for the Government to instruct the tax office to do it from a current date and the answer from the Chief Minister was yes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am sorry I do not follow, do what from a current date?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the monitoring of this because if in the tax returns that employers make and in introducing schemes of this nature, where the Commissioner of Income Tax has got to approve the scheme and approve the tax relief that goes with it, I could understand

that going back in time would be an expensive and time consuming exercise but given that it is the policy of the Government to have occupational schemes I would have thought that it would be desirable in furtherance of that policy to find out what there was already in the market because the Government have said previously that they would move down the route of legislating for this if the voluntary efforts did not produce results and I do not see how one can come to a conclusion whether the voluntary efforts have produced results unless one is monitoring the results and therefore I suggested to the Government acknowledging the difficulty that the Chief Minister has mentioned that it might be desirable to introduce the monitoring from a current date and the answer the Chief Minister gave me was yes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand. The Leader of the Opposition means in terms of how many occupational schemes he has approved this year, for example, by just keeping a tally. I suppose he might be able to say how many schemes he has approved as opposed to saying how many people are actually participating in the scheme as at which would introduce a historical context and the question does say in respect of the periods since the 1<sup>st</sup> April. Whether that is intended to exclude all the pre April schemes I do not know that might be the purpose of the question. I will have to ask the Commissioner of Income Tax whether he can at least say how many new schemes have come into existence since 1<sup>st</sup> April.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If I may remind the Chief Minister, what I said to him in the last House of Assembly was, *“Can I ask whether it could be possible to try and monitor given that it is not practical to try and find out the historical position to try and monitor new ones from say the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003 and then we will see what is happening during the year and we will be able to ask periodically?”* and the Chief Minister answered “yes” and now I am asking periodically.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

His excellent advice has not yet been put into effect.

ORAL

**NO 514 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 8B, SUBHEAD 6**

Have any payments been made in the financial year 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 as a result of the Group Life Cover for which premiums are provided under Head 8B Subhead 6?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No 515 of 2004.



**NO 515 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 8B, SUBHEAD 6**

Can Government now confirm if and in what amount the two claims referred to as pending in the answer to Question No 426 of 2003 have now been settled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The following are the payments effected as a result of the death in service Group Life Cover relating to civil servants and employees of Government related companies and agencies:

2002/2003

- 4 claims paid amounting to £83,470.36

Current financial year to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003

- 5 claims paid amounting to £261,259.85.

The two outstanding claims from financial year 2002/2003 have been paid during the current financial year as follows:

|                             |   |                                       |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 14 <sup>th</sup> April 2003 | - | £25,704.64 (includes £47.88 interest) |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> May 2003    | - | £26,409.88                            |

All claims to-date have been settled.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 515 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are these two part of the five claims in the present financial year that he mentioned in the first part of the answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

ORAL

NO 516 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**CONSOLIDATED FUND**

What was the final balance of the Consolidated Fund as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No 517 of 2004.

**NO 517 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND**

What was the balance of the Consolidated Fund as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No 516**

The balance of the Consolidated Fund as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002 was £32.8 million.

**Answer to Question No 517 of 2004**

The balance of the Consolidated Fund as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003 was £31.3 million.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 516 AND 517 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of Question No 517 of 2004 where the figure is higher than the original balance for this year is this the final given that we have now gone past the closing date for the account as it closes in December?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Some book-keeper would have some explaining to do if it were not the case.

**NO 518 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**I & D FUND**

Have Government now borrowed any funds from their loan facilities in the current financial year and if so give a breakdown by date and amount?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of £10 million was drawn on the 17<sup>th</sup> December 2003 from the revolving loan facility with Barclays Bank PLC and it was credited to the Improvement and Development Fund.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 518 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this likely to be the amount for this current financial year or does the Government anticipate that between now and the end of March there is going to be any borrowing?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I really cannot tell the Leader of the Opposition as a matter of day to day or even week to week cash flow management whether that would be required. I believe of the sources of funding to the Improvement and Development Fund I think that the figures that I gave him yesterday confirm this. The proceeds of sale from Government properties is probably lower than is estimated the other balancing figure is the draw down from the reserves from the Consolidated Fund. I do not know whether there will be some massaging of one figure against the other that is if they prefer to draw more borrowing and less from the reserves I do not know. It would be for that sort of reason if more money were borrowed. I am not aware of any need to borrow any more money.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I just wondered because the fact that it has been borrowed so recently would be an indication that it has not been needed earlier in the year. In the estimates the sum of £10 million was put in at the beginning of the financial year and therefore we are talking about a situation where having put in the estimates a requirement to have £10 million for a period of 12 months it is not until nearly the end of nine months that they have actually gone for it and that would give me an indication that having borrowed it so late in the year is why I am asking?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It probably will be that the expenditure of the Improvement and Development Fund will be less than it always is by 20 or 25 per cent less than estimated. It depends on the coincidence of projects coming, payments due perhaps a cluster towards the end of the year I do not know but it is a cash management situation rather than an expenditure driven situation in terms of over expenditure. There is certainly not going to be any over expenditure in the Improvement and Development Fund.

**NO 519 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

As at the end of December 2003, what was the value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

|                                     |             |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Monthly Income Debentures           | £23,241,700 |
| Pensioner Monthly Income Debentures | £53,526,200 |

ORAL

**NO 520 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU – EXTERNAL FRONTIERS CONVENTION**

Can the Government explain what reply it has received from the UK in respect of Spain's objection in November to Gibraltar's participation to a future external frontiers convention/regulation of the EU and when was the reply received?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No 521 of 2004.



**NO 521 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU – EXTERNAL FRONTIERS CONVENTION**

Can Government explain how it is that it was not made aware of Spain's objection in November to Gibraltar's participation to a future external frontiers convention/regulation of the EU?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As stated in the Government's press release of the 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2003, the Government have sought clarification from HMG regarding Spain's objection in November to Gibraltar's participation in a future external frontiers regulation, including an explanation as to why Gibraltar had not been duly informed of this matter at the time. A letter was sent to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office on the 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2003 to this effect but to date no substantive reply has been received. I am informed that this is due shortly and that the delay has been caused by the intervening Christmas break.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 520 AND 521 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

On the assumption that shortly means that the reply will arrive before the next Question Time arrives will the Chief Minister mind informing me of the reply if it arrives before there is another Question session when I can raise the matter again?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I can certainly inform him as to whether or not we receive a reply. I have not undertaken even in answer to this question to tell him what the reply would have been. The hon Member has to respect that the Government are entitled to confidentiality in correspondence if it chooses to do so. My policy is, if it is possible

to do so without destroying the conduct of business between governments to be as frank and open in this House as to HMG's position on issues as put to GOG but I would not wish to undertake to publish the content of the letters before I have seen what they are but I would certainly tell him if I get a reply or not and let him know what it is if it is appropriate to do so. This issue goes to the heart. The Leader of the Opposition has seen the public statements on the issues that arise from the draft treaty negotiations. Most recently the full document full analysis. One of the issues that we have been highlighting with HMG is precisely whether the borders language enables Spain to continue to object to an exclusion. On the one hand the United Kingdom is telling us that our concerns are over-egged and on the other hand the Spaniards is giving notice that they object in the knowledge that any such regime external frontiers regulation is likely to emerge after the new convention is in force. So, they must think that the new convention.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has an effect.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

.....yes, they must think that it has the effect of giving them the right to object so that is the circle that needs to be squared in the United Kingdom's response. It cannot be true, both, our concerns are over-egged and that Spain is free to consummate her objection.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government explain how is it that the Brussels Office did not pick this up before it became public?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is not in a public document. This has only entered the public domain because the Spaniards have boasted about it. But the meetings of that sort are not available on the public domain. These are Coreper meetings. These are not occasions which are reported in public so the fact that Spain has made this observation in this meeting is not something that is findable anywhere, British Government would know because they would have had a representative at the meeting in which this was said.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I believe the report in the Chronicle to which the Government reacted which apparently was the first they heard of it from the text of the Government press release. From memory their reaction was that they had contacted the Commission or whoever and that it had been confirmed obviously it was something that the pertinent institution in the European Union was not treating it as a confidential matter that there was a Spanish objection. They were willing to confirm it to the press.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, but before one asks for something to be confirmed one must be aware of its existence. The fact that they are willing to confirm or deny it, I am not assuming that the report did carry the element that the Leader of the Opposition has described does not mean that it is available publicly. These are not available publicly.

**NO 522 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMMUNITY CARE LTD**

Can Government state when they intend to Table in this House, the audited accounts of Community Care Limited for the years since 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Although I seem to recall that the accounts for Community Care were Tabled in this House for a year or two before 1996, Government believe that Tabling the accounts of Community Care Limited in this House may encourage others to argue that the arrangements are not private and non-Governmental and this is not in the interests of Gibraltar. Government are however provided with copies of the accounts by way of information by the Trustees. The Government are happy to provide copies to the hon Member outside of this House after clearing it with the Trustees.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 522 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I will be glad to receive a copy after the Government have cleared it with the Trustees. The reason for the question is that the Chief Minister will remember that he actually said during the course of the elections in a debate on radio that the audited accounts of Community Care were Tabled every year in the House and the last year in respect of which they have been Tabled by this Government was for the year 1996 but I think that was in 1997 or 1998 and nothing has happened since then. The Chief Minister actually said only in November that they were being tabled regularly and we checked and we have found that 1996 was our last year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If I did say that which I do not recollect but if the Leader of the Opposition recollects that I did say it then I am happy to rely on this occasion on his recollection. It must

have been that I had forgotten that at some point in the late 90's when it became clear that Community Care was being challenged on the basis that it was the Government in disguise as opposed to a genuinely private arrangement the decision was taken that to continue Tabling in the House would have tended to confirm that because at the end of the day the only things that are Tabled in this House are the accounts of public bodies. The accounts of the Trustees of the John MacIntosh Trust are not Tabled here, the accounts of other private trusts are not and their investment companies are not Tabled here. It must have been that in that debate I forgot that that assessment had been made and that we had stopped Tabling. Government do not regard themselves as the owner of those accounts and it has not objection to the Leader of the Opposition seeing them but in a way that does not enable somebody in the future to say, *"Ah, you see they are the Government in disguise why else would they be Tabled every year in the House?"*

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the answer to that is that they are Tabled in the House because they receive money from the House. We have in this year's budget an amount which the Chief Minister will recall I asked should be dealt with in a particular way precisely for the reasons that he is saying and he actually agreed to change the subhead so that the money went into the Social Assistance Fund and the Approved Estimates shows a different place from the Draft Estimates. The Approved Estimates we have seen here today. Distancing the charity from the Government was the reason for keeping the Social Assistance Fund going that he gave way back in 1996 but when accounts have been Tabled here of other entities it has been because they have received money from the Government that is why the MacIntosh Homes used to be Tabled here before the Elderly Care Agency existed and nobody was suggesting then that they were owned by the Government or were part of the Government. But that was the rationale, that they received money from the Government.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Government are not saying that it would necessarily have a lethal effect it is just that it seems to us not worth taking a risk with and as the hon Members can continue to have access to them by another means I am sure the Tabling is not of any importance to the hon Member. The advice that Government have is that actually whether it is done directly from the Consolidated Fund or from a special fund and whether it is funded from one type of Government revenue or another is actually in all legal likelihood and probability irrelevant to the question of the determination of the issue if it came to be determined. I understand why but the advice is that given the test that it would have to meet the distinction is too much of a nuance to be relevant.

ORAL

**NO 523 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMMUNITY CARE LIMITED**

Can the Government state when was the £5 million grant provided for in this year's estimates from the Social Assistance Fund paid to Community Care Limited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The £5 million grant to Community Care Limited from the Social Assistance Fund was effected on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2003.

ORAL

NO 524 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**CONSOLIDATED FUND**

Can Government state what is the latest forecast of revenue and expenditure for the Consolidated Fund for the current Financial Year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 525 and 526 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 525 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**CONSOLIDATED FUND**

Can Government state what has been the estimated expenditure from the Consolidated Fund in the current financial year to the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 by head of expenditure?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 524 and 526 of 2004.



**NO 526 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**RECEIPT OF REVENUE**

Can Government state what has been the estimated receipt of revenue in the current financial year to the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003 by head of revenue?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I do not have that information to hand available at the moment, Question Nos 525 and 526 of 2004 which are estimated revenue and estimated expenditure to the end of the year could be put together with just a few more days notice and I can send that on to the hon Member. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to await for the actual forecast outturn on the basis that it is calculated now for the estimates but if there is a management account of a revenue and expenditure I would send it on to him in the next few days.

**NO 527 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE**

Can Government say when they expect to be in a position to provide this House with copies of the approved Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am not aware that there has been any change in the long-established practice whereby copies are circulated by the Clerk and not the Government. When I saw this question I could not for the life of me work out what it was that the Leader of the Opposition was getting at. I have never been aware of how those copies are circulated, by whom and when, and who generates them nor was I aware that there had been a difficulty in this year within the arrangements. So, I have to say that the answer reflects what I was told in response to the hon Member's question rather than reflecting any knowledge that I might have had of what the mechanics have been in the past which I do not know. I did not actually know whether this was sent by the Government or by the Clerk but I am told that they have always been sent by the House and not by the Government.

**NO 528 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS**

Can Government state when the Principal Auditor finalised the audit of the Government accounts for the financial year 2001/2002 and when will this be Tabled in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Principal Auditor forwarded the Audited Accounts to His Excellency the Governor, as he is required to do, on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of July 2003. The constitutional requirement is that the Governor then writes to the Financial & Development Secretary directing him to lay the accounts in this House. Due to an oversight in the Office of the Governor they overlooked doing so, until prompted to do so by the hon Member's question.

ORAL

**NO 529 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government now confirm that the published pre 1996/1997 GDP figures did include MOD and that therefore the answer given by him in this House to supplementary questions arising from Question No 440 of 2003 were therefore incorrect?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 530 to 532 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 530 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what is the estimated percentage of GDP contributed by MOD in each financial year since 1994/1995?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos 529, 531 and 532 of 2004.

**NO 531 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INPUT/OUTPUT STUDY**

Have the Government now had an opportunity “to sit down analyse and consider” the response provided by Professor Fletcher prior to March 2003 as to why the MOD is calculated as 3 per cent of the economy, even though it is accepted to be more than that?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 529, 530 and 532 of 2004.

**NO 532 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INPUT/OUTPUT STUDY**

Can Government now explain how the initial result of the Input/Output study put the MOD share of National Income at 10 per cent and the final report places it as 3 per cent?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I can confirm that the published pre 1996/1997 GDP figures included the MOD. Indeed when I saw the question on the Order Paper I looked up the file and actually found a letter dated May 2003 that I had drafted to send to the hon Member. I cannot find evidence because there is no photocopy of the original that it has been sent from which I conclude given that he is asking the question and there is only a draft on the file that it was never sent and that it stayed in draft. I can now confirm that I did look into it at the time as I said and indeed was able to establish that it was. Under the income method for measuring GDP, the income contribution of the MOD as a proportion of GDP for the period 1994/1995 to 2001 was as follows:

| Year      | MOD(£m) | GDP(£m) | per cent |
|-----------|---------|---------|----------|
| 1994/1995 | 21.31   | 326.61  | 6.5      |
| 1995/1996 | 21.98   | 327.73  | 6.7      |
| 1996/1997 | 19.82   | 352.12  | 5.6      |
| 1997/1998 | 16.94   | 364.51  | 4.6      |
| 1998/1999 | 17.84   | 392.33  | 4.5      |
| 1999/2000 | 15.95   | 409.89  | 3.9      |
| 2000/2001 | 17.16   | 433.61  | 4.0      |

The comparable estimate from the Input/Output Study for 1999/2000 was 3.8 per cent. However, the MOD generates other expenditure within the local economy. The Input/Output Study gave an estimate of around £17m in respect of such expenditure on goods and services. Adjusting for imports, this would increase the contribution of the MOD to the Gibraltar economy to a total figure of between 6 and 7 per cent. The

original estimate of the draft Input/Output Study had put the MOD share of GDP at around 10 per cent. This figure was revised subsequently when it was discovered that the data provided by the MOD had included MOD expenditure which, although allocated to the MOD's Gibraltar budget, had not been spent within the Gibraltar economy.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 529 TO 532 OF 2004**

##### **HON J J BOSSANO:**

The figure in the table the Chief Minister has provided which shows the MOD share coming down to 3.9 per cent for 1999/2000, from the sentence that preface's it suggests that that is using the Income method for measuring GDP because it says under the Income Measure of GDP. The Input/Output Study by putting 3.8 per cent for the year 1999/2000 shows a very close result to the other one. If one is saying for 1999/2000 in one method says that it was 3.8 per cent and the other method says that it was 3.9 per cent that would be indicative of a very high level of accuracy using the same argument that has been used for the figure of £409 million. The argument in the Input/Output Study was that if two different methods come up with a very close result one is for £409 million and the other is for £410 million then that is taken to be indicative of accuracy and therefore by implication that is also through to 3.9. I find that strange because when the Chief Minister answered the question last time in March the impression that he left me with was that it was generally recognised that the 3 per cent was an understatement and that it was likely to be corrected in an upwards direction, would he not agree that that is what he seems to be saying in March? He said in March, *"I think that he (Professor Fletcher) accepts that the figure of 3 per cent is an understatement of the current contribution of the MOD to the economy and he has an explanation of why it is..."* rather than an explanation as to why it is an understatement I think that what we have got in this answer is an indication that it is an accurate figure because if there was an explanation saying under the Input/Output method we have come up with a figure of 3 per cent but under the income, the traditional method the figure is higher but there is an explanation for the discrepancy I would understand it but what it seems I am being told today is that the 3.8 is a very accurate figure because the income one produces 3.9.

##### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I agree with him. Adjusted according to the answer that has been prepared here for imports it would give a figure between six and seven. I cannot help the hon Member as to why that is mathematically so but as he has got the answer in front of him he might like to follow it there in print. In the end of the first paragraph it says, *"adjusted for imports, this would increase the contribution of the MOD to a total figure of between six and seven."*

##### **HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not sure what sense one can make of that answer because if what we are being told is that if we included what the MOD spends on imports the contribution would be six to seven per cent I can assure the Chief Minister is a nonsense answer because if the MOD is spending another £10 million on imports that is not a contribution to the



local economy. Precisely in every element in the Input/Output methodology what we do is we take imports out of the equation on the basis that they do not have a multiplier effect and there is no indirect and induced income generated by imports because those effects happen in the country which exports to us not in us so if what we are being told is that the MOD's spend in Gibraltar is of the order of six to seven per cent if one treats imports by the MOD as a contribution to the Gibraltar economy which I would not think of doing and neither would Professor Fletcher from the explanations in his book and neither would the Government Statistician from the figures in the table then I am afraid it does not explain anything. If the MOD imported an aircraft carrier presumably the contribution would then be 100 per cent.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Perhaps I ought to send the Leader of the Opposition this letter anyway, the one that was drafted in May, because it helps to explain the answer to this last point as to how they have split MOD into the bits that should be included and the bits that should not be included and this perhaps explain why the figure is lower than he and I might have expected because it reflects only the bit that they have decided should be included. Even though he has had the answer I will actually convert this letter with the current date and this will explain that and perhaps at a later Question Time it can be discussed again or write back if he is not satisfied.

**NO 533 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NATIONAL INCOME ESTIMATES**

When do Government expect to publish the National Income Estimates of the years 2001/2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Preliminary estimates of GDP and GNP for 2001/2002 are being finalised by the Statistics Office. Once these figures are available in their final form, hopefully by next month, they will be made available to Members of the House and published as were those in respect of the period 1996/1997 to 2000 /2001 in May last year. Since this was written I have been told that it may actually be before the end of this month.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 533 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it the case that the Chief Minister from remarks made earlier on in response to another question had an indication that we may have achieved more than six per cent that year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not actually seen figures but as I was rushing out of the office to go somewhere the Chief Secretary made a remark to me in the corridor saying there is a paper on its way to you. Yes, the answer to the hon Member's question , although I have not seen figures , I understand they show an improvement on the six per cent.

ORAL

**NO 534 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003, how many employers had not yet returned their 2000/2001 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificates and what is the estimated number of employees affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 535 to 537 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 535 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many employers had not yet returned their 2001/2002 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificates and what is the estimated number of employees affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 534, 536 and 537 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 536 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many employers had not yet returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificates and what is the estimated number of employees affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 534, 536 and 537 of 2004.

**NO 537 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many employers had not yet returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificates and what is the estimated number of employees affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I now hand the hon Member a schedule with the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 537 of 2004**

Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate not returned as at end of December 2003.

|                           | <b>Q No 534</b> | <b>Q No 535</b> | <b>Q No 536</b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Tax year                  | 2000/2001       | 2001/2002       | 2002/2003       |
| No of employers           | 152             | 152             | 361             |
| Estimated No of employees | 190             | 236             | 5,151           |

Question No 537 of 2004 duplicates Question No 536 and is therefore ignored in the answer.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 534 TO 537 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I have asked in supplementaries to questions seeking this information in the past that we find that it is the same employers given that the numbers always seem to finish up around the same figure. If it is the same 150 employers year after year who never do it should something not be done about these particular individuals if they happen to be the same all the time, if there are a different 152 in each year which might be rather surprising then it might be a different kettle of fish but if they are the same ones all the time and they just do not bother ever to return it if nobody ever does anything about it then presumably they never will?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I appreciate that the hon Member probably does not enjoy my New Year messages and that for that reason he may not listen to them too carefully but he will have heard me say, I hope, that arrears and those who do not pay for something that the Government are determined to tackle and this is precisely an instance of that sort. I believe it is usually the same rump who either do not pay or always pay much later than they should and if the hon Member reads the Auditor's Report attached to the account he will see that the Principal Auditor's criticisms for non-collection of arrears have risen in crescendo over the years and I think that it now needs to be tackled. There may be resources issues here but I think that probably what can be recouped would probably justify some additional resources. This is just one example of many areas of non or late payment of dues to Government that will now be much more firmly addressed than has been the case in the past.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In drawing attention to this particular instance where probably we are not talking about a lot of money because we are not talking about a lot of people, the point I am trying to make is that it seems in terms of seriousness, if they do not even bother to return it and nobody does anything about it, there are those who return and pay the lot, there are those who return and pay some, there are those who return and pay nothing and there are those who do not even return it. I would have thought that one needed to start at that end of the spectrum with the ones that are actually ignoring the existence of the system altogether and I think that one of the things that the Auditor has pointed out over the number of years is that this particular element is entirely unquantifiable because they do not return anything nobody really knows how much tax is involved or how many employers. The answer provided by the department in their case is entirely guesswork because they simply do not write back. What I am suggesting and asking the Government whether they agree that with the existing resources, certainly 150 people, it seems to me to start with the ones that are in the greatest breach of the law which is not even to answer.

ORAL

**NO 538 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003, how many employers had returned their 2000/2001 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificates and what was the total amount of tax deducted and the number of employees affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 539 to 541 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 539 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many employers had returned their 2001/2002 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificates and what was the total amount of tax deducted and the number of employees affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 538, 540 and 541 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 540 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many employers had returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificates and what was the total amount of tax deducted and the number of employees affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 538,539 and 541 of 2004.

**NO 541 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many employers had returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate and what was the total amount of tax deducted and the number of employees affected?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I now hand the hon Member a schedule providing the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 541 of 2004**

| <b>Question No</b>                     | <b>538</b> | <b>539</b> | <b>540</b> |
|----------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Tax Tear</b>                        | 2000/2001  | 2001/2002  | 2002/2003  |
| <b>No of Returns received</b>          | 1,695      | 1,734      | 1,583      |
| <b>Total PAYE Deducted</b>             | £53.2m     | £57.5m     | £46.1m     |
| <b>No of employees/deduction cards</b> | 25,486     | 25,427     | 18,640     |

Question No 541 of 2004 duplicates Question No 540 and is ignored.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 538 TO 541 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The columns for 2001 and 2002 would indicate that most of the returns for those two years are now in, would the government not agree from the numbers, sums and the number of employees affected?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO 542 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many of the employers who had returned the 2000/2001 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate had not paid the full amount of PAYE deducted and what was the shortfall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 543 to 545 of 2004.

**ORAL  
WITHDRAWN**

**NO 543 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**XXXXXXXXXXXX**

As at the end of December 2003 how many of the employers who had returned the 2001/2002 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate had not paid the full amount of PAYE deducted and what was the shortfall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos 542, 544 and 545 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 544 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many of the employers who had returned the 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate had not paid the full amount of PAYE deducted and what was the shortfall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This question was withdrawn.

**NO 545 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX - PAYE**

As at the end of December 2003 how many of the employers who had returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate had not paid the full amount of PAYE deducted and what was the shortfall?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the Schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question No 545 of 2004**

|                                         | Q542      | Q543      | Q544      |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Tax Year                                | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 |
| Total number of Returns received        | 1695      | 1734      | 1583      |
| No of Returns with PAYE tax outstanding | 210       | 224       | 274       |
| PAYE tax outstanding                    | £0.9m     | £2.7m     | £3.5m     |

Question No 545 duplicates Question No 544 of 2004 and is therefore ignored in the answer.



**NO 546 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX – SELF-EMPLOYED**

Can Government state as at the end of December 2003 what were the amounts assessed in respect of self-employed persons for each tax year 1995/1996 to 2002/2003 giving the amounts discharged, confirmed and paid and the number of taxpayers involved in each year?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information he has requested.

**Answer to Question No 546 of 2004**

|                 | 1995/1996    | 1996/1997    | 1997/1998    | 1998/1999    | 1999/2000    | 2000/2001    | 2001/2002  | 2002/2003  |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|
|                 | £m           | £m           | £m           | £m           | £m           | £m           | £m         | £m         |
| Assessed        | 8.0          | 8.5          | 11.0         | 10.9         | 46.1         | 13.9         | 13.2       | 6.3        |
| Discharged      | 5.3          | 5.3          | 6.9          | 6.7          | 41.5         | 8.5          | 7.2        | 2.1        |
| Paid            | 2.7<br>2.0   | 3.2<br>2.4   | 4.1<br>2.8   | 4.2<br>3.0   | 4.6<br>3.4   | 5.4<br>3.3   | 6.0<br>3.3 | 4.2<br>1.6 |
| Outstanding     | 0.7          | 0.8          | 1.3          | 1.2          | 1.2          | 2.1          | 2.7        | 2.6        |
| No of Taxpayers | <b>1,212</b> | <b>1,188</b> | <b>1,222</b> | <b>1,194</b> | <b>1,216</b> | <b>1,128</b> | <b>983</b> | <b>700</b> |

**NO 547 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

What is the current estimated amount of PAYE payable for the tax year 2001/2002 by area of employment and the number of employees as follows:-

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government owned joint venture companies;
- (d) Private Sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No 548 of 2004.

**NO 548 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX - PAYE**

What is the current estimated amount of PAYE payable for the tax year 2002/2003 by area of employment and the number of employees as follows:-

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government owned joint venture companies;
- (d) Private Sector?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information he has requested.

**Answer to Question No 547 of 2004**

Based on the 2001/2002 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 6 January 2004 the information sought is as follows:

|                                                  | £m   | Approximate No of Employees |
|--------------------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|
| (a) MOD                                          | 4.3  | 2,600                       |
| (b) Gibraltar Government                         | 18.9 | 5,700                       |
| (c) Government owned and joint venture companies | 2.6  | 600                         |
| (d) Private Sector Employment                    | 31.7 | 16,500                      |
|                                                  | 57.5 | 25,400                      |

**Answer to Question No 548 of 2004**

Based on the 2002/2003 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 6 January 2004 the information sought is as follows:

|                                              | £m   |
|----------------------------------------------|------|
| (a) MOD                                      | 4.7  |
| (b) Gibraltar Government                     | 7.1  |
| (c) Government owned joint venture companies | 2.8  |
| (d) Private Sector Employment                | 31.5 |
|                                              | ———— |
|                                              | 46.1 |
|                                              | ———— |

The above does not include estimates of PAYE tax payable in respect of employers that have not returned the Employers' Annual Statement. Also the PAYE Deduction Cards for the year 2002/2003 are currently being processed and it is not possible at this time to provide details of the number of Deduction Cards returned.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS 547 AND 548 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When I asked the question in March about the 2001/2002 tax year one of the things that I queried was the very low figure in respect of the Gibraltar Government which in answer to Question No 448 of 2003 showed £9.6 million being paid in respect of Gibraltar Government employees and only 3,100 persons affected. We had an exchange as to whether the explanation was a failure to submit in time the Employers' Declaration and PAYE statement. Given what we have just heard from the Chief Minister about whether I really knew his New Year message or not would he not agree that he is unlikely to impress those affected by the content of that message and by what we have said today if in fact in January 2004 Government Departments themselves have failed to make the return for the tax year ending in June 2002, will the Government agree with me that they are going to have a problem in persuading people that he is taking a tough line? The Chief Minister has just agreed with me that if people have not returned their statement and declaration then they ought to be pressed to do it but should the Government themselves not give an example?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I did not refer to delays in submitting Declarations I referred to delays or non payments of monies due to the Government. In the case of the Government itself this is financially academic. Since the Government are paying in effect itself it does not affect the availability to Government revenue given that if it has not received the revenue nor has it incurred the expenditure. In the case of Government it is entirely a book-keeping entry I am sure there is no exchange of cheques or anything it is just a book-keeping entry. There is a difference between what is an administrative entry

in the case of Government as an employer in respect of its employees and private sector employers whose failure actually results in the Government failing to collect money in a way which affects the amount of money available to the Government to spend on public services and in a way which is capable of affecting whether there are budget surpluses or budget deficits or in what amount. The hon Member must not misunderstand me I think it is in principle, desirable, that if there are time limits everyone should honour them but in the case of the failure on the part of the Accountant General to make the necessary book entries and to provide the necessary information to the Commissioner of Income Tax there is actually no net financial deterioration in terms of the Consolidated Fund. It is expenditure that would come out of the Consolidated Fund, would go back in to the Consolidated Funds since the same account pays so in terms of deadlines for making returns the hon Member's point is well made but it does not have the same financial implication to the public purse.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept that but in answer to the previous question when we were looking at the 150 people who never even bothered to answer we agree that even though there might not be a lot of money involved in that there was still a matter of principle. They are the ones who are breaking all the rules. In the answer the Chief Minister has given me to Question No 547 of 2004 we are told that the Gibraltar Government have as far as the tax office is concerned collected from its employees and pensioners £18.9 million in respect of £5,700. I would have thought normally that that would be the final figure for the tax year ending in June 2002 given that we are in January 2004. I note, for example, the private sector employment when compared to the answer that I was given in March of last year in answer to the same question shows that it has gone up by £800,000 and returns have been made in respect of another 500 employees and I would say that this probably means that there is very little extra. These figures are probably very close to being final. If the figure did not look on the low side compared to other years I would have assumed that the Government was up-to-date, is the Government able to confirm whether they are up to date or not in respect of the answer to Question No 547 of 2004? It is just that the figure looked low, that is why.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I cannot tell the hon Member what the position might be in that respect.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When I was making the point last year which was in March 2003 in respect of the return that should have been made by August 2002, the Chief Minister finished up agreeing that there was no reason why the Government should not be up-to-date in their paperwork. Given that it is now 11 months later there is even less reason now as to why they should not be up-to-date with their paperwork.

ORAL

NO 549 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

How much was collected in PAYE each month since February 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No 550 of 2004.

**NO 550 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

What was the amount of Company Tax collected in each month since February 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No 549 of 2004**

The PAYE (net of refunds) collected since February 2003 is as follows:

|                | £m                |
|----------------|-------------------|
| February 2003  | 4.7               |
| March 2003     | 5.6               |
| April 2003     | 5.3               |
| May 2003       | 4.6               |
| June 2003      | 4.5               |
| July 2003      | 7.1               |
| August 2003    | 4.3               |
| September 2003 | 5.3               |
| October 2003   | 6.0               |
| November 2003  | 3.8               |
| December 2003  | Not yet available |

**Answer to Question No 550 of 2004**

The Corporation Tax collected (net of refunds) in each month since February 2003 is as follows:

|                | £m                |
|----------------|-------------------|
| February 2003  | 0.1               |
| March 2003     | 5.1               |
| April 2003     | 1.8               |
| May 2003       | 1.1               |
| June 2003      | 2.4               |
| July 2003      | 0.8               |
| August 2003    | 0.3               |
| September 2003 | 2.3               |
| October 2003   | 0.2               |
| November 2003  | 0.3               |
| December 2003  | Not yet available |



**NO 551 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX – PAYE**

What is the amount of tax collected in PAYE in the financial year 2002/2003 by area of employment as follows:-

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government owned and joint venture companies; and
- (d) Private sector employment?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The total amount of PAYE collected in the financial year 2002/2003 is £60.2 million analysed as follows:

|                                                |      |
|------------------------------------------------|------|
|                                                | £m   |
| (a) MOD                                        | 4.6  |
| (b) Government of Gibraltar                    | 21.5 |
| (c) Government owned & joint venture companies | 2.8  |
| (d) Private sector employment                  | 31.3 |
|                                                | ———  |
|                                                | 60.2 |
|                                                | ———  |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 551 OF 2004****HON J J BOSSANO:**

I remember asking at one stage I believe it was the last time or one before that about the composition of the statutory bodies and agencies and I think I was told that they were being moved in some cases from the 'C' category to the 'B' category, does the Chief Minister have any information on that because if we are looking at figures for

different years and there is movement from one to the other that we do not know about then it paints a misleading picture in terms of the breakdown?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not aware that there has been any movement but I will check that and let him know.

**NO 552 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of December 2003 how many companies had been assessed by the Commissioner of Income Tax without having made a return of taxable profit (a) below £35,000 and (b) above £35,000 for the years 1998/1999 to 2002/2003, what was the tax assessed and paid in each case and for each category and each year and what were the amounts assessed and paid by qualifying companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member the information requested.

## Answer to Question 552 of 2004

### COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES

| YEAR OF ASSESSMENT                      | 1998/1999 | 1999/2000 | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                                         | £         | £         | £         | £         | £         |
| <u>Under £35,000</u>                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| No of Companies assessed                | 829       | 688       | 471       | 531       | 609       |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 1.6m      | 1.1m      | 0.9m      | 1.1m      | 1.6m      |
| Total paid under                        | 0.4m      | 0.7m      | 0.3m      | 0.3m      | 0.3m      |

### Over £35,000

|                                         |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| No of Companies assessed                | 48   | 41   | 15   | 29   | 36   |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 2.9m | 2.8m | 0.3m | 1.6m | 1.5m |
| Total paid over                         | 2.8m | 2.6m | 0.2m | 1.3m | 0.9m |

### QUALIFYING COMPANIES

#### Under £35,000

|                                         |     |     |     |     |     |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| No of Companies assessed                | 13  | 14  | 13  | 2   | 3   |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 13k | 14k | 9k  | 2k  | 5k  |
| Total paid                              | 1k  | 12k | NIL | NIL | NIL |

#### OVER £35,000

|                                         |     |      |      |     |     |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|
| No of Companies assessed                | 1   | 4    | 5    | NIL | NIL |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 18k | 0.3m | 0.4m | NIL | NIL |
| Total paid                              | NIL | NIL  | NIL  | NIL | NIL |

ORAL

**NO 553 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of December 2003 how many companies had declared taxable profits (a) above £35,000 and (b) below £35,000 for each of the tax years 1998/1999 to 2002/2003, what was the tax assessed and paid in each category and can Government state in each category and for each year how many were qualifying companies and what were the amounts of tax assessed and paid by such companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member the information requested.

**Answer to Question 553 of 2004**

**COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

| YEAR OF ASSESSMENT | 1998/1999 | 1999/2000 | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                    | £         | £         | £         | £         | £         |

**Under £35,000**

|                                         |      |      |      |      |  |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| No of Companies assessed                | 194  | 253  | 322  | 324  |  |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 453k | 507k | 760k | 767k |  |
| Total paid under                        | 423k | 473k | 729k | 725k |  |

**Over £35,000**

|                                         |      |      |       |       |   |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|---|
| No of Companies assessed                | 60   | 72   | 91    | 94    |   |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 5.1m | 7.6m | 10.1m | 10.0m | 1 |
| Total paid over                         | 5.1m | 7.5m | 10.0m | 9.9m  |   |

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

**Under £35,000**

|                                         |    |    |    |    |  |
|-----------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|--|
| No of Companies assessed                | 5  | 7  | 6  | 4  |  |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 3k | 5k | 3k | 2k |  |
| Total paid                              | 3k | 5k | 3k | 1k |  |

**OVER £35,000**

|                                         |      |      |      |      |  |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| No of Companies assessed                | 10   | 21   | 23   | 7    |  |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 869k | 1.7m | 1.4m | 312k |  |
| Total paid                              | 869k | 1.7m | 1.3m | 312k |  |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 553 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to a previous question on qualifying companies we were told that none had stopped trading when we were asking about new ones being registered and existing ones going, I note that for some time now that we have been Tabling this question on drawing a distinction between normal companies shall we say for the sake of distinguishing them and qualifying companies, the number of qualifying companies actually paying any tax either by making a return or by being assessed without making a return is very low compared to the 140 odd that are supposed to be trading. In the light of the whole business of the qualifying companies is the Government going to do anything on the business of chasing them up?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can the Leader of the Opposition remind me of the number of the question on qualifying companies to see whether there is a note there about the definition of active qualifying companies?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Question No 454 of 2004.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Now that it has been revealed that Ministers have notes at the bottom of the answer papers I might as well refer to some of them myself. Qualifying companies remain registered as active for the purposes of the company's administrators, the Finance Centre Director, until such time as the company or its representative notifies the Finance Centre to the contrary. That means that the number that I gave the hon Member in answer to that question of 122 active companies means outstanding certificates in issue whereas if the better definition of active is whether they are declaring or being assessed then it would seem that the number of active companies by that definition is not a lot because even if they were active but not profitable they would still be obliged to submit returns or they would still be assessed and then negotiate a nil liability on the basis of demonstrating to the Commissioner that the assessment was not justified. So, by this definition either in reality there is a handful of genuinely active trading qualifying companies or it is the scenario described or insinuated by the hon Member in his last supplementary which is that there are more than this that are active, that they are not submitting returns, that they are not being assessed and that they ought to be targeted. Which of those two it is I do not know but I will certainly make it a point of interest to find out.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably the Government will agree that given that they have got a privileged tax regime which is no longer available to newcomers the very least one would expect of

them is that they keep up with the little that they are expected to pay. So, I would think that it is in everybody's interest that we should know whether we are really talking about 20 or 120.



**NO 554 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of December 2003 how many companies, in each tax year 1995/1996 to 2002/2003 had been assessed for company tax, and what were the amounts of tax payable and paid in respect of each tax year?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information he has requested.

**Answer to Question No 554 of 2004**

|                 | 1995/1996 | 1996/1997 | 1997/1998 | 1998/1999 | 1999/2000 | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                 | £m        | £m        | £m        | £m        | £m        | £m        | £m        | £m        |
| Assessed        | 15.7      | 15.5      | 18.5      | 25.0      | 88.0      | 26.3      | 22.7      | 22.0      |
| Discharged      | 5.3       | 4.8       | 7.7       | 11.9      | 73.2      | 12.6      | 8.8       | 9.4       |
| Paid            | 10.2      | 10.7      | 10.8      | 13.1      | 14.8      | 13.7      | 13.9      | 12.6      |
| Outstanding     | 9.5       | 10.3      | 10.2      | 12.5      | 13.6      | 12.5      | 12.7      | 10.5      |
|                 | 0.7       | 0.4       | 0.6       | 0.6       | 1.2       | 1.2       | 1.2       | 2.1       |
| No of Companies | 1,441     | 1,416     | 1,461     | 1,439     | 1,517     | 1,524     | 1,383     | 1,174     |

**NO 555 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government now confirm that, as a result of the issues raised in supplementary questions arising from Question No 455 of 2003, it has now obtained a different explanation from the Commissioner of Income Tax for the difference in the number of companies shown in answer to Question No 454 of 2003 as compared to the total number shown by adding the total number of taxpayers provided in answer to Question No 452 of 2003 and No 453 of 2003 and provide that explanation?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Clarification has been sought from the Commissioner of Income Tax who confirms that the information provided in answer to Question Nos 452 to 454 of 2003 are correct. He further advises that:-

Question No 452 provided information on the number of companies (933 companies) on whom estimated assessments had been raised in the absence of returns.

Question No 453 provided information on the number of companies (248 companies) on whom assessments had been raised based on accounts submitted, **BUT DID NOT INCLUDE THOSE WHOSE ACCOUNTS SHOWED A NIL LIABILITY** as the Question sought information on **declared taxable profits**. Losses are not declared taxable profits therefore companies showing losses had not been included.

Question No 454 of 2004 included all three categories of companies assessed as follows:

|                                   |                 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Based on estimated assessments    | 933 companies   |
| Based on declared taxable profits | 248 companies   |
| Based on losses (nil liability)   | 249 companies   |
|                                   | _____           |
|                                   | 1,430 companies |
|                                   | _____           |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 555 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it that in the light of that explanation that applies to the three answers that we have been provided today?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would hope so, yes.

**NO 556 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - PAYE**

Can Government state on how many occasions since 1<sup>st</sup> July 1996, the penalties provided for in the Income Tax Ordinance have been invoked in respect of any employers who have failed to return the Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The £10 per day per employee penalty that the Commissioner of Income Tax may impose on an employer for the failure to return the Annual PAYE Return has not been invoked systematically since 1990 and very rarely since. The department's main concern is to collect the tax payable once its efforts in making the employer lodge the Annual Return are successful.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO 556 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

All I can say is that when an answer not too unlike that one but on a different subject was given in an earlier part of the House, the remark of the Chief Minister was either he did not know or he does not want to say. So, is this another example of he does not know or he does not want to say?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is more likely to be the latter but not me but the Commissioner. There are reasons which ought not to be rehearsed in public why they do not use this power more often and if the Leader of the Opposition wishes we can have an aside about it which may explain why.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The last time I asked the Chief Minister could not tell me how often but he said that it had not been used systematically which is the same as he said today and we were trying to put a figure on what that meant, whether it meant that it had been used at all or not at all or there have been some cases.

**ORAL**

**NO 557 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PROPERTIES BUILT IN 1960**

Can Government list the properties built in 1960 and give the number of dwellings in such properties and how many are rented?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 558 to No. 561 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 558 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state what is the estimated number of private sector pre-war dwellings fit for human habitation and currently rented?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 557, 559 to 561 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 559 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state what is the estimated number of private sector pre-war dwellings fit for human habitation and currently vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 557 to 558 and 560 to 561 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 560 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state what is the estimated number of private sector dwellings built between 1945 and 1959 fit for human habitation and currently vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 557 to 559 and 561 of 2004.

**NO 561 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state what is the estimated number of private sector pre-war dwellings fit for human habitation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

There is no way that Government could know this information without inspecting each such property to establish its condition. Furthermore the Government cannot, without employing disproportionate administrative resources, provide the information as to what buildings were built when.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 557 TO 561 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I was under the impression that in January in answer to some of my questions precisely on housing I was told that the computers would be updated and that there would be information available in many aspects relating to housing. I think it is about time that this matter was put in practice.

**HON J J NETTO:**

No, I think the hon Member must have misunderstood whatever I said before, but the fact of the matter is that he is asking questions in relation to the private sector. No computer system in the City Hall, in the Housing Department, relates to private sector dwellings so the information cannot be provided.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not the case that when we discussed the amendments to the Landlord and Tenants Ordinance we were told that there were a number of buildings that would have been caught had the rent control not been stopped at 1959 and that those buildings were in fact identified by the Chief Minister as buildings that one would not have expected to be considered to be sort of buildings that require rent control. So

how can they be looking at the Landlord and Tenants Ordinance and taking policy decisions without knowing the effect of it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Both the premise of his question is wrong and therefore the deduction that he draws from it and recites at the end of his question is also wrong. The Government did not say that they had been looking at the clock and the properties or the date clock and properties and come to the conclusion that because certain properties were about to be caught that it was being changed because those properties were about to be caught. What the Government said was that any system based on the passage of 45 years will eventually catch every property when they become 45 years old and the Government did not consider it appropriate that there should be that system in place. There was a property which somebody has informed the Government would be caught quite soon, I cannot remember the date, and that was the property Trafalgar House which is the property I think I mentioned in the debate. I think I also mentioned a building in South Barrack Road had already been caught as well.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Because it was in 1959.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes and the Government's decision, this is what we said in the House, was not based on saving a particular building or the next three buildings in line which of course had not been identified, it was based on the principle that the 45 year rule means that every building becomes caught eventually when it becomes 45 years old and that is the principle that the Government were seeking to legislate out.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So when the Government were giving the example of the buildings that would not be caught by this, the example that he gave just now of the buildings that would not be caught by the change, because of the change, when all buildings post 1959 would no longer be caught. If the reason is the effect it is going to have on the supply of property in the market how do they arrive at their estimates of the supply of property in the market if they do not have a clue?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot make sense of the hon Member's question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I will repeat the question. If the Government have said for example, that the fact that they are going to liberalise private sector rentals to the extent that they have done already and that there is something more in the pipeline is because they know that there are properties that would be rented, which currently are not rented, how is it

that they tell us here that they are not given any type of estimate? How can the Chief Minister have said in the election that hundreds of properties that currently are not rented because the landlords do not think it is worth renting them, would become available? How does he know there are hundreds if he says it is impossible to estimate?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The reason why the word 'hundreds' is used and not 174 is precisely because one conveys a sense of the size of the problem that cannot be quantified but we are aware of the existence of the problem and of its general dimensions, and the other would have required the ability to have counted the empty flats which the Government cannot do. For example, I suppose one could spend a long time pouring over electricity consumption records and water consumption records and marry those against the rates register and say, 'now come on here is a flat in which no water or electricity is being consumed, it must therefore be empty', and I suppose one could do that sort of exercise and eventually work out, after an enormous amount given that all this is not computerised, it is not scientifically and mechanically impossible to have a stab at working out how many empty private sector flats there are, but it is not practical. The Government do not have the systems in existence to do that. Now, how do the Government know? The answer is we do not know how many but the Government gets a sense of the existence and size of the problem from representations made to them by both sides of the fence. Action for Housing, from the tenants point of view, comes and makes those allegations to the Government. The landlords in trying to persuade the Government to change things, also may say to the Government 'and look if only you would change this or change that there would be many flats which our members are presently maintaining empty'. So the problems exist because both sides of the landlord/tenant equation, lament it, complain about it and refer to it. Now does that mean that the Government can put an exact figure or even an approximate figure? I have an approximate figure in my mind but it has not been scientifically reached, it has been reached by reference to the statements made to me by any number of other people and one puts all that forensic evidence together and come to a conclusion. Yes I think that there are more than 200 empty private sector owned flats in Gibraltar. If the hon Member is saying 'can the Government be sure that it is more or less than that' I cannot. I wish we were wrong I wish there were not that many number of flats but we believe that there are. However, it is not the only reason for needing to reform the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance and of course we can debate that which is one of the reasons but one cannot hang the whole debate about whether the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance needs reforming on the outcome of that particular issue because there are other issues to do for example, with questions of whether landlords get a sufficient return on their properties, whether they get enough revenue to repair and maintain the building, that in turn has a consequence on the quality of life of tenants and indeed on the aesthetic appearance of buildings in the historic part of Gibraltar. I am not saying that the hon Member should share our view that it needs reforming or that it needs reforming in the particular way that we propose to reform it, but I think the case for reform of a piece of legislation that has not been touched despite the changing circumstances over the decades, which both sides uniquely, this is the first time I think in the history of the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance that both the landlords and the tenants are pressing the Government for similar change, not change in opposing directions as one would expect, similar change. I think the case for reform is well and truly made. Of course one can disagree about the nature of that reform.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It was an estimate that we wanted and therefore with all the caveats that have been entered we take it that we are talking about what the Government believe to be 200. Something of the order of 200 would then be the answer to Question No. 561 which is the one that says what the Government estimates could be the total number of private sector dwellings fit for human habitation which are currently empty. Question No. 561 actually asks for the total, is that something that they do not have?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I said 200 because that is the first figure that makes the use of the plural, it was not because that was my estimate of the number of flats.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In Question No. 561 which is the estimated number of private sector dwellings fit for human habitation, that is the figure that the Chief Minister believes is in excess of 100 then. Or are we talking only about the ones that are available and empty?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not been addressing the question of human habitation. There is a question on the Order Paper later about the reform of the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance. The question of human habitation requires an inspection of each and every property to see, well first of all to establish the definition of human habitation which has both a legalistic element and a judgemental element. Question No. 561 is about the number of private sector pre-war flats fit for human habitation. For the Government to know how many private sector pre-war dwellings there are fit for human habitation the Government would have to physically inspect each and every private sector flat against whatever criteria the Health Authorities use for deciding the question of fitness and evaluate each particular flat. I am sure the hon Member will quickly recognise that the Government do not have that sort of system available to do that and that the Government cannot do that in answer to a question in this House. I have been addressing not the question of fitness for habitation but the question which I think is what he was addressing in his supplementaries, the question of the number of empty private sector flats as opposed to whether they are fit or unfit for human habitation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, are Government able to establish how many private sector pre-war dwellings there are, whether they are fit or not fit, empty or full?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is the question which I answered when I addressed the Supplementary. It is theoretically possible to do it through a forensic exercise not through any records that exist. Look, a flat that does not consume electricity and does not consume water is very unlikely to be occupied.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, that was not my question. I said were they able to establish the global figure whether they are occupied or unoccupied, fit or unfit, how many pre-war private sector dwellings there are? Is that also not possible? Whether they are empty or not, simply the total figure of pre-war dwellings.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh yes, I think that information, I am not aware that a particular count of it exists, but I can imagine that the Land Property Services rates system is capable of distinguishing between a private sector dwelling that pays the rates to them and a Government dwelling where the rates are included in the rent. I imagine therefore to that process it ought to be possible to get a number of rateable private sector dwellings out of the total rateable number of dwellings in Gibraltar. I imagine that that must be possible I do not know how difficult it would be or whether it can be done easily or not easily but I would be very surprised if we could not produce a count. Ultimately, one can have a pretty good go just by looking at the electoral register. It is relatively easy to see which are the Government-owned buildings, the housing estates and things of that sort, so I am sure the system eventually will be capable of producing the answer to his last question.

**NO 562 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state how many private pre-war properties that are currently unoccupied are Government leases and is there a provision in such leases requiring the lease holders to rent the dwellings in such properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The information requested cannot be obtained without a disproportionate administrative effort. However, I doubt if any that are held under Crown leases would have a provision therein such as he describes. Most properties in Gibraltar are held under grant from the Crown.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 562 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In view of the discussion we have just had may I suggest that a procedure is set in motion whereby at least once a year somebody from Government does actually go round and inspects these properties, because I think the housing problem is such in Gibraltar that it would be well worthwhile doing that exercise.

**HON J J NETTO:**

The Government do not have at its disposal personnel in order to do that function because as far as the Housing Department is concerned, we have got some other more pressing matters internal in the public sector. We believe that this is a function that should be carried out by the private sector themselves, by the landlords or perhaps by some other private entity such as like the one the Chief Minister referred to just a minute ago which is LPS, Land Property Services, but obviously within the public sector we do not have the resources to be able to carry out that function.

**NO 563 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state what is the total number of private sector pre-war dwellings which have had their rents fixed as a result of the provisions of section 15?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Such information is not readily available however, I am informed by Land Property Services that since 1969 the following rent controlled tenancies have been created as a result of the provisions of section 15 and of its predecessor section 7(a).

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| 1969 to 1975          | 28  |
| 1976 to 1980          | 39  |
| 1981 to 1985          | 75  |
| 1986 to 1990          | 100 |
| 1991 to 1995          | 228 |
| 1996 to 2000          | 175 |
| 2001 up to March 2004 | 121 |



**NO 564 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state what is the total number of private rented pre-war dwellings which have had their rents fixed by the rent tribunal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

I can confirm that since the start of the Rent Tribunal in 1986 there have been 167 cases for determination of rents. Of these 101 have been approved and have had their rents fixed by the Rent Tribunal and 60 have been unsuccessful and have had their cases dismissed for a large variety of reasons. There are six cases which are pending hearing, these have been scheduled for the 6<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> May 2004.

ORAL

**NO 565 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT CONTROL**

Can Government state the number of properties each year that became rent controlled since 1990, as a result of having been built on or before 1<sup>st</sup> day of January, 45 years previously?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Since the introduction of section 11A of the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance, five dwellings only have been brought under control by its application.

ORAL

**NO 566 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR HOUSES**

Can Government state how many pre-war housing units have been allocated to date in each month of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 567 to 569 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 567 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR VACANT FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war flats are vacant to date, giving the address, room composition and the date they became vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 566 and 568 to 569 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 568 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – VACANT FLATS**

Can Government state how many post-war flats are vacant to date giving the address, room composition and the date they became vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 566 to 567 and 569 of 2004.

**NO 569 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – FLAT ALLOCATED ON DIY BASIS**

Can Government state how many pre and post-war housing units, which have been allocated to date for each month of 2004, have been on a do-it-yourself basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The Government do not as a matter of policy publish the addresses of Government vacant properties. The remainder of the information sought is set out in the schedule which I now hand to the hon Member.

**Schedule to Question No. 569 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 566**

A total of 14 pre-war housing units have been allocated to date broken down as follows:

|          |   |   |
|----------|---|---|
| January  | - | 1 |
| February | - | 3 |
| March    | - | 6 |
| April    | - | 4 |

**Answer to Question No. 567 of 2004**

A total of 35 pre-war flats are vacant to date as follows:

|          |          |
|----------|----------|
| 1RKB x 3 | 22.11.02 |
|          | 16.07.03 |
|          | 20.04.04 |
| 2RKB x 9 | 26.11.01 |
|          | 10.10.02 |
|          | 14.08.02 |
|          | 27.08.03 |
|          | 21.10.03 |
|          | 09.01.04 |

|           |          |
|-----------|----------|
|           | 20.01.04 |
|           | 12.02.04 |
|           | 16.02.04 |
| 3RKB x 13 | 07.03.02 |
|           | 24.02.03 |
|           | 07.04.03 |
|           | 19.07.03 |
|           | 01.08.03 |
|           | 13.08.03 |
|           | 16.09.03 |
|           | 22.10.03 |
|           | 30.01.04 |
|           | 19.02.04 |
|           | 26.02.04 |
|           | 22.03.04 |
|           | 24.03.04 |

**Schedule to Question No. 569 of 2004**

|          |          |
|----------|----------|
| 4RKB x 6 | 17.01.03 |
|          | 26.04.03 |
|          | 03.06.03 |
|          | 19.07.03 |
|          | 03.11.03 |
|          | 17.11.03 |
| 5RKB x 3 | 19.08.03 |
|          | 05.09.03 |
|          | 10.03.04 |
| 6RKB x 1 | 02.03.04 |

**Answer to Question No. 568 of 2004**

A total of 52 post-war flats are vacant to date as follows:

|           |          |
|-----------|----------|
| 1RKB x 10 | 04.09.03 |
|           | 22.09.03 |
|           | 24.09.03 |
|           | 13.02.04 |
|           | 25.02.04 |
|           | 03.03.04 |
|           | 20.01.04 |
|           | 15.04.04 |
|           | 16.04.04 |
|           | 19.04.04 |
| 2RKB x 12 | 01.08.03 |
|           | 08.10.03 |
|           | 04.12.03 |
|           | 29.12.03 |
|           | 05.01.04 |

07.01.04  
11.02.04  
23.02.04  
12.03.04  
06.04.04  
07.04.04  
08.04.04

**Schedule to Question No. 569 of 2004**

3RKB x 20    03.04.02  
                  11.06.02  
                  03.10.02  
                  03.02.03  
                  16.02.03  
                  04.07.03  
                  22.10.03  
                  10.11.03  
                  22.12.03  
                  09.01.04  
                  16.01.04  
                  27.01.04  
                  30.01.04  
                  19.02.04  
                  26.02.04  
                  09.03.04  
                  24.03.04  
                  01.04.04  
                  02.04.04  
                  20.04.04

4RKB x 9     16.02.03  
                  09.07.03  
                  11.07.03  
                  03.11.03  
                  07.11.03  
                  04.12.03  
                  11.02.04  
                  26.03.04  
                  14.04.04

5RKB x 1     03.02.04



**Answer to Question No. 569 of 2004**

A total of 12 pre-war and 21 post-war housing units have been allocated on a do-it-yourself basis broken down by month as follows:

|                 | <b>Pre-war</b> | <b>Post-war</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <b>January</b>  | 1              | 7               |
| <b>February</b> | 3              | 3               |
| <b>March</b>    | 5              | 10              |
| <b>April</b>    | 3              | 1               |

**ORAL**

**NO 570 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – VOIDS LIST**

Can Government state how many properties were on the voids list (rent roll) as at the 31 December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 571 of 2004.

**NO 571 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – VOIDS LIST**

Can Government state what percentage of the properties on the voids list were pre-war and how many were post-war?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The question in itself is confusing. If the hon Member asked what are the number of properties under the classification of voids in the rent roll, the answer is nil. If on the other hand he requires to know the number of properties which are on the void list and out of the rent roll the answer is provided in Parts B and C of Question No. 109 of 2004. At the moment it appears that all the properties classified as voids 100 per cent are pre-war subject to the completion of the asset register. Finally I wish to remind the hon Member that the figures being provided need to be substantiated though regrettably this will not be available until we have completed the asset register exercise.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 571 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister have a date by when this is likely to happen?

**HON J J NETTO:**

This is a matter that I have referred to on occasions in the past and doing an asset register, I am told by the profession, is not something that one can do in a month not even in a year, it takes a substantial amount of time. What we are trying to do here when we are talking about the asset register is not just to be able to reconcile the figures which is very much the type of question that we have in the Assembly today, but also in addition to that as part of the asset register is to do surveys of the state of the properties, both external and internal surveys. Of course that takes time bearing in mind the number of properties that the Government have so it could well take a number of years, but it is the only way forward for any landlord who needs to know what the final figures are and do proper planned maintenance as opposed to what would have been the history in the past which has been very much reactive or ad hoc maintenance programmes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has the exercise started already?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes.

**ORAL**

**NO 572 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING**

Can Government state in respect of the 166 properties identified in January 2004 as possibly requiring demolition, which was the latest date on which they collected rent for each of these properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 573 to 574 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 573 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING**

Can Government state in respect of the 80 properties identified in January 2004 as requiring major extensive refurbishment, which was the latest date on which they collected rent for each of these properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 572 and 574 of 2004.

**NO 574 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING**

Can Government state in respect of the 56 properties identified in January 2004 as awaiting refurbishment by either the Buildings and Works or the Electricity Authority, which was the latest date on which they collected rent for each of these properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question Nos. 572 to 574 of 2004**

The information requested in relation to Question Nos. 572 and 573 of 2004 pre-dates this GSD Government and in some instances the GSLP period in Government. In addition, records were not properly kept when the GSLP Government privatised the Government Housing administration function and neither was there a smooth handover of records nor information available when the said function was reintroduced into the private sector under the GSD Government. In relation to the 56 properties works were in hand and some will have been returned and already allocated to people on the waiting list. Therefore providing such information retrospectively will be more than an impossible task.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 572 TO 574 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Minister not able to say in respect of those of the 56 properties that have not now been re-rented, when they last collected rent? We are talking about looking at 50 addresses in the rent cards surely.

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes, presumably the administrative task can be done but obviously, bearing in mind that some of those properties that were said previously have now been allocated and are now paying the rent, so doing the administrative function is something that we normally can do retrospectively but it does provide an administrative task which sometimes can be disproportionate. I think in future, perhaps, the hon Member may wish to request that whenever a Government property has been vacant, when was

the last date in which rent was paid for it but asking something retrospectively does provide an element of work in the administration that sometimes can be disproportionate amongst other things.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the last time the Minister had difficulty in establishing how long they had been vacant and that is why now we are asking for how long they have not been paying rent on the basis that that might be one way of establishing how long they have been vacant.

**HON J J NETTO:**

That is all in the category of the 56 which are the category which are flats, where we call in the system basically, where recently they have been left vacant the keys are passed over to Buildings and Works for the proper refurbishment then they are taken back. This is not the other previous category which the hon Member was referring to before.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No I have not asked a Supplementary on the other ones on the basis that he is telling us that the last time some of these properties, presumably the ones that require demolition, might not have been rented for 30 or 40 years. That is the impression he gave when he answered in respect of Question No. 572. That is why I am limiting the Supplementary to the last category because it seems to be a smaller one and if some of them have already been re-rented what I am asking is the ones that are currently being maintained, which must be an even smaller number.

**HON J J NETTO:**

I will be most glad to go back to my staff and see whether they will be willing to provide the answer in relation to the 56 properties if they consider it to be a manageable task.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The information that the hon Member seeks is unusual in its detail but ought to be provided to him if he really insists on having it. The Government must have a record either of when flats were handed in by the last tenant or when rent was last collected. It is there either in the rent roll or somebody in the Housing Department must have a register of when properties are handed over. So it is 56, it requires probably several hours work by one Civil Servant. The difficulty with answering questions of this sort is that if they then ask it about things that require, I mean how many individual file searches is it reasonable to submit to in order to provide one statistical answer in this House? It is a matter of judgement. I think, I do not want to set a precedent, but I would have hoped that in respect of 56 properties it was relatively easy to produce the answer in time. I am sure this is not the reason why the hon Members insist on asking so many detailed statistical questions but at the end of the day this does take up an enormous amount of time at an administrative level in Government because



the Government's system of computerisation, although coming forward in leaps and bounds to the extent that we can make resources available to it, is still pretty unsophisticated. The Government's ability to produce statistical information in this sort of quick time, as the hon Member knows, is not great.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If it is possible at least to produce an answer to the 56 we would be grateful, or to part of the 56 that are still under refurbishment.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I suppose they want an idea of how long it is taking for these flats to be maintained. I assume that is the answer that they want.

ORAL

**NO 575 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE**

Can Government state to what extent it is responsible, as landlords, for the internal maintenance and repairs of Government housing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Government's contractual liabilities as landlord are set out in a tenancy agreement, a copy of which I now hand to the hon Member.

**THIS AGREEMENT** is made the            day of            Two Thousand and Two

**BETWEEN**

(1) **The Housing Manager of the Government of Gibraltar for and on behalf of the Governor of Gibraltar (hereinafter called ‘The Landlord’ which expression shall where the context so admits include his successors in office for the time being) of the one part**

**AND**

(2)

of

Gibraltar (hereinafter called “the Tenant” which expression shall include where the context so admits his/her heirs administrators executors and assigns where the context so admits)

**NOW IT IS HEREBY AGREED as follows:-**

**1. DEFINITIONS**

In this Agreement;

- 1.1. “the Tenancy” means the tenancy created by this Agreement
- 1.2. “the Premises” means the premises more particularly described in Schedule 1 herein.
- 1.3. “the Rent” means the rent payable in accordance with Clause 3 herein.

**2. LETTING**

The Landlord agrees to let and the tenant agrees to take the Premises described in Schedule 1 herein **TOGETHER** with the use of the fixtures and fittings situate in or upon the Premises **SUBJECT TO** the covenants on the part of the Tenant contained in Clause 4 herein with effect from the Two Thousand and Two for the term of 50 weeks and thereafter unless otherwise determined from week to week.

**3. CONSIDERATION**

- 3.1. The Tenant agrees to pay to the Landlord Rent in the sum of £ per week inclusive of rates which rent the Tenant agrees to pay in advance to a Rent Collection Office specified by the Landlord for the purpose from time to time.
- 3.2. Where the rates payable in respect of the Premises are increased or decreased at any time hereafter the rates payable under this Agreement and included in the

Rent shall be increased or decreased accordingly with effect from the date of such change.

- 3.3. For the purpose of this Agreement "Rates" means any general rate and any brackish water rate levied by the Government of Gibraltar pursuant to the Public Health Ordinance.
- 3.4. Where the Landlord provides services in respect of the cleaning and keeping of refuse bins refuse chutes passages staircase yards patios or other common parts swept and clean and where the Landlord also provides services in respect of the electrical lighting of common parts the Tenant will pay to the Landlord a weekly contribution the amount of which shall be determined by the Landlord towards the cost of such services which amounts shall be payable together with the Rent herein reserved in the manner aforesaid.

#### 4 TENANT'S AGREEMENTS

The Tenant agrees with the Landlord;

- 4.1. to pay the Rent as well as any changes the landlord may make pursuant to Clause 3.4. hereof at the times and in the manner specified in this Agreement;
- 4.2. to pay all outgoings including all water and electricity consumption and all outgoings of a generally recurring nature;
- 4.3. to use the Premises in a tenant-like manner and in particular;
  - (1) To pay the rent rates and charges herein reserved on the days and in the manner aforesaid;
  - (2) To use and occupy the premises as a private dwelling house and for no other purposed;
  - (3) Not to use the premises or any part thereof for any business trade or profession or as lodgings;
  - (4) Not to share assign underlet or part with the possession of the said premises or any part thereof without previously obtaining the consent of the Landlord in writing;
  - (5) Not to permit or allow or leave caretakers in the premises without the previous consent in writing of the Landlord such permission in no circumstances to extend for a period of over three months;

- (6) Not to allow persons other than those specifically mentioned in Schedule 3 herein to sleep on the premises without the previous consent in writing of the Landlord;
- (7) To keep the interior of the premises and all fittings and fixtures therein in tenable repair and to carry out all internal decorations and repairs as stipulated in Schedule 2 herein and upon determination of this tenancy to deliver the premises to the Landlord in tenable repair in accordance with the provisions of this clause. In the event that the Tenant fails or neglects to leave the Premises in such tenable repair the Landlord may carry out the said repairs or any of them and the Tenant shall pay to the Landlord the cost of repairs so carried out;
- (8) To permit the Landlord or his agents with or without workmen or other persons to enter upon and view the state of repair of the said premises at any reasonable hours in the daytime and if in respect of any of the matters specified in Clause 4.3(7) of this Agreement the Landlord shall give notice in writing to the Tenant of any repairs decorating or cleaning required to be done to carry out same at his own expense with all reasonable dispatch to the satisfaction of the Landlord. In the event that the Tenant fails neglects or refuses to carry out to the satisfaction of the Landlord within a reasonable period which period shall be decided by the Landlord in his absolute discretion any or all of the matters specified in the said notice the Landlord shall elect to carry out the said repairs or any of them and in such case the Tenant shall pay to the Landlord the cost of repairs as carried out;
- (9) To permit the Landlord or his Agent with or without workmen at all reasonable times to enter premises to repair the inside or outside of the building;
- (10) Not to make or permit to be made any structural alterations in or additions to the premises without the previous consent in writing of the Landlord and of the Development and Planning Commission and without previously submitting to the Landlord all necessary plans and specifications for the said additions and or alterations;
- (11) Not to cover up or obstruct in any way access to the service duct panels in the premises;
- (12) To pay promptly all charges incurred for electricity telephone and fresh water;

- (13) Not to store deposit or use on the premises any liquid or solid inflammatory or explosive substances save paraffin in small quantities not exceeding one pint provided that such paraffin is brought or kept in a properly stopped bottle or suitable container (not being plastic) and not to do or suffer or permit to be done on the premise anything which may constitute a fire hazard;
  - (14) (a) Not to do or permit to be done any act or thing which may be or grow to be an annoyance damage or disturbance to the occupiers of the adjoining or neighbouring premises;
  - (b) Not to play or allow to be played any musical instrument or any radio television set gramophone or other sound reproducing equipment to the annoyance or disturbance of the occupiers of adjoining premises;
  - (15) To be responsible for the orderly conduct on any part of the premises of children living in the Premises and for any nuisance or annoyance that may cause to other tenants or to members of the public or any damage to or defacement of any building wall door or window or other property of the Landlord and to repay to the Landlord the cost of making good any such damage or defacement;
  - (16) To observe and perform the Covenants and conditions in Clauses 4.4. and 4.5. herein for the time being in force to be observed by the Tenant;
  - (17) Not to erect or affix any aerial inside or outside the premises of the Property but to use the communal aerial installed by the Landlord and no other or such other aerial or satellite system previously approved by the Landlord and the Development and Planning Commission;
- 4.4. (1) not to paint colourwash or otherwise vary the external decorative scheme of the premises;
- (2) not to allow for any cause any box parcel flowerpot refuse rubbish or any obstacle whatever to be left in the passage or on any landing outside the premises;
  - (3) not to throw or allow dirt rubbish rags or other refuses to be thrown down any water closet or use spirits of salt (hydrochloric acid) for the cleaning of sinks lavatory pans baths metal fittings or fixtures to any external part of the premises;
  - (4) not to permit nor hang out from any window or out of any balcony any washing or unsightly object nor allow any board placard sign or notice to be affixed to any external part of the premises;

- (5) not to keep or permit to be kept on the premises or any part thereof without the previous consent in writing of the Landlord any animal or bird;
  - (6) not to enclose or have any form of enclosure whatsoever on any balcony or verandah without the previous consent of the Landlord;
  - (7) if provided not to substitute or alter in any way the lock to the main entrance door of the premises;
  - (8) not to alter vary or adjust any of the services in the premises without the consent of the Landlord having been previously given;
  - (9) not to nail or fix anything to the plasterboard partition but shall only use special toggles or other system previously approved by the Landlord;
- 4.5. (1) to keep the premises fit for accommodation and safe from fire hazards.
- (2) to keep in accordance with the instructions of the Landlord any passage and staircase used in common with other Tenants swept and clean and free from obstruction or contribute an amount that may be determined by the Landlord toward the cost of any service for such purpose which the Landlord may introduce;
  - (3) to carry out any instruction of the Senior Warden or his representative in the same exercise of his duties which instructions shall be given in writing at the Premises and which shall related to the proper maintenance of the Premises and matters ancillary thereto as for example the depositing of refuse.

## 5. LANDLORD'S AGREEMENT

The Landlord agrees with the Tenant that the Tenant paying the Rent and performing and observing the covenants on his part contained in this Agreement shall peaceably hold and enjoy the Premises for the duration of this Agreement without any interruption by the Landlord or any person rightfully claiming under or in trust for him.

## 6. PROVISOS AND DECLARATIONS

- 6.1. This tenancy may subject to the provisions of the Housing (Special Powers) Ordinance be determined at any time by either party giving to the other not less than one week's notice in writing. **PROVIDED ALWAYS THAT** if any part of the Rent is in arrears for 14 days after becoming due whether formally demanded or not or if any of the covenants on the Tenant's part are not performed the landlord may at any time thereafter re-enter the Premises or any part thereof in the name of the whole and thereupon this tenancy shall absolutely determine but without prejudice to the right of action of the Landlord in respect of the Rent or any antecedent breach of the Tenant's covenants contained herein.

- 6.2. Any notice to the Tenant under this tenancy shall be deemed to be sufficiently served if it is left at the last known place of abode or business in Gibraltar of the Tenant or affixed on the front door of the Premises or sent by post in a registered letter addressed to the Tenant by name at the aforesaid place of abode or business.
- 6.3. The terms and conditions of this Agreement may be altered or modified by the Landlord from time to time as circumstances may require but no such alteration or modification shall bind the Tenant till made known to him in writing by the Landlord.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF** the parties have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year before written.

**SCHEDULE 1**

**The Premises**

ALL THAT flat consisting RKB and being Flat No situate

at

**SCHEDULE 2**

Repairs to be carried out by the Tenant

**Flushing cisterns WC Fittings**

Renewal or repairs to WC Cistern seat chain. Renewal of Broken WC pan.

**Wash hand basin and kitchen sink and bath**

Renewal of cracked or chipped basin or sink. Renewal of washers. Renewal or fixing chain and plug. Repairs to draining board. Unblocking and renewal of taps.

**Taps generally other than stop cock**

Renewal of washers.

**Drain**



Unblocking blocked traps and pipes from connecting to fittings to underground connection or stack pipes if under the control of the Tenant.

**Meters**

Repairs to damaged meters if under the control of the Tenant.

**Electrical Fittings**

Renewal of or repairs to broken or defective sockets switches plugs pendants lamp-holders fuses cooker control unit and consumer unit.

**Door window and cupboard fittings**

Repairs to doors locks hinges bolts buttons door frames etc.

**Glass**

Replacement of broken glass to doors and windows including louvres to windows.

**Plaster and Plasterboards**

Repairs to damaged internal plaster.

**Tiling**

Renewal of broken tiles

**Decorating**

Interior decoration.

**Generally**

In addition the Tenant is also responsible for any damage to the premises including fixtures and fittings caused by neglect carelessness or wilfulness.

**NOTE:**

1. The Tenant will not be responsible for any damage or defects which in the opinion of the Landlord are due to the reasonable wear and tear or to defective workmanship or materials. The decision of the Landlord in these aspects will be final. The Landlord shall not be responsible for the replacement of deteriorated or broken canvas to awnings.
2. Access must be available at all times to the service ducts in the kitchen bathroom entrance passage or cupboards for inspection of and repairs to the electric and other services therein. (See Clause 4.3. (11) contained herein.
3. The Tenant must consult the Landlord in writing in relation to any items areas or issues not covered herein. The Landlord shall reply to the Tenant's queries in writing.

**SCHEDULE 3**  
**Persons permitted to reside on the Premises**

**SIGNED** by the within-named Landlord  
in the presence of:-

**SIGNED** by the within-named Tenant  
in the presence of:-

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 575 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I have not had a copy but I still thank the Minister for the new copy. One point that is stressed here is that the tenant will not be responsible for any damage or defects which in the opinion of the landlord are due to the reasonable wear and tear or to defective workmanship or materials. Now the hon Member knows that I have written to him on various occasions about specific cases, I do not know if parliamentary procedure allows for specific cases to be mentioned here, but I assume that the Minister knows that there are certain people, some of them are pensioners, who are extremely distressed and they would like the agency responsible for internal maintenance, for maintenance in general, please to do something about 41 Valiant House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is wholly unacceptable.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I am asking if it is parliamentary acceptable.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not parliamentary acceptable. The Government are not going to debate individual cases regardless of whether it is parliamentary acceptable.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

May I please urge the Minister to do his best to look at the letters that I have written and tackle these problems because they really are serious human problems.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Fair enough.

**ORAL**

**NO 576 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – EXCHANGE OF GOVERNMENT FLATS**

Can Government say what is the policy as regard tenants seeking to exchange accommodation, in cases where the number of rooms currently occupied are in excess of the requirement for the family composition of the tenants, and the exchange required is for the same size of accommodation in a different location, and do different rules apply to either pensioner exchanges or requests on medical grounds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 577 to 578 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 577 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – EXCHANGE OF GOVERNMENT FLATS**

Can Government confirm whether an exchange of accommodation granted by the Housing Agency requires the prior approval of the Housing Allocation Committee and if so, can it state how many such exchanges have taken place each month since 1 January 2003 and confirm that in all such cases the Housing Allocation Committee's approval has been obtained?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 576 and 578 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 578 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PENSIONERS EXCHANGE LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the pensioner exchange list as at the 31 March 2004, giving a breakdown of those who are Government tenants and private sector tenants, their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 576 of 2004**

The policy is that when a change is of either a like for like in room composition or of a slightly larger variant the Housing Allocation Committee has allowed the Housing Allocation Unit the flexibility to approve the exchange. However, when the exchange solicited involves greater variants or emanates from complex backgrounds and circumstances then these are referred to the Housing Allocation Committee for either approval or rejection. These rules also apply to pensioners and medical cases. In addition to the above the Government have relaxed the policy with regard to pensioners currently occupying a 5RKB to be allowed to move into an empty 3RKB instead of a 2RKB. The reason for this is that unfortunately the stock for 5RKBs are few and the Government wish to encourage pensioners to release their current flat for the benefit of larger families in the waiting list with the opportunity to acquire suitable accommodation based on their needs.

**Answer to Question No. 577 of 2004**

Approval for the exchange of accommodation is as stated in my previous answer. The breakdown of exchanges granted each month is as follows:-

|                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| January 2003   | 3   |
| January 2004   | 2   |
| February 2003  | 2   |
| February 2004  | Nil |
| March 2003     | 1   |
| March 2004     | 2   |
| April 2003     | 3   |
| April 2004     | 5   |
| May 2003       | 1   |
| June 2003      | 1   |
| July 2003      | 1   |
| August 2003    | 1   |
| September 2003 | Nil |
| October 2003   | 2   |
| November 2003  | Nil |
| December 2003  | Nil |

Only one of these cases was deemed necessary for the Committee's decision.

**Answer to Question No. 578 of 2004**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 a total of 275 applicants were on the pensioners exchange list. Of these 221 were Government tenants and 54 were private tenants.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 576 TO 578 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The policy that exchanges are allowed between flats of the same size or slightly larger seems to be in conflict with the argument that they have relaxed the rule so that people do not have to move to two but have to move to three. Is the Minister saying then that people are not permitted to go from five rooms to five?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No, I think the hon Member has confused two separate groups of people. When we are talking about exchanges if we are talking about a like for like in terms of room composition or whether the two of us are two sitting tenants and one wants to move into my particular flat but my flat happens to be one room more than what they are strictly or technically entitled to, that small variant is typical of an example whereby the Housing Allocation Committee has relaxed the duty to the Allocation Unit not to get on and facilitate the admitted purpose. That is one issue. Of course if it is something which is far more complicated because it is not just a two way exchange

but a three way exchange, different family circumstances, that would have to be referred to, but where the hon Member is obviously getting confused is in relation to the 5RKB. The issue of the 5RKB where the relaxation has come into being is only and exclusively in relation to pensioners which are currently having a 5RKB, whereby they do not need the 5RKB any more because their sons, their children have grown and left. What the Government are saying although a pensioner may request to move to what he is properly entitled, which is a 2RKB, some pensioners will not take the decision of the option to move from a 5RKB to a 2RKB, so we have relaxed it to move to a 3RKB because the Government needs a number of 5RKB which are few to get by, in order to allow large families which are not many in the housing waiting list but because there are very few of those types of accommodation we need to get a number of them to be able to provide those families with such properties. Or else what happens is, through lack of stock, is that they remain for a large number of periods of time in the waiting list.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So if a person has a 4RKB what is the situation then? Is that the same?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Only for 5RKB.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would say if the hon Member would allow me to intervene, that it is an area of policy that we have under consideration. There was the initial relaxation that the Minister has described and my personal view, which is not yet reflected in Government policy, and indeed may not be, is to be able to always trade down regardless of the amount of the extent to which the resulting flat is larger than would be their entitlement as applicants on the waiting list. That is really what I would like to see reflected in policy, there are housing management considerations about the fact that there is demand for more flats of a certain size than of others and of course the policy has to be sensitive to that. Frankly subject to that I personally do not see the logic of imposing any restriction. If somebody is in a 4 bedroom flat and is happy to move into a 1, 2 or 3 bedroom flat, why say no? A five bedroom flat is always more valuable to the Government subject to the management of the different levels of demand that the hon Member is saying. We are trying to look and see, the Housing is trying to look and see the extent to which this area of policy can be relaxed even more than the Minister has done over the last couple of years.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So if I have understood correctly then at the moment if the person that wants to move into another flat gives out a 5 room he will be permitted to go into a 3 room, but if the one that is giving up is 4 he has to go to 2.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He has to go to his entitlement.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Therefore nobody is permitted to go from an existing flat where the size is more than their entitlement to another one which is still more, of the same size which is more.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Smaller but still more than their entitlement.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Smaller but still more, and obviously even the same but still more than their entitlement. Is that the case?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I detect some confusion by the hon Member. One has got to differentiate between exchanges, which is the question I have been asked, to what is an allocation. Exchanges is in relation that we want to exchange two sitting tenants but the variant is slightly bigger or smaller, that would be allowed between two persons, whether they are entitled to that or not because it is two sitting tenants. I notice a confusion with the hon Member, perhaps I have not made it clear myself either, is that in relation to a pensioner occupying a 5RKB, we are not exchanging we are actually allocating because we are allocating to an empty flat, not between two sitting tenants.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Then what does the pensioner exchange list mean? Allocating or exchanging?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Exchanging between themselves which has always been the case.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, so the people on the pensioner exchange list are not people who want to be put in another place.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They might also want to be put in another place.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Opposition know of people who say that they have asked to be moved say from Moorish Castle to Laguna, or from the top floor of the Tower Block or whatever

because they have got problems in going upstairs and that kind of thing, and we are told that the reason why they do not move is because the Department says there is an empty flat, the flat may be the same as the one they have got but they are not permitted to go into it. They have to go into something smaller. Now, I am not talking about two people exchanging with each other I am talking about the people who say 'we want to move because of our age or heart problems and that kind of thing' and we are told these flats are empty but they will not give it to them because they have to move into smaller accommodation, they have got a problem with furniture and that kind of thing. Now, that seems to be addressed in the 5RKB to 3RKB, what I need to find out is what happens in cases where what they are leaving is less than 5RKB?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is the point that I tried to communicate to the hon Member. I want to make the caveat subject to the management of stock and the different demands that there is for different sizes of housing, I would like to see that policy extended if viable in terms of housing management, the nitty gritty of which I do not understand, I would like to see the logic that has been applied to occupants of the largest flats extended downwards to the 4RKB flats as the hon Member has said. There is one factor that needs to be taken into account whenever the Government has empty flats and they may be what may be regarded by some as more desirable locations than others. If every time flats become vacant, existing tenants in other estates ask to swap their flats in allegedly less desirable estates for those empty flats, eventually for people on the housing waiting list they only get the other ones. They only get the flats that the people have sought to move out of, that has also got to be factored in when we are considering transfers. So we let a few transfers, but not so many, such that in effect makes all the available stock coming onto the books so to speak, channelled to transferees or to desiring transferees, as opposed to people who have no house at all and who are waiting for a Government house. It is not quite so simple but I do agree with the underlying spirit of the hon Member's latter supplementaries, and that is that to the greatest possible extent there should be flexibility as to numbers, and this should not be a numbers game. If one gives up a 5RKB one can go into a flat which is bigger than what would have been ones entitlement as an originating tenant, but one has a 4RKB then one does not have those rights. People should, within reason and subject to stock management issues, always be allowed to trade down. I just look at it as flat construction costs. A 5RKB flat is more expensive for the Government to build and therefore theoretically more valuable to the Government, and therefore the Government always ought to be able to be willing to exchange something less valuable for something that is more valuable, but I accept and this is why the matter is being looked at internally in the Department. I accept that the view which we appear to share about the desirability of that is impacted by other factors that the Housing Department also has to take into consideration.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How long has the relaxation on the 5RKB been in place?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Several years.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of this exchange in the figures that the Minister gave us about the numbers that had been approved by the Housing Unit and only one had been approved by the Housing Allocation Committee. Are these exchanges between two tenants? So the exchange into the empty one is not included in those figures, is that correct?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes, I think it is included but I will have to check it out.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I hope the Minister understands it is not possible to make sense of the figures unless we know whether these figures are, given the distinction that he has emphasised a number of times, that an exchange is something that happens between two people that are already tenants and that the other is not an exchange is an allocation, so we need to know whether these are exchanges inclusive of allocations or not.

**HON J J NETTO:**

The answer is that it is not included.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. So it means then that the relaxation only applies to this, in the cases where it is the other it has always been by the Housing Allocation Committee. Is that the answer?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO 579 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – VALUATION LIST**

Can Government confirm that the valuation list shows residential property that is unoccupied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

No, the valuation list can only be used to arrive at the net annual value of hereditaments. Although it contains all residential properties with their net annual values, except in the case of new developments with development aid, it does not differentiate whether properties are occupied or not.

**ORAL**

**NO 580 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – SQUATTERS**

Can Government state what is the position as regards entitlement to apply for Government housing of persons who have previously been squatters in Government properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 581 of 2004.

**NO 581 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – HOMELESS PERSONS**

Can Government state what new procedures have been put in place concerning applications for Government Housing by homeless persons?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 580 of 2004**

The position as regards the entitlement to apply for Government housing of persons who have previously been squatters in Government properties is the same as any other entitled person.

**Answer to Question No. 581 of 2004**

The new procedure put in place concerning application for Government housing by homeless persons is, once it is established that the homelessness has not been self inflicted, a homeless report for a period of one month must be provided. After the first two weeks the Housing Inspector will monitor the situation at random and report on the matter for the consideration of the Housing Advisory Committee.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 580 TO 581 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I think it is important in view of the reply that the Housing Advisory Committee meets as often as is humanly possible because there are needs in this area and I would suggest that instead of meeting maybe three or four times a year, they meet more often.

**HON J J NETTO:**

That is not the case. Normally they tend to meet about once a month. Even if there were to be an extraordinary event within the four week cycle of the month, I am sure they will get together or do a round robin.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

So if there are urgent cases they would meet, because in answer to a question that I asked in January I think the answer was that these meetings take place three or four times a year. I am glad to hear that it is not the case and that it is more like once a month.

**HON S E LINARES:**

As a matter of clarification, are we talking about the Housing Allocation Committee or the Housing Advisory Committee? There are two, are there not?

**HON J J NETTO:**

The role of the Housing Advisory Committee along with the Medical Advisory Board are two subsidiary sub-committees of the Housing Allocation Committee, advising the Housing Allocation Committee whether on medical matters or on social matters.

**ORAL**

**NO 582 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – OPTION ‘C’**

Can Government state what is the number of option 'C' tenants in the Gib V housing estate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 583 of 2004.



**NO 583 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – GIB V**

Can Government state if it has been contacted by any of the Gib V tenants as a result of experiencing difficulties with their payments?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 582 of 2004**

There are presently 217 Option C tenants in Gib V.

**Answer to Question No. 583 of 2004**

Gib V tenants who experience difficulties with their payments approach the Ministry for Housing. These tenants were required to complete a financial assessment form which was later assessed. Those who met the required criteria were allocated Government housing by the Housing Allocation Committee.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 582 TO 583 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can the Minister give me an idea as to how many were successful in getting Government housing?

**HON J J NETTO:**

The information I have is that we have had eight requests, one has been allocated/transferred, two are pending further information and five have been rejected.

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to Gib V tenants in the C Option who do not pay their service charges, are Government liable for those service charges? If not, who is liable for those service charges?

**HON J J NETTO:**

My understanding is the management company of Gib V not the Government.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Surely as they are tenants of Government, they are Government tenants because the property belongs to the Government, if they are Government tenants and they fail to pay the service charges, is the landlord not supposed to be responsible for the service charges, Government in this case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is an issue of contention between the Government and the management company of Gib V which they raise with me at meetings and which we are working towards a solution to. Of course the difficulty is that if I were to say or accept, or if the Government were to say or accept 'yes if you do not pay the Government will' it is not rocket science for the hon Member to work out what the consequences of that would be. People would just stop paying their service charges. So the solution that I am trying to engineer with the management committee, indeed I think they have got a meeting scheduled in my diary within the next few days, and I am sure this item will be on the agenda for further development, is an alternative way in which the Government can address the matter financially without having those, I am sure the hon Member would regard as well also, undesired consequences of thinking people saying 'well if the Government pays it if I do not, then I will not pay so that the Government pays it'. That is the approach. There was an issue about affordability by some tenants and my hon Colleague the Minister for Housing, I think there may be a question on the Order Paper about this so I will not say too much, we did have a scheme last year whereby Option C tenants who could genuinely could not afford it were given an exit strategy. Therefore anyone who did not avail themselves of that one should presuppose is able to afford to pay the service charges. Yes, the hon Member has obviously been well informed by somebody, but there is an issue, a contention about what the legal merits of the position is. I mean, whose the liability is but the solution is trying to go down another route rather than the legalistic.

ORAL

NO 584 OF 2004

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the pre-list for Housing to date, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Answered together with Question Nos. 585 to 587 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 585 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the housing waiting list to date, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements and the date they became eligible for housing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 584, 586 to 587 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 586 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS SOCIALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state what is the number of housing applicants to date who are socially recommended and how many are classified as homeless, giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 584 to 585 and 587 of 2004.

**NO 587 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many housing applicants to date are medically recommended providing a breakdown of the category of their medical recommendation, age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 584 of 2004**

A total of 548 applicants are on the pre list. The flat requirement is as follows:-

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| 1 RKB | 362 |
| 2 RKB | 33  |
| 3 RKB | 105 |
| 4 RKB | 41  |
| 5 RKB | 5   |
| 6 RKB | 2   |

**Answer to Question No. 585 of 2004**

A total of 463 applicants are on the housing waiting list. The flat requirement is as follows:-

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| 1 RKB | 240 |
| 2 RKB | 53  |
| 3 RKB | 102 |
| 4 RKB | 62  |
| 5 RKB | 6   |

**Answer to Question No. 586 of 2004**

There are 25 housing applicants who are socially recommended of which 16 are males and 9 are females. Three are classified as homeless.

**Answer to Question No. 587 of 2004**

Twenty-four applicants are medically categorised as follows:-

|           |               |         |           |
|-----------|---------------|---------|-----------|
| Medical A | 6 applicants  | 2 males | 4 females |
| Medical B | 7 applicants  | 2 males | 5 females |
| Medical C | 11 applicants | 9 males | 2 females |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 584 TO 587 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In the case of the medically categorised A, is there any procedure where Government can in fact not use preferential treatment of course, but ensure that advice is given when needed. There are a number of people who contact me, I have written to the Minister in connection with some of them, they have been medically categorised A for over a year and they still have not had a flat allocated.

**HON J J NETTO:**

The fact that some people who are medically categorised contact the hon Member does not mean that nothing is being done on medical cases. The Government can practically say that it has given a lot of consideration over the last eight years to maximise the number of medical cases into Government housing, and we have done hundreds of them. The fact of the matter is that there is all sorts of demand. There are demands from medical cases, which is continuing all the time, there are demands on social cases and there are demands of people on the waiting list against the stock and the supply that we have. That is the management that we have but every single consideration has been given, will continue to be given to medical cases, social cases and people on the waiting list.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

What needs to happen is that more houses at affordable prices have to be built, basically.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That has got absolutely nothing to do with it. The hon Member has to understand that the medical A list, I mean I have much more sympathy actually for the people on the medical B and the medical C list, I am not quite sure why those lists exist frankly, but as far as the medical A list is concerned the hon Member has got to understand that it is a waiting list, and getting on the list does not mean that one can have a house it means that one is given priority access to a house. Otherwise, if just being on the medical A list were an entitlement to an immediate house, then the housing allocation decision would not be made by Government or by the Housing Allocation Committee, they would in effect eventually end up all being made by the doctors in the Health Centre or by the Consultants. It just does not work like that. The hon Member was not around in the House at the time but may recall reading in the

newspapers at the time, that as a result of building Bishop Canilla House the medical A list was removed in totality because it happens that most people on the medical A list are elderly people. One could have the exception to that rule but on the whole most are elderly people, and when Bishop Canilla House was built the medical A list for the first time ever was accommodated lock stock and barrel in one go, and when we build the new enlarged version of Bishop Canilla in the new housing schemes in Waterport Road the medical A list and possibly the B list will be removed again, but it has got nothing to do with affordability of housing or building affordable housing because these are not houses for sale. These are houses for rental to people on the housing waiting list so the question of building more affordable housing is completely non germane to the question of accommodating elderly people on the housing A waiting list.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Of course it is connected. When affordable houses are built Government housing stock will be vacated by people who buy these affordable houses and then others could be moved into those empty flats. When Bishop Canilla was built promises were made that more homes for the elderly were going to be built. It was made by made by the Chief Minister in his New Year message in 2001. That is why I mentioned the fact that more buildings need to be made and constructed to solve these problems.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

For a start I just told the hon Member that the new Government housing scheme includes 250. Secondly, the hon Member's remark which caused me to rise to my feet was 'I suppose this proves the need for more affordable housing to be built'. The explanation that I have tried to give him, which he obviously does not appreciate, is that addressing the demand for housing from people on the category A waiting list actually has nothing to do with the shortage, availability, surplus or anything else to do with affordable housing, because this affordable housing is the language of housing for sale and we are talking about housing for rental. He is wrong as well on his suggestion that if building of affordable houses vacates Government housing for people on the medical A list. Again not correct. Most people on the medical A list are already in Government housing, it is not that they do not have housing, it is that the location of the housing is not suitable. For example, they might live up in Moorish Castle or up in Calpe and they have got to climb hills to get there, or it might be on the fifth floor of a block without a lift and they cannot come up and down the stairs. The vast majority of people on the Government's medical A list already have a Government house and therefore it is not a question of just flats becoming empty, flats have to become empty which happen to be on the ground floor in an estate in the lower part of town, and that is not addressed or resolved by the flats that become vacant because Government build affordable housing and people move from Council flats to home ownership flats. That would not address the demand for housing for people on the medical A list. It is not about number of houses it is about location of houses. It is not about them not presently having a house, it is about their present house not being in a suitable location and that is not addressed because as the hon Member can well imagine, that even if there are 200 Government flats becoming vacant as a result of Council tenants becoming home purchasers, the chances of enough of those flats being on the ground floor are very much reduced. That is why, and I am glad to see that the hon Member thinks that Bishop Canilla was a solution to that, that is why we came to the conclusion that the only way to address this



problem in a structured way which was not a sort of hit and miss lottery, was (1) build housing suitable and specifically designed for the elderly, given that most of the elderly were also the medical A list, and (2) install lifts in Government flats, so that anybody that had to move for medical reasons because they could not walk up and down stairs, would no longer need to move house. Most of these elderly people actually do not want to move house, they have lived there all their lives, they have spent a lot of their own money doing it up, they have got all their furniture, they have raised their children in that house, it is regarded as the family home and most of them do not want to move and are much happier to have a lift installed so that they can retain the investment, both financial and emotional that they have made in their house over many decades. This is not a question just of housing list management it is about structured approach, it is about building specifically designed houses for the elderly, for those that need to move, and building lifts in the remaining Government blocks. I am glad to say that since 1996 both of those policies have been deployed and are continuing and will go further and we believe that that is a sensible, effective approach, much more so than micro managing the waiting lists.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I am glad the Chief Minister has mentioned the building of lifts, because I have one specific case, there are many I am sure, somebody came to me and explained that they had a letter dated January 2003 and the answer to this gentleman who desperately needs lifts in Knight's Court said that the construction of lifts in Knight's Court was imminent and therefore he would not be considered for application to another flat. That is something that was an answer given from the Housing Department to this family. Obviously my question is, what is the meaning of imminent? Is it in a few weeks time or is it in three years time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Tenants of Government housing estates in Gibraltar benefited hugely from the arriving into office of the GSD Government. In many ways, not just general repair and maintenance, but also and particularly because it was not until we arrived in office that the question of investing public funds in installing lifts became a reality or even came up for consideration. Now of course it is all very well for the Government to have an innovative policy of that sort that the hon Members did not even think of when they were in office, and then ask questions about the ones that have not been built rather than about the ones that have been built as if the Government could build lifts in every block simultaneously all in the same year, as if there were enough building resources and enough financial resources to do it. Therefore when the Government sets about a programme of building lifts in as many Council blocks of flats as can structurally take a lift, we are not going to be subjected to pressure about when is this particular block or that particular block going to be done. There has got to be a programme and that means that some come first, some come second, some come third and some come twenty-third. Frankly, to be spending the sort of money that we are spending on the installation of lifts, in Varyl Begg, in Alameda Estate and in many others, so that the hon Member comes here to ask 'well when are you going to do it in Knight's Court?', and I suppose when we have done it in Knight's Court he will come here and say 'and when are you going to do it in Rosia House?'. I am sorry that is just not realistic. There is a programme, the programme is being gone through and people have to be patient, but patience at least gives light at the end of the tunnel. When there was a Government that had no policy of installing lifts, there was no hope whatsoever. So people are still much better off now than they used to be.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I think the Chief Minister has missed the point. All I am trying to say is that I know one cannot build lifts in two days, that is pretty obvious but to write a letter to a couple, to pensioners, saying to them that the construction of lifts in such and such a building is imminent I think is unfair. What they should have said, in my view, is suggested that it could take 18 months or it could take two years and then that elderly couple would know that they would have to wait. It is in the response, the replies that some people get.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the six people on the A medical list, which is where we were some time ago, is it the case that this is purely chronological? That is to say that one goes down the list depending on the date that they join it?

**HON J J NETTO:**

That is correct.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is why there is an A, B and C list. The medical prioritisation is the distinction between medical A, medical B and medical C, which is why I started with the quip it is not clear what value it is to be on medical B and C, I do not think anybody gets a house for being on medical B and C. One alternative might be to prioritise the people within a single medical list but there is no prioritisation within each of A, B and C. A, B and C is itself the prioritisation system.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Chief Minister say what is the date of the first of the six?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. I do not think it would be appropriate. Housing lists normally are published but this is a medical list, we would be putting into the public domain that somebody has a medical problem.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not asking who it is, I am asking how long he has been on it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The way the Leader of the Opposition formulated the question, it came across as if he wanted the name.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, the first person on the list, how long has that person been there, the first one?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Provided I get notice, yes, I would provide the information.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

For arguments sake, when was the last time somebody on the list was given a house.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Basically, yes.

**HON J J NETTO:**

So long as I am given notice.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a percentage of the allocations that are put on one side for medical cases or not?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Normally that is the case. There is not a strict percentage in the sense that if in a given month so many houses have come back from refurbishment, whatever the number happens to be, obviously they will try to fit in within that number so many people of the waiting list, so many people from the medical list and so many people from the social list. So they are trying to manage that against the number of flats that come in, in a given month, which will oscillate up and down in every month.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So there is no a policy that says ten per cent of the allocations within a month or a year or whatever should be for medical cases?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No, there is not a certain percentage for the month or the year.

**NO 588 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING**

Can Government provide the answers given in writing to Question Nos. 123 to 131 of 2004 by the Minister for Housing, for the purpose of the record in Hansard?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

No, the purpose of questions in this House is to provide the hon Member with the information which I have done in writing. If the hon Member wants an oral answer for Hansard, then he must put an oral question. However, I am happy to confirm that I confirm the answers that I gave him in writing. If that is not sufficient for his purposes then he should ask oral questions based on the information that I have provided him, or design to elicit the same answer.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 588 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In just the same way as answers are given to the Opposition in writing in a matter of minutes and they appear in Hansard, is it not reasonable to request that answers to questions asked in the House but which arrive ten days later also appear in Hansard?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government do not agree that that is logical at all. There is a procedure for written questions, or questions for written answer, there is a procedure for answers to oral questions, and both of those are parliamentary in nature. There is a system whereby the hon Member is free to write a letter to the Minister outside the parliamentary scope and he gets an answer to his question. In both cases the suggestion, even in respect of the parliamentary version, even when one puts down a question for written answer, a formal parliamentary question but for written answer as opposed to for oral answer, the idea that the hon Member then or whoever, in fact there is another question later on in the Order Paper asked to another Minister which is going to get a similar reply, the idea that we just stand up here and read out the answer, the answer is no.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer that the Chief Minister has given no to has nothing to do with the question that is being asked. The question put by my hon Colleague and the other one in the Order Paper is for the Government to simply say in the House, 'I provide the hon Member with the answers to questions 123 to 131' and then the answers would be recorded. These are not answers to letters, these are the answers to the questions put in January which the Minister said would be sent within ten days because they had not had enough time. If they had had enough time and answered it in January it would be recorded in Hansard.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Hansard only records what is said in the House, even oral or writing, not outside the House.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

With all due respect, what he said in the House is 'the reply is too voluminous to read, I hand the hon Member the answer'. That is not what the record in Hansard shows. The record in Hansard shows what has been handed over, although it has not been said in the House and not been read in the House. All we need to do is to look at the last Hansard and we will see that all the information that the Government passes to the Opposition appears in Hansard as if it had been read out. We have not put a question saying will the Minister give a written answer. We have put a question saying will the Minister give an oral answer. He told us in January that because of the work involved he would write to the hon Member providing in writing what he would have given in this House across the floor if it had been ready on time. If it had been ready on time it would have been recorded and because it arrived ten days later it is not recorded. We do not think it is unreasonable for the Minister, who says we need to put an oral question, well he has got an oral question. The question is whether he will provide the answers and all he has to say to that question is 'yes I give the hon Member the answers' which is what he says in a hundred other occasions, and then it would be recorded. So why do they have a problem with that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, first of all I think we need to distinguish the various different types of practices. There are many occasions in which the Opposition Members, and I know it is not what he is referring to now, but there are occasions in which the Opposition Members ask for information on which notice has not been given in the question and the Minister might say 'well I do not have that information with me but I will send it to the hon Member'. That is a matter of correspondence, that example is a matter of correspondence and not a matter of Hansard. Frankly, it is entirely a matter for the Speaker what he interprets should go into Hansard. I was actually not aware. Sometimes since I have had the need personally to look at Hansard that I had not appreciated that the content of all these tables, all these schedules, go into Hansard. Well that is not a judgement, that is not my call. I query whether that is necessarily the correct decision but if that is the decision that the Speaker has made that is what he is here for. He is the custodian of Hansard and that is fine the Government have no objection to it going into Hansard if the Speaker decides that it should go into Hansard. Hansard is supposed to be, I would have thought, a written transcript of

the oral event. That is my interpretation of what Hansard is supposed to be but I could be wrong, I have never addressed my mind to the issue. On the last occasion that we had a meeting of the House, the hon Member asked questions which were simply impossible by their nature for the Government to have, at an administrative level because the politicians do not do the work for putting these questions together. At an administrative level some of them just could not be prepared, the answers could not be researched, tabulated, printed and delivered in the necessary time available. The Government could have come to the House backed entirely by not only parliamentary convention but long established practice, saying the information required by the hon Member's question is administratively disproportionate to put together and not answer it. That is the standard historically established way to deal with questions that require a disproportionate administrative effort to prepare. We could have done that and if we had done that this question would now not be arising. In other words, the Government would have just relied on what governments have always relied on, say 'no I cannot get the answer within 5 days and therefore I do not answer the question because a disproportionate administrative effort is required to prepare the answer within 5 days'. Then the question asked by the hon Member would not arise, we are entitled not to answer questions for that reason. We chose not to do so because we chose to draw a distinction between answers that required a disproportionate administrative effort to get to qualitatively, and situations which were marginal. In other words, we just need a few more days, it is quantitatively rather than qualitatively disproportionate and the quantitative margin was liveable with. So we did not. Instead of saying 'no we will not give you the answers because of the usual parliamentary pretext given for that or reason given for that', we said 'no we will give you this information within ten days'. Now, we did not think that we were offering or that the hon Members were going to interpret that to mean as part of the parliamentary Question and Answer Session, and the question does not say 'you can not have the information', one has the information in writing, the question says 'now I want it in Hansard', the Government do not think they have given it in a parliamentary framework. The Government simply believe that we have said in Parliament in answer to a question that we could have declined to answer we could have said, we chose instead to say we will not answer it. Well, we will give the information within ten days. The information was provided, the hon Member now wants to find a way of putting that information provided into the parliamentary context of Hansard whether it is rightly or wrongly does not matter, that is a side issue. The answer is not intended to be unhelpful. The answer is intended to mean, we do not think the proper way to do this is for us simply to repeat the information as if we were putting the clock back and repeat orally information that has been given in writing. We have however, on record in Hansard, confirmed that we in the parliamentary sense endorse the answer. This is what we confirm that the information given in writing is confirmed. Then the answer goes on to say, if that is not enough sufficient for his purpose then if he actually wants to see it spelt out verbatim in Hansard, then he needs to ask the question and he could have done it here. For example, if indeed it is the practice that what we give in schedules does go into Hansard, the hon Member could ask the same question again in which what we would simply do is instead of giving a schedule full of words and full of numbers, we would just give him a schedule with the letters that the Minister got and then it can be typed in if that is the practice. We do not think that in the circumstances that this issue arose it is the proper analysis of what we thought we were doing anyway. Our analysis of what happened is that it was in the parliamentary context so that that activity required us just to sit up and read orally the information can the Government provide the answers given in writing. That is not a question, that is not asking the same question which would attract the same answer orally. For example, if the question answered in the letter was 'what is the price of fish?', if this question had asked 'what is the price of fish?' then he would have had the answer to that question, but the question is 'will the hon Member

provide the answers given in writing by the Minister, for the purposes of the record in Hansard?'.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The only reason why we drafted this was because we thought we ought to do it in recognition of the fact that the information has been provided. Otherwise we could have simply put a question saying, 'will the Government now answer question 123?' as if they had not already answered it. We acknowledge that they have answered it, we acknowledge that if the answer on that piece of paper had simply been given here in the House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I was not aware of that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well that is why it happens and therefore, if Question 123 were being asked now it is nonsense for the Minister to say he is not going to stand here and read it all out. He always stands up and says the answer is too lengthy to read out in the House and I now hand over the information on a piece of paper. That is what he sent in writing. So were he to say 'can the answer that he gave us to Question 123 be provided in the House?', because we think that is the only way to have it in a document which is the official historical record of the answers in this House. The piece of paper is in our offices but there is no record of the answer given by the Government. The question is there but their answer is not. I would have thought it would be in their interests as well that the explanation that they have given should be in the records of the House. We could think of no other way of doing it but if instead of saying 'can he now give us the answer to Question 123?' we read Question 123, he will then say 'yes' and hand a piece of paper. Well, we will add all these questions to the next meeting.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Just to round off this short discussion, I was the person who thought of this question because as a new Member of the House I thought I had identified a loophole and I discovered that the procedure of handing answers over to the other side, as those answers got entered into Hansard I thought I would ask the question in the case of answers to questions that were received later. That is all.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

If I might, just for the sake of the record books, I think this is very important not just for us and for the Government to have recorded in Hansard what is said but also for third parties not members of this House who may wish to access the information that has passed across the floor of this House. The definition that I have of what Hansard is and let us recall that it is called the official report of debate, is that it is a full report of speeches, questions and answers, statements and all things said in the House itself, and separate papers report debates in standing committees, but Hansard also includes written answers to questions and this is the important part of the definition,

and certain other matters going beyond what was actually said in the House, such as occasional detailed supplementary information relating to answers to questions. It may be that the best way to deal with this issue is that when the Minister says 'I am going to give you this information, you will have it within ten days' and that is not a correspondence issue, it should also be provided to the House and perhaps added just for the sake of the record.

**MR SPEAKER:**

No. One cannot have it both ways. If there is an oral question the answer is an oral answer. The fact that some of it is in writing is for the purpose of shortcutting procedure on both sides but when one gets the written part of the question, it is not a written answer it is the written part of a question, one can ask a supplementary in the House. If the Minister says 'we will give you the information' no supplementary arises. So therefore it is not recorded. He sends the information in writing and then you answer back and say this is wrong because I asked about whether this is going to be recorded in Hansard. No.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I suggest a possible alternative approach. The Government have no difficulty with this. It is just a question, as far as we are concerned, of mechanics and correct procedure and proper procedure. For example, I am not sure that there are any questions on this occasion that have been postponed for ten days, we try to avoid it as much as possible. Whenever the Government need to do that, perhaps one alternative device is for the question to be there and then converted into a written question or a question for written answer, so that when the answer is provided it might then be eligible to go into Hansard as answers to a written question. I do not know what the rules are on that. What is the procedure for including in Hansard when there is a parliamentary question asked for written answer as opposed to for oral answer? Does it then get into Hansard or not?

**MR SPEAKER:**

I have had a long session with the Hon Mari Montegriffo, she wanted to have written questions and get written answers, but she wanted everything. After having that she wanted to have supplementaries on that and that cannot be. So it might be that the Hon Miss Montegriffo and the other Minister, the Hon Col Britto, might enter in the picture too to make the procedure easier.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The arrangement that I came to with the Minister is that for a question to go through Hansard and be recorded in Hansard all that needs to be done is to ask the question over again.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Yes, and one can ask another 900 questions. I have got a feeling that there are so many questions because I have cut on supplementaries, I am hoping it is not.



ORAL

**NO 589 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state whether the negotiations with the union regarding the move into a proposed Authority for the Buildings and Works Department have now been concluded?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

No, they have not yet commenced as such although documents for discussion have been tabled.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 589 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In answer to Question No. 122 the Government said that they were currently engaged in discussing the proposed authority with the unions. Was that not the case then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes it is the case, his question asked whether negotiations commenced not whether discussions are in progress.

ORAL

**NO 590 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SUPPLY TEACHERS**

Can Government state why the Department of Education is no longer contracting supply teachers to cover for absent teachers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

It is not correct that the Department of Education is no longer contracting supply teachers to cover for absent colleagues.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 590 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

If this is the case, they are still going to cover, why is it that all schools have been told that no extra supply will be supplied?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The hon Member's informants in this respect have not got their facts right.

**NO 591 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GASA SWIMMING POOL**

Can Government state why the Department of Education is no longer paying for children to be able to go to the GASA swimming pool?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

It is not correct to affirm that the Government are no longer paying for children to be able to go to the GASA swimming pool.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 591 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is it not the case that instructions have been given to schools to get the money needed in order for the children to go to the swimming pool from their own capitation rather than from the Department of Education?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The operational aspects of this procedure is very much up to the administration as a matter of policy, which is my concern, the Government are still committed to pay for children to be able to go to the GASA swimming pool.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister then confirm that the Government are going to pay GASA out of the capitation from schools?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I cannot confirm that. I repeat that the Government are satisfied that provision is being made in whatever operational manner for children still to benefit from attendance at the GASA swimming pool. That is a matter of policy and I am satisfied.

**HON S E LINARES:**

My question has not been answered. My question is specifically, is the money for children to go to the swimming pool coming from the capitation of schools? Is it coming from capitation? Not whether the Minister is satisfied.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The question was, 'is the Government no longer paying for children to be able to go to the GASA swimming pool', and I have answered that it is not correct, that the children can still go to the GASA swimming pool and the Government are providing. Whatever operational procedural way it is not a matter for me to investigate. In any case notice perhaps could have been given as to how the whole thing is operated administratively. The question is one of policy and I have answered.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister explain how it has been done in the past? How is GASA paid and from what monies GASA is being paid?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The answer is GASA, who have now raised their fees I believe to £1.50 per head per session, have been paid from Government funds administered by the Department of Education.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Correct, administered by the Department of Education. Is it not the case now that it has to be administered from the capitation money given to schools rather than from the Department of Education?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No what I mean is that the capitation funds are also part of the funds provided by the Department of Education. That is an operational channelling of payments which is not the important point.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So the Minister is now confirming that through his different arrangements the money is coming from the capitation given to schools. Can he confirm that?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I cannot confirm that here and now.

**NO 592 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL TRIPS**

Can Government explain whether the same safety standards apply to children in Gibraltar as they apply to children in the UK when attending school trips?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Similar safety procedures to those employed with school children in the UK are applied by our schools when planning school trips. Safety assessment is carried out by each school before all these trips and the well being of the children is paramount at all times. I might add that our schools, thank God, enjoy an excellent safety record on school trips, despite the very large number of these which are organised annually.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 592 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The Minister has just said the word 'similar' and not 'the same'. Can he state the differences?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Similar, the same, .....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister is not accountable in this House for the law and practices in the United Kingdom. The hon Member himself, once he informs himself of what is the position in Gibraltar, can if he wants compare them to the practices in the UK and work out for himself whether there are any differences. It is not for the Government to do for the hon Member a comparative analysis of the position between Gibraltar and the UK. We are accountable for the position in Gibraltar.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Government give us the position in Gibraltar of the safety?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have already answered that, I have said that a safety assessment is carried out by each school before each trip and I am absolutely satisfied that the attention and precautions taken by those involved, particularly the teachers involved, are perfectly adequate.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state who makes these safety assessments?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Safety assessments will be made primarily by the Head teacher supported by the other teachers who are organising the safety trip, and in consultation of course with other relevant authorities who would give the necessary advice.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister then give us what qualifications the Head teacher has to make a safety assessment on school trips?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Head teachers are qualified in a very generic sense concerning the safety and health of their children, and as I say they also consult and seek advice from relevant persons and experienced persons involved in school trips.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister then assure every single parent that the Head teacher makes assessments on buses that they travel in? The Chief Minister might laugh but it is a very important aspect because one of the things now that the Chief Minister is laughing at it, I will tell him that one of the things that are required in the UK, which we even have not got any legislation here but we tend to have "similar" practice to the UK, is that buses should have in every single seat a seat belt and they do not. Even the bus that we have here in our Department to take children to different places. So that is one of the things. Carrying on with the question, can the Minister then assure parents that the Head teacher will look at every single aspect because that is what he is saying that it is a safety assessment, and an assessment means that they look at the places they stay in, the way they travel and who they travel with. Can the Minister assure this?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister was not laughing because the matter is not serious. The Chief Minister is laughing because of the political opportunism and unreasonableness of the question. The Minister, nor the Chief Minister nor all the kings horses and all the kings men, can provide parents with a guarantee that when their children go on a

school trip they are not going to befall an accident. I, as a parent, when I allow my children to go on school trips understand and appreciate that regardless of the degree of care that has been taken by those organising the trip, accidents happen. Therefore the use of the words 'can the Minister give an absolute assurance' are frankly not sensible words to try and put in the Minister's mouth. What the Minister and the Government can do is assure the hon Member that the care, skill and extent of the precautionary preparations taken now in connection with the planning of school trips is at the very least, at least as robust as they were when the hon Members were last in government themselves and responsible for the same thing. That assurance I can give him.

**NO 593 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PRIVATE NURSERIES**

Can Government state whether private nurseries are following the Foundation Year during the Pre-school year as is done in Government Schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Foundation Course is not a statutory obligation and schools are able to choose whether to do it or not. Government of course are not in the practice of dictating specific curricular provisions to private nurseries.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 593 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state if he is aware whether there is any private school actually doing the Foundation year with the pre-school?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No I am not aware. The administrators in the Department of Education no longer keep an eye. In any case I repeat, it is not a statutory provision even for Government pre-school provision and it is a question of value. I do not want to go into a wider debate but I am sure the hon Member knows and understands that over prescription at pre-school stages are not advisable by modern research, and therefore as in fact the National Curriculum at later stages of schooling has come into controversy precisely because of that over work and over prescriptive criteria, similarly and even more forcefully, at pre-school age.



**NO 594 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PRIVATE NURSERIES**

Can Government state whether any Private Nursery has been inspected since the last one in 1997?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

I am sure the hon Member also knows that formal inspections, the traditional regimented inspection, are not seen today to be the best way of actually guiding and advising and monitoring most aspects of educational establishments. As regards private nurseries, although there have been no formal inspections in that sense we are in constant, especially in a small place like Gibraltar, in constant daily contact with the staff, with the parents, with the therapists, who do tend in situ to the needs of speech and language development, and occupational therapists, and I think in conjunction in this context the Department is satisfied that private nurseries are doing their job rather well.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 594 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister give us an indication of how many times an Educational Adviser or any other education psychologist have actually gone to private nurseries?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I cannot give any particular number of cases or instances. I have given the background to this, there is no formal visitation perhaps but there is an interaction and a constant sharing of experiences and information.

**NO 595 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – POST 16 ISSUES**

Can the Minister state whether the NASUWT have responded to the Department of Education's request to contribute their views on Post 16 issues?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Minister can state that the NASUWT have not as yet responded to the Department of Education's request for their views on Post 16 issues.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 595 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Since the last time has the Committee that the Minister formed in order to look at these issues, have they met in the last six months?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, the working group completed their work, they produced a document prepared for Government with their views and submitted this in January 2003, and it was a copy of this document that was actually provided to the NASUWT. It actually took place during a very thorough and wide ranging discussion with Mrs Sue Rogers, the National Treasurer of the NASUWT during a visit to Gibraltar a few months ago. She actually took the initiative and suggested that this issue of Post 16 education should be seen within the much wider context of the Tomlinson Report in the UK, 14-19, that that provided a much global, more comprehensive view which touched upon the Post 16 education. She actually suggested that they would take over as from then because even the Tomlinson Report and the implications were not quite clear as yet, they were very much in the pipeline and the union in UK was actually studying its implications, and that when they were clearer about that, they would come back to us with the considered views of the union and that is exactly why I said in the answer to the original question that the NASUWT have not yet formally responded, we are awaiting their very valuable view in the context of the wider developments of the Tomlinson Report 14-19.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So whilst we await the report from the NASUWT and looking at the 14-19 Tomlinson Report, what is going to happen with the current children, or should I say young adults, what is going to happen to them? Are we going to wait indefinitely, because this committee that the Minister set up was set up in 1998 and since then we have had no progress as in a policy, I am not saying progress in another sense, but as a clear cut policy. So what is going to happen as from now? Are we going to wait again for another three or four years until in the UK the Tomlinson Report recommendations are brought up and taken on and the unions discuss with the Government? What are we going to do, just wait all the time like we are?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am rather disappointed at the reaction of the Opposition Member, I thought he would understand the academic and educational aspects which are so important to consider this issue in perspective and in depth. This question of indefinite, there is nothing indefinite in the sense that as I say, the union itself, Mrs Sue Rogers herself said that we should wait and look at all the implications of the 14-19 report. Meanwhile of course, it is not a question of just lying still. There are many operational aspects in practical terms of consortia and cooperation between the schools in order to improve, perhaps the provision of the 16-19 phase of education.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Are Government thinking of implementing from 14-16 as well, because that seems to be the trend?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

We are thinking of everything that comes into the market, if I may put it rather crudely, in the educational field. We think of everything, but of course it is thinking, it is considering, it is studying, and I go back again to explaining that the union itself in the UK have said that that is their position at the moment.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I agree with the thinking and the studying. What we need to do is the implementing as soon as possible.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I think it is rather rash to rush.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Rash, when he started this committee in 1998. Rash?

ORAL

**NO 596 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SUPPLY TEACHERS**

Can the Government state why probationary teachers on supply are being asked to go through a second interview process even though they have been successful in their first interview the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 597 of 2004.

**NO 597 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SUPPLY TEACHERS**

Can the Government confirm that probationary teachers on supply who chose to interview the second time are given priority of employment over those who chose not to attend?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question No. 596 of 2004**

May I point out that there are no probationary teachers as such on supply. Probation is only a process available to those on a permanent and pensionable contract. The purpose of these interviews is to assess their suitability for a permanent and pensionable post in our schools complement. Whilst teachers are required to apply every year it is not true to say that they are asked to attend interviews every time. It is up to them, they are offered a choice. Interviews allow teachers to provide more details about their past years experience and professional development in the schools they have serviced since their first interview, and any other relevant experiences they may have gained, but as I say it is optional to them whether or not although most of them want to attend a second interview precisely for that purpose.

The answer to Question No. 597 is no Sir. No priority of employment is given to these teachers over those who choose not to attend the interview.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 596 TO 597 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The Minister has mentioned the fact that probationary teachers are the ones who are permanent and pensionable and therefore that is when their probationary year starts. Is it not the case that supply teachers are offered supply, usually on a full time basis which is a contradiction in terms. May I add that one can not have a supply teacher on a permanent basis, but the Government have started that practice. Does that mean that a teacher who is in supply for a year and is a teacher who has come from the UK and has gone through his or her induction course, which they usually do, these supply teachers go through these induction courses and all that, that then they have to go through another probationary year once they are on a permanent and pensionable basis?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, the answer is yes. Once a teacher gets onto the permanent and pensionable basis they do the first years probation in more senses than one. One is because it is General Orders and it is a Civil Service requirement that the first year in permanent and pensionable employment is a probational year. Secondly and very importantly, because I was involved directly with the Department of Education in the UK, is this induction year that some of them who come have not done that formal structured induction year in UK, which actually makes them eligible for teaching in a State school in the UK. We had to negotiate that the Department for Education and Skills in the UK would recognise our probation year, which is similarly structured, precisely for that purpose and this was a bonus of course for our teachers who might wish for one reason or another to move to the UK and teach in a State school there.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes, I remember the Minister actually answering my predecessor, the Hon Mr Gabay, in relation to this but what I am stating is that a supply teacher for a year who is asked to do the induction course, what the Minister is now confirming is that that teacher will have to repeat that induction course once they become permanent and pensionable. I think what the Minister should do is inform the supply teachers, the current supply teachers, whether they come from UK without having done the year or not, that they are to do their induction course again, which I understand that most of them do not do it again anyway. They are sort of put down as probationary teachers for the purpose of what the Minister has said, due to General Orders but do they have to go through the induction course again once they become permanent and pensionable, because they are doing it under a supply basis?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

They may do a year of supply which can be seen, as the hon Member is trying to do, as a probationary period. Yes, it is the gaining of experience, it is an opportunity for professional development, but the actual structured course which was actually very seriously negotiated with the Department for Education and Skills in the UK, only takes place once a teacher becomes a full member of the complement on a permanent and pensionable basis. So the teachers involved know all about this and they are quite satisfied to go through the process.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No, the thing is that the teachers on supply now are asked to do this induction course. Therefore if the supply teacher is being asked to do the induction course, then they have to repeat the induction course once they become permanent and pensionable. This is the issue. I understand and I know the basis of these induction courses and I appreciate the fact that they go through this and then they have the "qualification" to go to the UK and then say 'I am now a teacher who can pass through a natural course'. I am aware of that but what I am stating is that the supply teachers who come from the UK and are now posted in different places, who are currently doing the induction course which the Minister has stated, then they have to repeat that induction course, the same one, it is not as if there is an advanced induction course, it is the same one once they become permanent and pensionable.

I doubt if they are aware that they have to go through it again. I doubt it very much so can the Minister state what is the state of affairs this moment in time?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

My understanding is that it is only once the teacher becomes permanent and pensionable that the probationary aspect is really structured and formalised, that the supply year is no longer as demanding or as formally exacting as the year when the teacher becomes a full member of the complement of permanent and pensionable.

**HON S E LINARES:**

In light of that answer can the Minister then inform his Department not to force supply teachers who come from the UK to do that induction course, because then they are doing that. They are doing now, they are forcing supply teachers to do that induction course, which I see positive by the way, but they are not aware. They are under the impression that they are doing the induction course in order to avoid doing the induction course once they become permanent and pensionable. So could the Minister then inform all supply teachers who come from the UK after their studies that they are not eligible, or they should not or they do not have to do the induction course, because at the present time that is the case.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am not aware that there have been any complaints from teachers because of this but certainly we will look into the matter so that they are well informed, and I believe teachers right from the very start are pretty well informed of all their conditions of employment.

ORAL

**NO 598 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEBREW PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in the Hebrew Primary School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 599 to 610 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 599 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in St Paul's School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 and 600 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 600 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST MARY’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in St Mary's School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598, 599 and 601 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 601 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST BERNARD’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in St Bernard's School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 600 and 602 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 602 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NOTRE DAME SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in Notre Dame School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 601 and 603 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 603 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST JOSEPH’S FIRST SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in St Joseph's First School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 602 and 604 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 604 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GOVERNOR’S MEADOW SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in Governor's Meadow School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 603 and 605 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 605 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in Bishop Fitzgerald School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 604 and 606 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 606 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST JOSEPH’S MIDDLE SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in St Joseph's Middle School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 605 and 607 to 610 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 607 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST ANNE’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in St Anne's School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 606 and 608 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 608 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SACRED HEART SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in Sacred Heart School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 607 and 609 to 610 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 609 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BAYSIDE SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in Bayside School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 598 to 608 and 610 of 2004.

**NO 610 OF 2004****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION – WESTSIDE SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in Westside School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

I hand over a statement with all the details, the breakdown the hon Member is asking for.

| School             | 2003/04     |            | 2004/05     |            |
|--------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
|                    | Minor Works | Repairs    | Minor Works | Repairs    |
| Governor's Meadow  | £109,794.00 | £10,411.44 | £10,789.31  | £4,351.50  |
| Notre Dame         | £1,155.00   | £41,958.48 | -           | £11,734.00 |
| St Bernard's       | -           | £5,391.48  | -           | £447.50    |
| St Mary's          | £35,506.70  | £6,358.05  | -           | £3,629.50  |
| St Paul's          | -           | £10,864.20 | -           | £1,702.00  |
| St Joseph's First  | £3,654.31   | £15,021.94 | -           | £3,985.00  |
| Bishop Fitzgerald  | £103,352.00 | £23,095.79 | -           | £4,078.79  |
| Sacred Heart       | £10,722.61  | £17,680.48 | -           | £3,949.88  |
| St Anne's          | -           | £13,587.03 | -           | £6,021.50  |
| St Joseph's Middle | £28,715.52  | £11,282.76 | -           | £2,286.61  |
| Hebrew Primary     | -           | £1,752.45  | -           | £305.00    |
| Bayside            | £42,979.22  | £33,236.84 | -           | £3,670.00  |
| Westside           | -           | £25,550.58 | -           | £10,956.91 |

May I point out that in total the amount spent on minor works in the last financial year in our schools was £350,000 and in repairs around £220,000, that gives us £570,000 spent in our schools on minor works and repairs. As to his question on this financial year, of course minor works only £10,000 we have had the opportunity to spend, that was in Governor's Meadow I think it was in connection with the asbestos problem. The rest is a question of on-going repairs which have cropped up in this financial year.

## SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 610 OF 2004

### **HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state how the Department differentiates between minor works and repairs?

### **HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, repairs is meeting problems that arise in the on-going daily life of the school, like breakages and burst pipes, broken windows and furniture, things that need to be repaired. Minor works is more developmental, more planned developments of the school infrastructure.

### **HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state in the list given whether any of these monies, because it states 2003/2004 and I understand that he has got 2004/2005 probably if it is Governor's Meadow it would be with the asbestos or anything else, something that has cropped up as minor works, but is this before because I wanted from the last financial year and the present financial year. Now the present financial year is not this one, the present financial year has not ended yet as such so we are talking about having the expenditure of 2003/2004, is this what has been spent to date and is there any money that is going to be spent from now till the end of this financial year?

### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer given relates to the financial year. The details totalling about £570,000 was in respect of the financial year 2003/2004 which has ended, it ended on 31<sup>st</sup> March. The hon Member also said that in addition they had spent £10,000 this year, meaning since 1<sup>st</sup> April, so the bulk of the information given deals with the last financial year, 2003/2004, the twelve month year period ending 31<sup>st</sup> March that has passed. The question also asks 'and present financial year' and he has had the answer, bearing in mind that most of this expenditure is incurred during the summer holidays. Therefore it would be unusual for it to happen in April, May, except for emergency works.

ORAL

**NO 611 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST MARTIN’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much money has been spent on maintenance in St Martin's School in the last and present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 612 and 613 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 612 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST MARTIN’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state whether the playground equipment at St Martin's that was due to have been installed in September 2003 has now been completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 611 and 613 of 2004.

**NO 613 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST MARTIN’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state whether St Martin’s school roof has been repaired?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

In answer to Question No. 611, the amount spent on St Martin’s school during the last financial year is minor works £51,138.38 and in repairs £10,519.54 and during the current financial year £4,078.79 spent on repairs during the past couple of months.

In answer to Question No. 612, the playground equipment has been purchased and the perimeter fence has now been replaced. All that now needs doing is resurfacing the area in question before we can actually install the equipment. These works will be carried out early during the current financial year.

In answer to Question No. 613 about the roof, the answer is no Sir, the roof has not been done yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 611 TO 613 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES**

First of all in relation to the playground equipment, I remember asking this question I think it was the second but last session of the House of Assembly and the Minister gave us a guarantee that they were in the process of purchasing it at the time and they purchased it, and now the equipment is lying in St Martin’s school for the past six or eight months it has been lying there and no movement whatsoever is seen at St Martin’s School. I appreciate that the Minister wanted it in September 2003, well it has not happened, can he then state which is the next date in which the pupils of St Martin’s will be able to avail themselves of this equipment, which is lying by the way in the rain and sun in St Martin’s School.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have answered that question, I have said that the resurfacing, which is necessary before the equipment is installed, will be carried out early during the current financial



year. The reason that it has not happened is purely for logistical reasons, the contractors also have to set their priorities in terms of demands made on them in St Martin's itself, in Governor's Meadow and Bishop Fitzgerald there were additional works to be carried out because of the asbestos problem and other issues like that that make it impossible logistically for the contractors to attend to everything that is in their shopping list.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So the Minister can confirm it is not part of his priority then. It is not part of his priority because if it were part of his priority, when I asked the question last time it was a major priority. Now it has gone down in his priority list obviously because (1) it has not been done; (2) it is still lying there and (3) now the Minister says there are extra works to be done before putting in the equipment. When the question was answered last time, the equipment is there, everything is going to be done. Now it seems that it has gone down the priority list.

ORAL

**NO 614 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST JOSEPH’S NURSERY**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Joseph's Nursery?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 615 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 615 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST BERNARD’S NURSERY**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Bernard's Nursery?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 and 616 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 616 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S NURSERY**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Paul's Nursery?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614, 615 and 617 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 617 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEBREW PRIMARY SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in the Hebrew Primary School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 616 and 618 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 618 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NOTRE DAME SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Notre Dame School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 617 and 619 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 619 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST BERNARD’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Bernard's School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 618 and 620 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 620 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST JOSEPH’S FIRST SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Joseph's First School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 619 and 621 to 633 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 621 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Paul's School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 620 and 622 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 622 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GOVERNOR’S MEADOW SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Governor's Meadow School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 621 and 623 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 623 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST MARY’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Mary's School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 622 and 624 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 624 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Bishop Fitzgerald School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 623 and 625 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 625 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST ANNE’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Anne's School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 624 and 626 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 626 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SACRED HEART SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Sacred Heart School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 625 and 627 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 627 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST JOSEPH’S MIDDLE SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Joseph's Middle School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 626 and 628 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 628 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BAYSIDE SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Bayside School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 627 and 629 to 633 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 629 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – WESTSIDE SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Westside School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 628 and 630 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 630 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST MARTIN’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Martin's School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 629 and 631 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 631 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in the Gibraltar College of Further Education?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 630 and 632 to 633 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 632 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BLEAK HOUSE**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Bleak House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 614 to 631 and 633 of 2004.

**NO 633 OF 2004****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in offices of the Department of Education?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The financial information requested by the hon Member is provided in a separate paper which I will hand to him.

| <b>NAME</b>                          | <b>SCHOOL COMPUTERS - AMOUNT</b>                  |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| St Mary's First                      | £5,065.00                                         |
| St Bernard's First                   | £5,413.00                                         |
| St Joseph's First School and Nursery | £15,360.00                                        |
| St Martin's School                   | £1,961.00                                         |
| St Paul's First School and Nursery   | £12,339.00                                        |
| Notre Dame First School and Nursery  | £11,234.00                                        |
| Governor's Meadow First              | £5,724.00                                         |
| St Joseph's Middle                   | £25,007.00                                        |
| Bishop Fitzgerald Middle             | £14,923.00                                        |
| St Anne's Middle                     | £2,443.00                                         |
| Sacred Heart Middle                  | £14,025.00                                        |
| Hebrew Primary                       | £2,188.00                                         |
| Westside                             | £18,321.00                                        |
| Bayside                              | £1,158.00 - £15,000 committed this financial year |
| Gibraltar College                    | £120,00 - £11,000 committed this financial year   |
| St Paul's Nursery                    | -                                                 |
| St Bernard's Nursery                 | -                                                 |
| Offices                              | £7,310.00                                         |
| Bleak House                          | £4,561.00                                         |
| <b>TOTAL SCHOOLS/OFFICES</b>         | <b>£147,152.00</b>                                |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 614 TO 633 OF 2004**

In respect of the breakdown I would like to point out that in total £147,152.00 have been spent on computers in our schools this year. This figure actually excludes the installation of computer suites in all schools, except Bayside which is to be completed this year, but in all other schools computer suites have been completed with networked facilities and that came from the minor works vote rather than from computer equipment.

### **HON S E LINARES:**

The Minister has stated he spent £147,152.00 in computers this year. It is quite short considering the amount the Chief Minister said he was going to spend, and he actually announced it, that he was going to spend £250,000 this year. The question, if I may, I have drawn it further because he stated that it would be spent on education but he said it at all levels, meaning to me or to anybody out in the street, at all levels meaning the youth, the Department of Education, Bleak House, training at all levels and that is why I have posed the question in Bleak House, in the College of Further Education and the Department of Education, so it falls short from what was announced.

### **HON DR B A LINARES:**

That is a commitment as we said in respect of the lifts, not everything can be done in one go and this is an on-going expenditure which is targeted on that amount of money that the Chief Minister said.

### **HON S E LINARES:**

It would be appreciated that that is announced, when it is announced that it is spent that it is going to take time rather than say 'oh we are spending £250,000 this year', this year because there is a difference between the lifts. The lifts could well be a commitment of four years and I can understand that and I think everybody here understands it. The Hon Mr Bruzon actually acknowledged that. What I am saying is, saying to the general public that this financial year, because it was to do with that specific year, it is short and the Minister must admit to that.

### **HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will give the hon Member an example, we have been actually building networked computer suites in those schools, we cannot buy the computers for that school until that work is completed. So those are the logistical difficulties and complexities of actually dishing out the money to buy the computers. I hope the hon Member understands what we mean by logistical and operational complexities and difficulties.

### **HON S E LINARES:**

Yes but I do understand that but it is the way that it is announced that people out there do not understand and that is that when it is announced it should be explained

at the same time of what the Minister is saying now, it will not be spent during one year it will be spent during two years or there are logistical problems in the way we spend the money. That is fair enough then but not to come out saying it will be spent and then it is not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not everybody is as concerned as the Opposition Member is to denigrate anything that the Government does. If the Government decide to make £250,000 worth of investments on computers in schools, the suggestion that in order that the hon Member should not suffer too much of an electoral disadvantage amongst people who think that this is a jolly good idea, that we should start adding 'oh and by the way this is straddled over two financial years, or it is subject to laying cables or it is subject' it is absurd. The Government disagree entirely with the alleged justification that the hon Member has just explained as to what should be the formal public announcement. The Government make a resource available for a particular improvement in the educational or any other line, and then the programme to deploy the expenditure of that resource is entirely a different matter. Some of them are announced and some of them are not. In fact the Government have not made as much of a fuss as they could have made about the deployment of this policy. We announced that we were going to renovate the computer infrastructure in the schools and we quietly got on doing it. If the hon Member prefers that every time we install computers in the school we issue a press release saying 'today the Government have installed computers in St Bernard's, hooray everybody three cheers for the Government' and we have still got left to do the following schools, then when we do the next school, I just do not accept the hon Member's view that when the Government make a general statement of allocating resources to a particular person that we have got to go into the nitty gritty about how it is going to be explained in case there is somebody who thought that it was all going to be spent on one day, the day after the announcement is made.

**HON S E LINARES:**

As typical of the Chief Minister distorting all of what I say, because he has just distorted it all, I have not said that he has to announce in every single press release, which he has said and I have not said I have not even mentioned press releases, I said that the Chief Minister announced £250,000 expenditure on computers at all levels, the Chief Minister announced it and where in the estimates is the £250,000, they can not even be found.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is a point of order. The hon Member has said that I have distorted what he has said and then he goes on into a diatribe none of which amounts to suggestions of distortion. So he should please start by explaining what it is that he has said that I have distorted by suggesting that he has said something different to what he has said.

**HON S E LINARES:**

The fact that I did not say that a press release has to be announced every time they buy a computer. That is a distortion, total distortion of what I said. What I said is that when he announced the £250,000 expenditure on computers he should have actually qualified that by saying 'if all the infrastructure is ready then we will spend the £250,000 on computers'. That is what I said. So he has distorted because every time he stands up he tries and changes the arguments in such a way that I am saying what I have not said. That is exactly what the Chief Minister has done.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Then it confirms what I believe. That is that the hon Member either does not understand the meaning of the word 'distortion' or does not know how to conduct a debate and distinguish between (a) distortion of other peoples statements on the one hand, and simply points used in illustration. Look, he alleges that the distortion of his words, his words do not require much distortion they are pretty distorted the moment they come out of his mouth, his allegation of distortion is that I have suggested that he has suggested that he had said that the Government needed to put a press release out every time a computer was installed in a different school. I never attributed those words to him. What I said was that the Government did not agree with his view that when the original statement was made all the details that he was now suggesting the Government should have included in the original statement should have been made. I have not attributed to him, I have therefore not distorted anything in relation to him in relation to the press releases. The reference to the press releases was mine not his, but it is not a distortion of what he says because the way that the Government make statements is through press releases. So the only way that the Government can clarify how the deployment of a policy is going is through press releases. I have not said that he had said that this is the way it has to be done, I was just explaining to the hon Member that the only way that the Government could inform the public in the nitty gritty of the deployment of the originally announced policy and expenditure was through a series of press releases, which the Government could have done for their own publicity purposes and chose not to do. That is not distorting anything, he did not even talk about press releases. So unless I had said 'the hon Member said that I should have issued a press release', that would have been distorting what he said because he did not say anything about press releases. So the hon Member is himself distorting the debate in this House by suggesting, falsely, that I have distorted what he has said, and he does it regularly because he does not distinguish and properly listen and analyse the statements that are made in his earshot. It is not I who distorts therefore, it is he who distorts or does not understand the meaning of the word 'distort', one or the other.



ORAL

**NO 634 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2000**

Can Government state how many students graduated who have been on government grants in 2000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 635 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 635 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2000**

Can Government state out of the students who graduated in 2000 how many have obtained employment in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 and 636 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 636 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2000**

Can Government state out of the students who graduated in 2000 how many went to do higher education?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634, 635 and 637 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 637 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HIGHER DEGREES IN 2000**

Can Government state out of the students who completed higher degrees in 2000 how many went to obtain employment in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 636 and 638 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 638 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2001**

Can Government state how many students graduated who have been on government grants in 2001?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 637 and 639 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 639 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2001**

Can Government state out of the students who graduated in 2001 how many went to do higher education?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 638 and 640 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 640 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GRADUATES EMPLOYED IN 2001**

Can Government state out of the students who have graduated in 2001 how many have obtained employment in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 639 and 641 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 641 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GRADUATES EMPLOYED IN 2001**

Can Government state out of the students who completed higher degrees in 2001 how many went on to obtain employment in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 640 and 642 to 649 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 642 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2002**

Can Government state how many students graduated who have been on government grants in 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 641 and 643 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 643 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2002**

Can Government state out of the students who graduated in 2002 how many have obtained employment in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 642 and 644 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 644 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2002**

Can Government state out of the students who graduated in 2002 how many went to do higher education?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 643 and 645 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 645 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2002**

Can Government state out of the students who completed higher degrees in 2002 how many went on to obtain employment in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 644 and 646 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 646 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2003**

Can Government state how many students graduated who have been on government grants in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 645 and 647 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 647 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2003**

Can Government state out of the students who graduated in 2003 how many have obtained employment in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 646 and 648 to 649 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 648 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2003**

Can Government state out of the students who graduated in 2003 how many went to do higher education?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 634 to 647 and 649 of 2004.

**NO 649 OF 2004****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION – STUDENTS GRADUATED IN 2003**

Can Government state out of the students who completed higher degrees in 2003 how many went on to obtain employment in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested, to the extent that it is available, is set out in the schedule that I hand to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question No. 649 of 2004**

1. The breakdown of students graduated who have been on Government grants by year is as follows:-

| <b>YEAR</b> | <b>NO. OF STUDENTS</b> |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2000        | 216                    |
| 2001        | 242                    |
| 2002        | 201                    |
| 2003        | 254                    |

2. The breakdown of students who graduated and went on to do higher education by year is as follows:-

| <b>YEAR</b> | <b>NO. OF STUDENTS</b> |
|-------------|------------------------|
| 2000        | 9                      |
| 2001        | 18                     |
| 2002        | 20                     |
| 2003        | 24                     |

3. The Government do not compile records regarding the employment obtained by graduates it has sponsored. We are satisfied that the employability of individual graduates is enhanced by their participation in higher education and this justifies our investment in this area.



4. The situation in respect of students who have graduated with higher degrees is the same as for those who completed first degrees.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 634 TO 649 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Did the Minister not commit himself or at least gave us the assurance that he was going to monitor the fact that he was going to look at how many of the students who graduated either on first degrees or higher degrees, whether they obtained employment in Gibraltar?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

What I did say was that we were trying very hard to obtain this information. The system that we adopted in recent years was actually issuing questionnaires to graduates of first degrees and higher degrees, but the response was so poor to put it bluntly that the indicators, the resulting data was really not indicative or reliable. So my answer is that we have not got any reliable or indicative records of the outcome in terms of employment and other avenues of graduates and those who have finished their first degrees, I am being perfectly honest about it. It is just that we have not been able, though we have tried hard, obviously the only way is approaching directly through a form of survey but these surveys have not really led to any information that I would put on the Table here as being really indicative.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do Government not consider it important to know how much of the investment that is being made in higher education is actually reflected in people coming back here rather than staying abroad with the knowledge that they have gained?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is important to some extent I would say because then there is also the freedom of choice of students, we educate them, we fund their education, enrich their experience academically and intellectually but then of course the freedom of the individual to choose their own avenue in life is also important to accept, but yes it is important that we have some indication to what extent our investments yield for our own benefit in our own economy, but as I have been honest enough to say that our methods of obtaining this information have as yet not yielded any clear response.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it still the practice to require students to sign an undertaking that they will come back?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is the practice still on a very formal contract basis when they sign for sponsorship, but then as most of them are not required by Government, the contract is that they may be required by Government to serve the Government's employment not anywhere else in the private sector. As this is not available, except in some cases like teachers for instance, the subject teacher is required in a particular vacancy for that particular subject, mathematics, physics, it is difficult to recruit, then of course the Government have the option to demand that contractual obligation, but as I say generally I have to say that most of these contractual obligations entered from the start are waived.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, is a waiver any indication of the numbers not coming back?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No because the waiver is limited as I say to all those who are required by Government to serve the interests of Government but not across the board to other students, graduates who may choose all sorts of avenues in life.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What is the element that, for example, that is mentioned in the Auditor's report of people having to repay the Government, what is that in respect of?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is rather complicated actually. The refunding of monies spent on a student during one particular year is required when it is manifest that the student has failed the completion of that year in terms of university qualification, with an element of negligence, certainly not in the case of illness but it is assessed on the particular case and the merits of each particular case whether there is just a sheer negligent approach, the fact that the Government have actually funded a year and after two months or three months the student packs it in. As one can understand it is in the tax payers interest that Government try to recoup that money.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It has nothing to do then with whether they come back or not?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there any other source than the Department of Education that could be used for this. For example, the Employment Service, could they be alerted to, at the end of the academic year when the student is due to come back, to get a feedback of what sort of numbers or what proportion come back.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, that is a very good point and since my arrival in the Employment Ministry I am actually pursuing the possibility of actually obtaining that information through the machinery and the processes of the Employment Services, but as I say I am new there and we are now considering the possibilities of actually obtaining this information.

ORAL

**NO 650 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in St Martin's?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 651 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 651 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in the Hebrew Primary?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 and 652 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 652 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in St Joseph's First?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 550, 651 and 653 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 653 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in Notre Dame?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 652 and 654 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 654 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in St Paul's?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 653 and 655 to 663 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 655 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in St Bernard's?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 654 and 656 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 656 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in St Mary's?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 655 and 657 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 657 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in Governor's Meadow?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 656 and 658 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 658 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in Bishop Fitzgerald?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 657 and 659 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 659 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning and support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in St Joseph's Middle?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 658 and 660 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 660 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in St Anne's?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 659 and 661 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 661 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in Sacred Heart?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 660 and 662 to 663 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 662 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in Bayside?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 650 to 661 and 663 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 663 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government state how many learning support assistants are permanent and pensionable, on temporary contract, and supply in Westside?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

I hand over to the hon Member the statistical information that he requires. A few handwritten marginal notes that I have put in will surely not distract him from the essence.

Answer to Question 663

|                   | School | P&P | P&P | Supply | Supply | Temporary | F/T | P/T | F/T | P/T | Contract |
|-------------------|--------|-----|-----|--------|--------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| Governor's Meadow | 0      | 0   | 0   | 4hrs   | 0      |           |     |     |     |     |          |
| Notre Dame        | 4      | 1   | 2   | 2      | 0      |           |     |     |     |     |          |
| St Mary's         | 0      | 0   | 0   | 10hrs  | 0      |           |     |     |     |     |          |
| St Paul's         | 1      | 0   | 3   | 1      |        |           |     |     |     |     |          |

|                    |                         |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
|                    | 0                       |
| St Joseph's First  | 2<br>1<br>0<br>2<br>0   |
| St Bernard's       | 0<br>0<br>0<br>1<br>0   |
| Bishop Fitzgerald  | 1<br>2<br>1*<br>2*<br>0 |
| Sacred Heart       | 0<br>0<br>1<br>0<br>0   |
| St Anne's          | 0<br>1<br>0<br>0<br>0   |
| St Joseph's Middle | 0<br>0<br>0<br>0<br>0   |
| Hebrew Primary     | 0<br>0<br>0<br>1<br>0   |

|             |     |
|-------------|-----|
| St Martin's | 4   |
|             | 9   |
|             | 0   |
|             | 1.5 |
|             | 0   |
| Bayside     | 5   |
|             | 1   |
|             | 0   |
|             | 0   |
|             | 0   |
| Westside    | 2   |
|             | 0   |
|             | 1   |
|             | 0   |
|             | 0   |

\*The two p/t P&P Classroom Aides and the two supply p/t Classroom Aides are the same people. They are doing extra hours on supply which brings them up to full time. The f/t supply Classroom Aide goes over to Governor's Meadow for 4hrs.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 650 TO 663 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister satisfied at the fact that there are so many on the supply compared to on permanent and pensionable? I count about 12 on supply and it seems like it is quite a high number. Can the Minister state what is the average time that a supply stays on supply as in rolling supply?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am sorry but I do not quite understand the question. If I can answer the first part of the question.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I will ask the question then. The question is, is the Minister satisfied with the high amount of supply learning support assistants that he has in this list?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the Minister can answer in a moment, I jolly well hope he is because I am highly dissatisfied with the amount of money that has been spent on this matter.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Well that is the amount of money that inclusion policy costs. These are the policies of Government so Government have to have the responsibility of paying for their policies. This is inclusion, this is a lot to do with the inclusion process. This is not absent teachers, this is learning support assistants. This has nothing to do with teachers, it is to do with learning support assistants.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

As the Chief Minister has pointed out, obviously the budgetary consideration of these programmes have to be taken into account to ensure that we get value for money in this respect, but in respect of the supplementary about the huge amount of supply classroom aides compared with the permanent and pensionable classroom aides, that is not correct. My sums here make it 19 permanent and pensionable classroom aides, full time and 16 part time permanent and pensionable as opposed to eight supply full time and five, really 10, but the equivalent of five full time part time supplies. So really your initial statement that there was a lack of balance between the permanent and pensionable supply, remember may I point out that only very recently we actually made permanent and pensionable 13 classroom aides.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I say that because the percentage is pretty high. If on the one hand the Minister has just stated that he has got 16 full time and then he has eight on supply, so there are 15 P&Ps and eight on supply, that is 50 per cent, it is high. What I am trying to get at really is how many of these supply team learning support assistants have been on supply for 3, 4, 5 years? Some of them have been for a long time. That is another question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No it is actually not the question, it is another question but the premise of his last supplementary is not relevant. In other words, this Government by the way, Governments in Gibraltar have always used supply teachers for many years, this Government, not the previous one, this Government adopted the policy of considering whether people that had been on supply terms for an extended period of time were really members of the permanent establishment who were just on cheaper terms and conditions unfairly, so we introduced the process of looking at this from a socially and labour fairness point of view. So let that be the starting point. We did what no government had done before but that principle does not necessarily apply in this area because some of these assistants had been engaged because of particular children going through the educational system at this point in time that may need one to one or, one to two or one to three, so one can not make them permanent and pensionable because when those children get beyond a certain point in their educational system there may not be others that need that degree of care and attention. It is a service, this particular facility is a facility that can only sensibly be provided but particularly when it is for named students. If there were a teacher for young Joe Bloggs because young Joe Bloggs needs a particular form of cover, one cannot employ a permanent and pensionable person for the next 40 years because Joe Bloggs needs attention for the next two years. What does one do with the person when Joe Bloggs has finished school? There may not be another Joe Bloggs or person needing one to one, so it is not an area that it is easy to apply the general principle to about percentages, the ratio being high, which is the hon Member's point, well there is 16 to 10 that is a very high ratio. The nature of the activity giving rise to the need for these assistants is such that it necessarily has to have a high number of people on supply or other forms of temporary employment, it does not have to be supply terms, the Government could, if it wanted to, develop some other model of temporary employment as opposed to permanent and pensionable and not call it supply, I think we have had this discussion in the House in the past.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just to put on the record, his Government who got rid of these supplies as he said.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We gave them permanent and pensionable conditions.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes, but it was I in the GTA who negotiated with the GSLP to get rid of teachers who had been, not only because of the GSLP but the previous AACR, they had been on the supply list, at least on a permanent supply because they had been on permanent supply for 11, 10, 8, 6 years and what I am saying is we got rid of it, but unfortunately this Government have re-established the same issue. I will give an example, all teachers, there are many teachers on supply lists now, there are loads of them they come back from the UK and the first thing is that they are given a year of supply which is a contradiction in terms. A supply should be under contract not on a supply basis and the Government are employing teachers on a supply basis who have loads of problems. Why, because they want to get mortgages, they cannot get mortgages because there are issues of non full time employment, these are the issues. So the Chief Minister should first look at the facts, like he tells me constantly, to look at the facts to look at everything that has been done during the past and not do the practice that he is doing now. The practice now, and he is doing the same with the learning support assistants may I add. That is why I am mentioning it because there are learning support assistants who have been on a supply basis for five years and I do not accept the argument that Joe Bloggs will not be here next year. One can do that on a small scale but not on a 50 per cent scale like it is done now.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Eight individuals is a pretty small scale. It is not a question of percentages it is a question of the number of individuals. Well the hon Member may have as part of the GTA negotiated with the GSLP government, of course of which he is not a part, he belongs to a different political party, well I am sorry that his negotiations were so unsuccessful.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No they did succeed.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether he succeeded or whether he did not, all I can tell the hon Member is that when we came into office we were presented by the unions with lists of people going back a decade on supply terms. We were correcting people that had been on supply for years and years and the hon Members negotiations on their behalf with the then government of Gibraltar were not successful. I will give the hon Member the names and the dates and how long they had been there for. On the question of permanent and pensionable terms, the hon Member can sit there shaking his head, I can assure him that what I am telling him is correct and what I will now do is I will personally take the trouble to see how many supply teachers the GSLP government made permanent and pensionable during any time that he was an official of the GTA, and I will bring that information back to this House next time we meet on Question Time because that information is available. So if the hon Member has tried to erect, as I believe he has, a self-serving political argument which is factually untrue, I intend to remove the bush from in front of him so that he no longer has a hiding place. Now, he says about people with mortgages, look employing people on permanent and pensionable terms is an extremely costly thing for the tax payer. The Government do not engage people on permanent and pensionable terms to help

them out with their mortgage, or so that they can decide whether they can buy a house for this or that price, the Government employs people on permanent and pensionable terms when there is a requirement and a need to do so in the interests of the tax payer, not in the interests of the employee of the person concerned.

On the whole question of classroom aides the hon Member has got to understand that classroom aides as a concept in the United Kingdom, is being introduced increasingly as a cheap way of recruiting teachers. In other words, they have got too high a teacher pupil ratio and instead of employing more teachers and reducing the size of the classroom, they employ classroom aides, shove them in with the teacher and still have one teacher for 40 pupils. Well in Gibraltar we have sorted out that problem in a different way. We have an agreement with the GTA as to pupil teacher ratios, that is the envy, in fact the United Kingdom will never reach that pupil teacher ratio ever, and the suggestion therefore that we should both have our Rolls Royce solution to the problem and on top of it replicate the United Kingdom's poor mans alternative for sorting out the same problem is crass, absolutely crass. The idea that because the United Kingdom does not want to employ teachers to bring the teacher pupil ratio down when we already have our teacher pupil ratio down to lower levels than the UK is even aiming at as a target, that we should also fill our classrooms with classroom aides at the taxpayers expense I can assure him will never become the policy of the Government. As far as I am concerned classroom aides are only in relation to the individual needs of individual pupils on temporary passage through the educational system and they are not and are never going to be something that the Government recruits mimicking the UK when we do not have the problem that the UK has and that that is the reason why they are recruiting. If the UK had a pupil teacher ratio of 1 to 23 as we have, they would not dream of employing an additional classroom aide to put in amongst those people and that is the position and that is why the Government do not make more classroom aides permanent and pensionable, because it is a temporary requirement which is supplied by a temporary method of labour provision and the Government are not prepared to satisfy a temporary need with permanent and pensionable staff. It is a noose around the financial necks of future tax payers and the Government consider it completely undesirable to do that.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

May I distinguish between pensionable and permanent and the matter of holiday entitlement and sick leave because I think what is important is to take into account that there are classrooms aides, or whatever the new terminology is, who have been in fact in our schools for more than a year, two years, and they have no sick leave entitlement and no holiday entitlement.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is a much more valid distinction to make. In other words, the difference between supply and temporary. One does not want to make somebody permanent and pensionable because one does not have the permanent need for their services. That does not mean that one has to employ them on the terms which presently attach to supply workers. Supply workers are supposed to be covering for absent staff. That should, and I agree with him, it should be distinguished with staff for which there is a finite, in terms of time and therefore temporary need. What is presently happening is that they are being drawn from the same pool of people and therefore they have been supply on supply terms, but as I said to him in a



supplementary a few moments ago, the Government could consider a form of contract as opposed to just supply workers. In other words, an alternative model. The fact that one is not permanent and pensionable does not mean that it has to be on supply terms, it is possible to devise a middle model of temporary contracted worker with terms, as the hon Member has said, about leave entitlement and other terms and conditions of employment better than the supply worker. I think that is a perfectly rational suggestion which the Government should certainly look into.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I appreciate wholeheartedly the last bit that the Chief Minister has said because that is the answer, not only to the hon Member's question but also to mine. The diatribe that he went on before must be ignored, which is to do with classroom pupil teacher relationship, with the UK, the comparisons and all these things. I never mentioned anything of this sort and again the Chief Minister goes on to distort not what I said but distort the whole argument. Talking about classroom aides and I was told off two sessions of the House ago, that it is not classroom aides any more they are learning support assistants, but that is another point. What I am saying is that I appreciate the fact that the Chief Minister has realised that there are people who are five years on supply and have not got rights and this is the issue, and this was the issue with the supply teachers, and this is the issue which I wanted to bring up and I am glad that it has been answered now.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I correct what I said before about the hon Member. The problem is not that he does not know what the word 'distort' means, the problem is that he does not have a sufficiently long memory retention function to remember what he himself said in the last 15 minutes, this is his problem. Or does he not remember asking about whether the Minister was satisfied with the number of classroom aides that he has? Or does he not remember asking the Minister whether these people should be made permanent and pensionable? To suggest that the answer that I have given the Hon Mr Bruzon is the answer to his question is not correct. The Hon Mr Bruzon, has cogently acknowledged the distinction between permanent and pensionable on the one hand and temporary on the other. The hon Member has said nothing that suggests either that he understands that there is a difference between the two, still less that he acknowledges and agrees that there is a viable difference between the two. The hon Member was asking the Government to make these 8 people, which he says is a very high percentage, I suppose one person is 50 per cent and therefore in his language a very high percentage if it is out of two, he seems to think that because there are eight and the total is 16, that that is a very high percentage. Well, in respect of that number, eight or 50 per cent depending on how we present the statistic, the hon Member was asking for them to be made permanent and pensionable. Well, I am sorry, it is implicit in everything that the hon Member has said and explicit in some of the things that he has said. The hon Member's problem is that he appears, I do not know whether he engages his jaws and does not connect it to his memory, this may be a problem. This has been going on in supplementaries with my Colleague the Hon Dr Linares for about half an hour on the basis that he was wrong that these eight people should be on supply terms and not permanent and pensionable terms. When I explained to the hon Member why they are not on permanent and pensionable terms, he describes all that as irrelevant to nothing that he raised and a distortion of everything that he said. A terribly adult debate, when I do not like the answers that I am getting I know, I will stand up and describe them as

distortion of what I said, let us see if I can throw enough mud into the water to make it murky. This seems to be his intellectual approach to debating in this House. It does not make what I say a distortion it simply means that he does not know. So I am glad that he agrees with me and with the hon Member sitting next to him, he is completely wrong in thinking that that is an answer to his question. It would have been an answer to his question if he had asked could these people be on some model of employment other than permanent and pensionable which respected their rights of employment a little bit more than the supply terms do. Does he have any recollection of having said or asked anything similar? Do those words strike his memory as concepts that he has formulated or uttered in the last half hour? No. I suggested it and then his Colleague next to him suggested it, and when he has suggested it I have agreed with him but I do not agree with the Hon Mr Linares because his thrust was permanent and pensionable and the Government do not agree.

ORAL

**NO 664 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited St Joseph's First School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 665 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 665 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited Notre Dame School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 and 666 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 666 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited St Paul's First School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664, 665 and 667 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 667 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited St Mary's School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 666 and 668 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 668 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited Governor's Meadow School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 667 and 669 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 669 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited the Hebrew Primary School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 668 and 670 to 677 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 670 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited St Bernard's School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 669 and 671 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 671 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited Bishop Fitzgerald School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 670 and 672 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 672 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited St Joseph's Middle in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 671 and 673 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 673 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited St Anne's School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 672 and 674 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 674 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited Sacred Heart School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 673 and 675 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 675 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited Bayside School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 674 and 676 to 677 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 676 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited Westside School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 664 to 675 and 677 of 2004.

**NO 677 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL NURSES**

Can Government state how many times school nurses have visited St Martin's Special School in the last and present academic year giving a breakdown by term?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Visits to schools by the School health nursing team are currently carried out only upon request by the individual schools. In 1998 the provision of health services for children in schools came under review by the GHA. The review concluded that with the development of services at the time in the Primary Care Centre and the strengthening of paediatrics in the community, the existing arrangements for routine examinations of healthy children during school visits by nurses were shown by research to be no longer appropriate or of any great benefit to the health of children. It was then decided to replace these arrangements with an enhanced immunisation programme with a greater medical input in a clinical environment for all school children up to school-leaving age. School nurses of course continue to work closely with other professionals such as the dental practitioners, the othoptist, the optometrist, through clinics which identify children with special health needs and they are always available to parents, carers and teachers for advice and indeed will visit schools when requested to do so.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 664 TO 677 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

When was this introduced?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

In 1998 there was this review of the service by the GHA.

**HON S E LINARES:**

When was it that the school nurses did not regularly go like they used to? When was it implemented? The Minister stated that it was looked at in 1998 but when was it



implemented? When was the last time that the school nurses regularly attended schools?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

In 1998, that was when the whole system as existed then was reviewed, and by that I understand that they reconsidered what they were providing and that they then decided and concluded that they would provide this on a wider context that I have actually explained in detail.

ORAL

**NO 678 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Can Government now state if they have now finally determined what equipment they will provide or fund for the Environment Agency to enable the latter to continually and properly monitor air quality in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 679 of 2004.

**NO 679 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**“BUCKET BRIGADE”**

Will the Government agree to provide any financial assistance to the Environmental Safety Group for the presentations and other activities scheduled by that charity and to be held in Gibraltar between 7-11 May this year by Mr Denny Larson of the "Bucket Brigade"?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

There is provision in this year's estimates for the Improvement and Development Fund for the acquisition of necessary and proper scientific equipment to monitor air quality in accordance with and as required by the Air Quality Directives. In answer to the hon Member's second question and as a result of my first reply, the Government do not consider it necessary or appropriate to provide funds for the "Bucket Brigade".

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 678 TO 679 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that answer. Can the Minister give an indication of what exactly it is that the equipment purchased will be?

**HON F VINET:**

What I can tell the Opposition Member is that the equipment will measure and monitor levels of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide and oxides of nitrogen particular matter, lead, carbon monoxide, benzene and ozone. The particular equipment he refers to, what is expected is that there will be two different monitoring stations. One will be at a roadside location on a major road and close to key power generation point sources, and a second smaller station away from the town area.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Minister whether that is in fact in keeping with the recommendations made in the report which the Chief Minister referred to in answer to Question No. 10

of 2004? Was there in fact a recommendation in that report that there should be two stations, one large station and one smaller station?

**HON F VINET:**

There is no need for two stations. In fact merely one station will suffice to meet the requirements of the European legislation as is mentioned locally as well.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister said in answer to Question No. 10 of 2004, which I put dealing with the same issue, that there is a report which Government are presently considering which raises many issues. Amongst them these issues precisely of that sort, and one of the different options, this is the unedited version of Hansard, is whether there should be just one monitoring station or a series of little monitoring points all over. The reason I am asking the Minister whether we are going to have a large and one small station and whether that was in the report, is because the answer given by the Chief Minister seemed to suggest either one main station, which covers all, or various small stations not just one small station. I would be grateful for some clarification in that respect.

**HON F VINET:**

As I have said, just that the one station would suffice for legal requirements. It was simply felt that we would add a second one, albeit a smaller one, to ensure that the readings are as accurate as possible.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That would be in keeping with the provisions of this report, or has the Minister not had sight of this report?

**HON F VINET:**

It would be in keeping with the report.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Thank you, that is what I wanted to establish.

ORAL

**NO 680 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WASTE DISPOSAL – TRANSACTION MANAGER**

Can Government state what is the latest position regarding the tenders for the disposal of waste and refuse by any process and whether a Transaction Manager has now been appointed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 681 of 2004.

**NO 681 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INCINERATOR**

Can Government state whether it is still their intention to build a new incinerator plant in Gibraltar and if so what site has been identified for this purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Yes it still continues to be the intention of the Government to do so. The location has not yet been finally decided, but will probably be the site of the current inoperative incinerator plant, and the project of course will go out to tender.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 680 TO 681 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think that was an answer to both Question No. 680 and No. 681.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Has the transaction manager now been appointed or not?

**HON F VINET:**

The reason why Government have chosen to reply to these questions together is the following. That is the intention to combine the incinerator with that of the proposed sewage treatment works, because the sludge that emanates for this sewage treatment works is likely to be incinerated at the incinerator. Therefore it makes practical and economic sense for both projects to be combined and of course for the Government to have to deal with just the one entity. Tenders for the appointment of a transaction manager to administer both these projects for Government were received some time ago. The Government decided to reduce the scope of the services to be provided by the transaction manager to that of the provision of specialist technical advice before preferred bidders were asked to resubmit their proposal for the revised scope of works. The revised proposals were received in late November and they send a report with recommendations and an award is currently receiving Government consideration.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister aware that the question of the burning of sludge effluent is something which causes considerable concerns to those who have better knowledge of the chemical issues involved. In particular because in Gibraltar our sewage runs with salt water whilst in most other parts of the European Union it runs with fresh water. Of course it makes a lot more sense in my view that it should run with salt water but that the burning of the sewage which has that salt water in it, can create I think carcinogens if the smoke is not properly treated and that should be something which should be very much at the top of the Government's agenda if consideration is being given to the burning of our sewage.

**HON F VINET:**

What I can tell the Opposition Member is that Government are aware of those views, but indeed there are varying opinions within the expert field and of course Government are aware of those opinions and will take them into account.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will Government agree to provide the Opposition with a copy of whatever opinion they have obtained which suggests that the burning of sewage which includes salt water will not create an escape into the ambient air of Gibraltar which has any dangerous carcinogens?

**HON F VINET:**

What I can give an undertaking to this House is that whatever measures are implemented will comply fully with the requirements contained in EU legislation as passed in Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I would not expect the Minister or anybody in this House to want to do anything which is not in compliance with legislation but if the Minister is telling the House that we are not to worry because there is an expert report, will he consider sharing that expert report with both sides of the House so that we can all be satisfied that an issue of public health such as that is being dealt with in a manner which is satisfactory?

**HON F VINET:**

At this stage the answer would be no.

**NO 682 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WASTE DISPOSAL – COLLECTION POINTS**

Can the Government state if they will agree to take action to avoid the unsightly accumulation of rubbish at open refuse collection points which attract rodents and other animals by providing for these collection points to be designed in a manner that will allow for rubbish to be deposited in closed receptacles?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government continue to operate the refuse collection points in accordance with the system designed and introduced by the GSLP when it was in government. There are no plans at present to change that system. The Government do, however, share the hon Member's apparent view that this is sometimes unsightly. Government have not been advised that a change is required due to rodents. However, if closed receptacles should be viable, have no adverse implications for the collection process and were impractical for users to deposit the rubbish in, the Government might consider such a system as an improvement on the present one.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 682 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister is not responsible for the manifesto commitments of his colleagues of 1996 but he has admitted in his answer that the system in place today for the collection of refuse is exactly the same as there was before 1996. In the 1996 manifesto of the GSD there was provision for changing the unsightly accumulation of rubbish at refuse collection points. In some areas of Gibraltar, in particular in the Upper Town and in areas beyond Catalan Bay, apes are being attracted to come down despite the rules on the non-feeding of apes, because they can access food in the refuse collection points. That in itself is attracting other animals et cetera because the apes are able to rip open plastic bags which other animals are not able to do. Can the Minister at least commit himself to look into this because I think it is important that for the general look of Gibraltar, in particular in the Upper Town when tourists come down from visiting the Upper Rock, it looks very unsightly and for the sake of all of us that live here I am sure it is not any good for the public health of any of his constituents or mine.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, first of all I should say that everybody is everybody's constituents, we do not have a constituency system and since he cannot be certain which citizen voted for him and which citizen voted for us then we should all regard the whole electorate as our constituents, but the Government basically agree with the sentiment expressed in his question and I think that was the intention of the answer. It is being considered. Whenever these things are replaced they are, wherever possible, replaced by the covered ones. There are operational considerations. The amount of space available for the refuse truck. Does it add to the time for emptying? Would that create traffic problems? The Government's policy is completely in accord with the view that he has expressed. In other words, it is preferable where it does not undermine the operational viability of the insertion and collection and carting away process, that these things should be covered up. Unsightliness, smell, all manner of reasons. So the answer to his question is yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Perhaps we can go even a step further. We are not just talking about the green bins which have lids which are covered. Those bins themselves are often in areas which are not covered. In other words instead of being in a building.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes but they are put in a bin.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I understand that and I appreciate that. Very often the bins are sufficient to keep the refuse in control so to speak.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know I think there are covers over the bin.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Right. There are some areas where those bins are located and they are not within buildings they are only in open areas where the monkeys gain access, open the bins, other animals cannot do it and the mess.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Those are only in places where there are monkeys.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will resist the quip that obviously flows from that. The mess, especially on Sunday evenings, is absolutely disastrous and obviously that in itself attracts other rodents. Perhaps the best solution is that I should liaise further with the Minister for the Environment and show him photographic evidence of what I mean so that we can perhaps together try and see what action can be taken to resolve it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We do not need photographic evidence of what he means. What he means is perfectly clear without the need for photographic evidence. We agree with him. All we are saying is that different central collection points lend themselves physically to different sorts of treatment and some of these collection points are in areas where they cannot be covered up, the egress, entrance and egress to them is necessarily constrained because of where they are located in relation to the highway. Indeed some of them are in areas where, there are some on Line Wall Road which are very unsightly. I agree with the hon Member. The Government's position is, unless there is a very good reason why these things cannot be put more out of sight or covered up, in whichever of the two ways he has described, that they should be, unless there is a very good reason why it cannot be. So by all means he should exchange ideas with the Minister. It is something that is in hand.

ORAL

**NO 683 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DUMPING OF RUBBLE**

Have Government now found an alternative site to the area next to the Caleta Hotel for the dumping of rubble?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government have not yet made a decision on an alternative site for the location of a rubble tip. Several sites remain under consideration including the area to the south of the Caleta Hotel.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 683 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The last time we discussed this issue I think the position was that the area next to the Caleta Hotel was actually the preferred site for dumping given the alternatives that the Government had. Is that still the position?

**HON F VINET:**

It continues to be one of the possible options but is not the preferred site.

ORAL

NO 684 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ORANGE BASTION**

Have Government now taken a decision to proceed with the Orange Bastion project?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

The Government will proceed with this project but no decision has been taken as to timing. It is not planned for the current financial year.

ORAL

**NO 685 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**FEASIBILITY STUDY – SEWAGE TREATMENT**

Can Government state whether the feasibility study on what is required to comply with EU requirements on sewage treatment has been completed and whether they propose to make the results of the study public?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 686 to 688 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 686 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE PLANT – TENDER**

Can Government state when they propose to go to tender for the proposed sewage treatment plant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 685, 687 and 688 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 687 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**SEWAGE PLANT – LOCATION**

Can Government state where they intend to locate the proposed sewage treatment plant?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question Nos. 685, 686 and 688 of 2004.

**NO 688 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE PLANT – COST**

Can Government explain their plans to invest 40 million euros in a sewage plant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

A number of studies have had to be undertaken to generate the necessary data for inclusion in the tender documents for the proposed sewage treatment works. An initial scoping study was undertaken and this provided cost estimates for the proposed works. The quoted figure reflects the possible order of cost for the overall project.

Additional studies have been undertaken in relation to this project, some of which have now been completed and others due for completion during the coming months. Until all such studies have been completed and Government have had the opportunity to consider its contents and assess the implications, they will not be in a position to proceed with this tender.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 685 TO 688 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister give a view as to when all these studies will be completed by?

**HON F VINET:**

I cannot give a definite date to the hon Member.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has a site been identified and is this something that requires a lot of space?



**HON F VINET:**

Government have considered a number of options. Of these the Brewery Crusher is considered the most suitable both from an initial construction point of view as well as from an operating perspective.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Although out of the Chamber I was able to hear the Minister's answer, can the Minister help me to reconcile his answer to me a moment ago that studies had been provided to the Government confirming to the Government that they could burn sewage, and that there would be no effect on the release of carcinogens into the air, with the answer to my hon Friend Mr Randall that those studies have not been completed. Are we talking about different studies?

**HON F VINET:**

No, what I said earlier on was that there are conflicting views among experts.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So those views do not form part of the studies that the Government are undertaking. Those views are just taken from other sources, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the hon Member may be misunderstanding the nature of the process. The Government are not designing this plant. The Government are now going out to tender for what is called a transaction manager for this plant. That transaction manager is to advise the Government on all of these issues. That is what the transaction management function is. There will then be a tender for the design and build of the plant. Different bidders will put in different processes of the design. The Government advised by their transaction manager then have to decide amongst the competing bids which process they wish to go for, taking into account a whole number of factors, costs, scientific nature of the process, all of them of course have to comply with EU directives on smoke emissions and all these things because that is part of the original tender specification. I get the impression from some of the hon Member's supplementaries, that he thinks that the Government have called for reports at this stage so that the Government themselves can make a decision on the process to be built and operated. That is not the procedure.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I appreciate that clarification because I was under that misapprehension. Maybe by misinterpreting of the answer as provided earlier, but in that case there has yet therefore been no decision to burn sewage, which certainly is an impression that I think would have been fair to take from the answer first given.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes I think the answer to the hon Member's question is yes, correct there has not yet been a decision on that because there has not yet been a decision on anything, but the disposal of residue, all of these processes, all of these treatment and disposal processes produce a residue. One cannot destroy matter, it can be reduced to another form, it can be converted into another form, it could be gaseous or it could be solid, in fact most of them can almost always produce both. One always ends up with a solid residue, usually slag or fly ash or something of that sort, and the process, the refuse incineration and treatment process has always as its final phase what is the methodology for disposal of the residue in whatever form, and that is one of the issues that is taken into account when assessing. Let me tell the hon Member that the issue of disposing of such residues in Gibraltar is a complicated one because there is only one place that they can easily go. There are problems with the disposal of fly ash and other products of grit blasting in the Cammell Laird yard, it is generally a problematic area, but yes it forms an essential part (a) of the design of the process and (b) of the Government's eventual assessment of which process to select and authorise the construction of as to what is the residue that is created and what are the proposals for the disposal of that refuse as it is produced through the operation of the plant.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In part of that answer there was a reference to refuse, is one of the options then a combined sewage treatment and refuse disposal?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As to disposal of residue, yes, that is one of the options that is being considered because the residue disposal, in other words, there are only two things one can do with the sort of residue that results from either of these processes, either it is exported or it is used for the manufacture of something in Gibraltar. None of these residues by the time they have come out of the processes can be used for building brick block works and things of that sort. There is an intention to explore during this process that I have been describing, this contractual process, to tie up at least the disposal of residue part in both plants. It would not be logical to have an infrastructure in place to dispose or export the residue from one plant and a problem or a completely different process for the disposal of the other. So at the very least in respect of how one deals with the residue of the process, yes, the answer to the question is yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was not thinking of the residue I was thinking of the actual incinerator process that is being looked at for refuse.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is an option which will be kept opened throughout the tendering process that the same operator could build and operate both plants given the synergies that there will be in terms of fuel use, in terms of personnel, technical the sort of person that one

needs to employ, the disposal of refuse issues, the financing issues if we decided to go down a clear route. There may be a case for having it both together, but the tendering process will be structured in a way that we get the prices on both so that we can then decide whether it is better value for them to be done by separate operators or by the same operator in one transaction.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a deadline on the sewage plant?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes it is a deadline that neither Gibraltar nor most of the Campo area, nor indeed most of southern Spain will comply with. The deadline I think is some time in 2005, yes December 2005, our plant will not be ready and of course Algeciras which is accountable for the majority of residue into the Bay, being a much larger city than ours, has not even got as far as we have got in terms of the technical preparatory work that we have done and the EU tendering for a transaction manager which is almost ready to go and that sort of thing. So we will be ready. Los Barrios has got a degree of urban waste water treatment in place already. Algeciras I think treats the residue produced by 10,000 people only, the bulk of Algeciras remains untreated. La Linea has recently built in the Carretera del Higuero or whatever its formal name is, the urban waste water treatment plant that is there, but the rest of the Campo have got no treatment at all and we will probably be next on line. I mean La Linea is there, Los Barrios has got it, we will probably be next. The next to have a plant actually up and operational.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is one of the synergies between the two plants location, in other words, will both plants most likely be in the same place?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I think that has been looked at and the Brewery Crusher does not have, there is not enough room in the Brewery Crusher for both sites, but they are not far away. If one can imagine the geography the Brewery Crusher and the site of the existing incinerator really are separated only by a short length of that road.

ORAL

NO 689 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state whether all the employees of the Electricity Department have now been transferred to the Electricity Authority?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Yes Sir.

**ORAL**

**NO 690 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**CEMETERY**

Can Government state whether they have now awarded the contract for a programme of on-going embellishment, up-keep and maintenance of the cemetery, and if so, to which company and on what terms?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

There is no specific on-going embellishment scheme but Government have been looking at various options that will enhance the state of the cemetery and in this context undertook a trial project involving two companies dealing with the aspect of vegetation. The results of these trials are currently being considered but in the light of various difficulties that were encountered during their execution, Government have embarked on considering other options that would be more cost effective and result in a greater impact on the enhancement of the cemetery.

ORAL

**NO 691 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DUDLEY WARD TUNNEL**

Can Government state whether there has been any progress with regard to their assessment of the full viability of their preferred option for the remedial works that will enable the reopening of Dudley Ward Tunnel for vehicular traffic

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 691 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is the process still on-going and has a date been set by which a decision will be reached?

**HON F VINET:**

The process is still on-going, no date has been fixed.

ORAL

**NO 692 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS – RESURFACING**

Can Government state what areas of Gibraltar's public highways they plan to resurface during the course of the quarter ending 30th June 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 693 and 694 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 693 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS – RESURFACING**

Can Government state what areas of Gibraltar's public highways they plan to resurface during the course of the quarter ending 30 September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 692 and 694 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 694 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS – RESURFACING**

Can Government state what areas of Gibraltar's public highways they plan to resurface during the course of the quarter ending 31 December 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

The programme has not yet been decided.

**NO 695 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DISABLED PARKING BAYS**

Can Government provide the reason why parking on some of the bays reserved for disabled drivers are restricted to 12 hours a day?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The restriction of 12 hours has been imposed on those disabled bays that have been requested by users specifically for work related purposes. Such users do not reside within the said areas and will therefore not be making use of such bays outside working hours. This arrangement of course maximises the availability of parking in such areas.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 695 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I have been approached by a number of people who have asked me whether the hours in the parking bays next to Casino Calpe can be extended to 24 hours a day as opposed to the 12 hours a day they apparently used. That is an area which services the whole of the Main Street and people normally, people who are disabled are disabled 24 hours a day and not 12 hours a day, so when they want to access that area disability parkings are not many and that could be of great benefit to these disabled people.

**HON F VINET:**

That is a matter for the Traffic Commission to consider and I would urge the hon Member to advise the persons affected to write to the Secretary of the Traffic Commission.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I have written to the Traffic Commission on their behalf and have yet to receive an answer. Will the Minister undertake to look at this and if possible extend parking

hours in those two or three particular parking bays to 24 hours as opposed to 12 hours?

**HON F VINET:**

I will certainly agree to look into it. I can give no undertaking but having said that, I am sure, the Secretary of the Traffic Commission will be replying to the persons concerned in due course.

ORAL

**NO 696 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD – CASUAL WORKERS**

Can Government give a monthly breakdown of vacancies for casual workers opened with the Employment Agency by Cammell Laird or alternatively in the shipping industry for the month of January 2004 giving a breakdown of how many of these have been filled by Gibraltarians?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 697 and 698 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 697 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD – CASUAL WORKERS**

Can Government give a monthly breakdown of vacancies for casual workers opened with the Employment Agency by Cammell Laird or alternatively in the shipping industry for the month of February 2004 giving a breakdown of how many of these have been filled by Gibraltarians?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 696 and 698 of 2004.

**NO 698 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD – CASUAL WORKERS**

Can Government give a monthly breakdown of vacancies for casual workers opened with the Employment Agency by Cammell Laird or alternatively in the shipping industry for the month of March 2004 giving a breakdown of how many of these have been filled by Gibraltarians?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Seventeen vacancies were opened for casual workers in the shipping industry in January 2004, of which nine were filled by Gibraltarians. In February two vacancies were opened for casual workers in the shipping industry, of which one was filled by a Gibraltarian. In March 16 vacancies were opened in the shipping industry, of which four were filled by Gibraltarians.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 696 TO 698 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

As a matter of interest how many of these were in the Cammell Laird training centre? That were in the training centre and actually were employed.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Gibraltarians. I would require notice of that.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Okay.

ORAL

**NO 699 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC EMPLOYERS INSOLVENCY FUND**

Can Government give a breakdown of miscellaneous payments of £55,579.72 from the Gibraltar Development Corporation (Employers Insolvency Fund) for the year ended 31st March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 700 of 2004.

**NO 700 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC – EMPLOYERS INSOLVENCY FUND**

Can Government state when the Gibraltar Development Corporation (Employers Insolvency Fund) was established and what was the source of the miscellaneous receipts of £2,085,247.74 for the year ended 31st March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Gibraltar Development Corporation (Employers Insolvency Fund) was established on 22 August 1991. Miscellaneous receipts for the financial year amounted to £315,078.66 and not £2,085,247.74. These receipts are in respect of the employer's contribution to the fund under the Gibraltar Development Corporation (Employers Insolvency) Regulations 1991. The expenditure of the Gibraltar Development Corporation (Employers Insolvency Fund) for the year ended 31 March 2003 was £49,192.52 and not £55,579.72. This amount is composed of claims made by employees under the provisions of Regulation 7 of the Gibraltar Development Corporation (Employers Insolvency) Regulations 1991.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 699 AND 700 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say how many employees were involved in the payment of the £49,000, and how many employers?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Six employers were involved, but I do not have the number of employees.

-----  
**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When I asked the question on the Insolvency Funds I was told that the receipts were not £2,085,247.74 when in fact that was the figure I was given in answer to Question No. 482 in January, that is where I got it from.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I thought that the wording of this Question was ambiguous, what was the number of today's Question?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In Question No. 700 I asked can Government state when it was established and what was the source of the miscellaneous receipts of £2,085,247.74 for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, now the word 'for' in the question he presumably means as at. In other words two point something million is the balance of the Fund not the receipt during any particular period.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Then all I can say is that I did not put the 'for' there, I copied the 'for' from here, which was the answer that I got to Question No. 482, where in reply to my question about what was the forecast for the outturn of the Gibraltar Development Corporation, the Chief Minister said to me that for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March there were miscellaneous receipts for £2,085,247.74, so he put 'for' in the answer and I put 'for' in the question. The question is copied from the answer that I got from the Chief Minister.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am sure the answer can not have confused the hon Member. He presumably knows that that is not the level of receipts to be expected from that source in that period.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I thought perhaps, that is why I asked when it was established, I thought maybe the Fund was established that year and that money was somewhere else before. That is not the case? That is the impression I got.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am sure it is not the case, and if it were the case the last answer would have disclosed this.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the answer the Minister said the receipts were not that and in Question No. 482 I was told those were the receipts, and equally in respect of the expenditure, the

Minister has told us today that the expenditure was not £55,572 but £49,192. Of course the figure of expenditure I was getting from the reply that I received for the same, payments in that same sheet it says payments £55,579.72. Now, we have just been told today that the figure that I had quoted in my question, which was the reply that I got in January, is wrong, so I take it that these answers are wrong then.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have uncited with the papers of the previous answers but on the basis of what I am hearing from the earlier answers, yes, the earlier answers must be wrong. In any case the Minister will no doubt clarify the matter later.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The account that was given with Question 482 made me think that the Fund was established in the financial year 2002/2003, it says that the balance on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002 was zero. I am happy that the Minister should have a look at this but it says on 1<sup>st</sup> April there was no money in the Fund and at the end of March there was £2,067,000 and the receipts for the year were £2,085,00. So in fact this was indicative that the GDC Employers Insolvency Fund was created after 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002 or at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002 and not on the date that we have been given in the answer today.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, in which case the answer may be the reverse. I remember there was a time that these contributions were held through a deposit account and it may be that the Accountant General has made it, it is an accounting arrangement on which I have not been consulted. It sounds, from what the hon Member is saying, that the £2 million is not the receipts of a year but the capital transfer from one holding arrangement into what might have been a new fund that year. That is a possible explanation and I will have it looked into and I will write to the hon Member to confirm. Can the hon Member just give me the first answer, was it 482?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer is the answer being provided to my Question No. 482, sorry 481, 482 is the Social Assistance Fund, 481 is the Development Corporation. Question No. 481 was answered together with Question No. 482, but the figures that I am quoting read at the top of Question No. 482 but really are the answers to Question No. 481.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It may be then that that is the year in which the deposit account holding arrangements were changed in favour of this Fund and I will have that confirmed to the hon Member.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Then it means that the date given today for the creation of the Fund, that the Minister said was 1991, was not correct.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

1991, I will check all that. It may be that the answer is that August 1991 is when the insolvency deposit, in other words the liability for employers to contribute for insolvency and that this was just being looked at as a book keeping and accounting arrangement in the Treasury, and they are assuming that the hon Member is not interested in the name of the vehicle that holds the money but rather in these arrangements. I think the answer is drafted on the basis. It glosses over the changes in holding structure and I will have it all clarified and write to him later.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Also will the Chief Minister clear the discrepancy between the £49,192 which we are being told today have been the payments and what the accounts that I was provided with in January showed, which was a figure of £55,579 as the payments made?

ORAL

NO 701 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

Can Government state how many contracts were registered with the ETB at 30 June 2003 with a rate of pay of less than £4.00 per hour?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Answered together with Question Nos. 702, 703 and 704 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 702 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

Can Government state whether any new contracts have been registered with the ETB with a rate of pay of less than £4.00 per hour, since the 1 July 2003, and if so, give a breakdown of the numbers per month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 701, 703 and 704 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 703 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

Can Government state of the contracts registered as at 30 June 2003 with an hourly rate of pay below £4.00, how many were increased to or above this hourly rate and give a breakdown of numbers each month notifying such increases?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 701, 702 and 704 of 2004.

**NO 704 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT – MINIMUM WAGE**

Can Government state what steps have been taken by the ETB to ensure compliance with the statutory minimum wage since 1st July 2003 and specify the number of employees and employers affected by such action with a breakdown by month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The information requested by the hon Member is not readily available, as it would require an individual file by file search. I am given to understand that this is not feasible. As regards the steps that have been taken by the Employment Service to ensure compliance with the statutory minimum wage since 1<sup>st</sup> July 2003, the £4.00, let me assure the hon Member that these are no more and no less than the Employment Service takes to ensure compliance with all the other statutory provisions in relation to employment, be it in respect of pay as in this case, holidays, sick leave and any such other conditions of employment for which there exists statutory regulation provision. I am informed that such has been the case, as indeed it could not be otherwise given the statutory nature of the issue, since the Employment Service was set up originally as the Employment and Training Board in the late 1980s.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 701 TO 704 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the Minister surely accepts that if a new statutory wage is introduced it is not quite the same as checking that the statutory holidays that have been there for the last 50 years have been complied with. Is something not done for example, to make sure when the wage comes in that something actually happens?

**DR B A LINARES:**

Yes indeed, I am informed that there is a processed procedure when the employment contract is given notice. They are not approved as such, what happens is that the employer is advised whether he is not complying with the statutory minimum wage or any other factor involved, and if the chap is actually adamant and refuses to comply

with a variation notice, there is a set form for a variation notice, then of course the matter is passed on to the Labour Inspectorate to put pressure that the Regulations and the Statutes have to be complied with. If it is still recalcitrant then of course the matter will be taken over in terms of prosecution through the Attorney General. So these are the steps which are taken in practical terms, that is not waffle that is actually operational. I am told actually that in almost 100 per cent of cases in the very start of the process, when the employer is innocent really in terms of not having knowledge of the increase in the minimum wage, that situation is put right, right from the very start.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, I know that the ETB would not, it is obvious that they would not approve a contract they should not approve and I would not expect them not to approve a contract which is below the minimum wage laid down by law. What I am trying to see is what evidence is available of the impact of the introduction of the new rate. How many people benefited from the new rate, or how many employers? If the new rate comes in on 1<sup>st</sup> July, then on the basis of the answers that I have been given by the Minister, we have no knowledge at all of what the effect of that new rate was as to the number of people who were below that rate in June, and the number of people who were at or above it from July on. Surely the Minister will also agree that in a case like this it may well be that some employers who were paying less than £4.00 did not raise the rate, not because they were resisting the change but because it did not come to their notice or the employees did not press them for it or nobody made them do it or whatever. So it was an attempt really to see how many people had been affected by the rate when it came in, that the questions were seeking to find out.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have not been able to give numbers but what I am satisfied is that definitely there is a thrust in the Employment Service to actually inform the employers, who very innocently often do not know and have not caught up with the changes in the statutory requirements. They are optimistic that a lot of them, and they have variation notices coming in, but I apologise for I would really have to go through file after file, but that globally and in general terms the Employment Service officials feel that the great majority of employers have come up to compliance with the new Regulations. They are aware the whole thing has been very public and in their contacts with them through the Labour Inspectorate with employers, they feel very optimistic that I think there are very few. Unions are also very often involved and they bring notice to the Employment Services, in particular employers who are not coming up to requirements. I hope that satisfies the hon Member.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it this information is not being computerised and is not something that can be extracted from the computer.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

We are not entirely computerised as I would wish.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it that in one of the answers to the supplementaries what the Minister was confirming is that in fact no contract has been accepted since 1<sup>st</sup> July unless it was £4.00 or more, is that correct?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes indeed.

ORAL

**NO 705 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the month of January 2004 were registered with the Employment Agency as unemployed giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 706 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 706 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the month of February 2004 were registered with the Employment Agency as unemployed giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 and 707 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 707 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the month of March 2004 were registered with the Employment Agency as unemployed giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705, 706 and 708 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 708 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency in the month of January 2004 were registered as looking for part-time jobs giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 707 and 709 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 709 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency in the month of February 2004 were registered as looking for part-time jobs giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 708 and 710 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 710 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency in the month of March 2004 were registered as looking for part-time jobs giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 709 and 711 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 711 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during the month of January 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 710 and 712 to 719 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 712 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during the month of February 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 711 and 713 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 713 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during the month of March 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 712 and 714 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 714 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the month of January 2004 were registered with the Employment Agency giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 713 and 715 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 715 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the month of February 2004 were registered with the Employment Agency giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 714 and 716 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 716 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the month of March 2004 were registered with the Employment Agency giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 715 and 717 to 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 717 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYMENT REGISTER**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during the month of January 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 716 and 718 and 719 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 718 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYMENT REGISTER**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during the month of February 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 705 to 717 and 719 of 2004.

**NO 719 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYMENT REGISTER**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during the month of March 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to him. May I point out with respect, and also for the purpose of Hansard, that Question Nos. 714 to 716 are duplicated as Question Nos. 705 and 707, they are exactly the same. Similarly, Question Nos. 717 to 719 are the same as Question Nos. 711 and 713.



**Answer to Question 719 of 2004.**

The number of Gibraltarians that were added to the unemployment register during the months of January, February and March of 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex is as follows:

| <b>January</b>       | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 10          | 11            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 30          | 20            |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 59          | 45            |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>99</b>   | <b>76</b>     |

| <b>February</b>      | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 5           | 3             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 38          | 15            |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 39          | 26            |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>82</b>   | <b>44</b>     |

| <b>March</b>         | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 3           | 6             |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 28          | 11            |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 31          | 26            |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>62</b>   | <b>43</b>     |

The number of Gibraltarians employed in the months of January, February and March of 2004, who were registered with the Employment Agency given a breakdown by age and sex is as follows:

| <b>January</b>       | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 4           | 2             | 6            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 15          | 5             | 20           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 15          | 22            | 37           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>34</b>   | <b>29</b>     | <b>63</b>    |

| <b>February</b>      | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 1           | 0             | 1            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 12          | 7             | 19           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 19          | 5             | 24           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>32</b>   | <b>12</b>     | <b>44</b>    |

| <b>March</b>         | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 1           | 1             | 2            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 20          | 11            | 31           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 19          | 9             | 28           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>40</b>   | <b>21</b>     | <b>61</b>    |

Contd...

**Contd Answers to Question 719 of 2004**

The number of Gibraltarians registered as unemployed with the Employment Service in the months of January, February and March 2004 as looking for part-time employment is as follows:

| <b>January</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>    | 0           | 0             | 0            |
| <b>18-24</b>       | 0           | 3             | 3            |
| <b>25 and over</b> | 2           | 21            | 23           |
|                    | <b>2</b>    | <b>24</b>     | <b>26</b>    |

| <b>February</b>    | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>    | 0           | 0             | 0            |
| <b>18-24</b>       | 0           | 3             | 3            |
| <b>25 and over</b> | 2           | 21            | 23           |
|                    | <b>2</b>    | <b>24</b>     | <b>26</b>    |

| <b>March</b>       | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>    | 0           | 0             | 0            |
| <b>18-24</b>       | 0           | 2             | 2            |
| <b>25 and over</b> | 0           | 21            | 21           |
|                    | <b>0</b>    | <b>23</b>     | <b>23</b>    |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 705 TO 719 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful, I think I was realising as I read them that they seemed to be identical. I am grateful.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

If I may point out, I do not want to be pedantic, but the correct nomenclature is no longer the Employment Agency or the Employment Training Board, but the Employment Service.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I note actually that the words 'Employment Agency' have also been used in the schedule passed to me, so it is obviously a mistake which we share.

ORAL

**NO 720 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the month of January 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Question withdrawn.

ORAL

**NO 721 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the month of February 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Question withdrawn.

ORAL

**NO 722 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the month of March 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Question withdrawn.

**NO 723 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the month of January 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 720 to 722 and 724 to 734 of 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 720 TO 723 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just say that I note that that appears to be a repetition of Question No. 720, that it appears that in respect of my some of my Questions Government have both the questions I submitted and the photocopy that I made of them.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It seems that the hon Member's party photocopying machine is getting to the quantity rather than quality amount of work. This is what happens when too many questions are asked and even the photocopy machine gets.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Mr Speaker, do you wish me to ask those questions which are the same or just treat them as withdrawn? Well, 723, 724 and 725 are the same as 720, 721 and 722.

**MR SPEAKER:**

All right, withdrawn.

ORAL

**NO 724 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the month of February 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 and 725 to 734 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 725 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the month of March 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723, 724 and 726 to 734 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 726 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – CONTRACTS TERMINATED**

Can Government give details of the number of employment contracts terminated in the month of January 2004, giving a breakdown by nationality and industry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 to 725 and 727 to 734 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 727 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – CONTRACTS TERMINATED**

Can Government give details of the number of employment contracts terminated in the month of February 2004, giving a breakdown by nationality and industry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 to 726 and 728 to 734 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 728 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – CONTRACTS TERMINATED**

Can Government give details of the number of employment contracts terminated in the month of March 2004, giving a breakdown by nationality and industry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 to 727 and 729 to 734 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 729 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – VACANCIES FILLED**

Can Government state of the vacancies filled in the month of January 2004 how many were for part-time employment giving a breakdown by sex as follows:-

- (a) Gibraltarians; and
- (b) Other nationals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 to 728 and 730 to 734 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 730 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – VACANCIES FILLED**

Can Government state of the vacancies filled in the month of February 2004 how many were for part-time employment giving a breakdown by sex as follows:-

- (a) Gibraltarians; and
- (b) Other nationals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 to 729 and 731 to 734 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 731 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – VACANCIES FILLED**

Can Government state of the vacancies filled in the month of March 2004 how many were for part-time employment giving a breakdown by sex as follows:-

- (a) Gibraltarians; and
- (b) Other nationals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 to 730 and 732 to 734 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 732 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT**

Can Government state how many Terms of Engagement were registered with the Employment Agency in the month of January 2004 -

- (a) including directors; and
- (b) excluding directors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 to 731, 733 and 734 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 733 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT**

Can Government state how many Terms of Engagement were registered with the Employment Agency in the month of February 2004 -

- (a) including directors; and
- (b) excluding directors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 723 to 732 and 734 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 734 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT**

Can Government state how many Terms of Engagement were registered with the Employment Agency in the month of March 2004 -

- (a) including directors; and
- (b) excluding directors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to him.

**Contd Answer to Question 734 of 2004**

Part time vacancies filled.

| <b>Gibraltarians</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>Other</b>    | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>January</b>       | 9           | 23            | <b>32</b>    | <b>January</b>  | 11          | 42            | <b>53</b>    |
| <b>February</b>      | 10          | 11            | <b>21</b>    | <b>February</b> | 23          | 23            | <b>46</b>    |
| <b>March</b>         | 14          | 31            | <b>45</b>    | <b>March</b>    | 16          | 34            | <b>50</b>    |

The number of work permits issued in the months of January to March 2004.

| <b>January</b>   | <b>Bulg.</b> |          | <b>Indian</b> |          | <b>Korean</b> |          | <b>Israeli</b> |          | <b>Antig.</b> |          | <b>Moroc.</b> |          | <b>Venez.</b> |          | <b>Cypr.</b> |          |
|------------------|--------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|----------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|--------------|----------|
|                  | <b>M</b>     | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>      | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>      | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>       | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>      | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>      | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>      | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>     | <b>F</b> |
| <b>Manag.</b>    |              |          | 4             |          |               |          |                |          |               |          |               |          |               |          |              |          |
| <b>Prof.</b>     |              |          | 2             |          |               |          |                |          |               |          |               |          | 1             |          | 1            |          |
| <b>Ass. Prof</b> |              |          |               |          |               |          |                |          |               |          |               |          |               |          |              |          |
| <b>Admin</b>     |              |          |               |          |               |          | 1              |          |               |          |               |          |               |          |              |          |
| <b>Skilled</b>   | 1            |          |               |          |               |          |                |          |               |          |               |          |               |          |              |          |
| <b>Personal</b>  |              |          |               |          |               |          |                |          |               |          |               |          |               |          |              |          |
| <b>Sales</b>     |              |          |               |          | 1             | 3        | 1              |          | 1             | 1        | 1             |          |               |          |              |          |
| <b>Plant</b>     |              |          |               |          |               |          |                |          |               |          |               |          |               |          |              |          |
| <b>Element</b>   |              |          |               |          |               |          |                |          |               |          |               |          |               |          |              |          |

| <b>February</b>  | <b>Cyprus</b> |          | <b>Moroccan</b> |          | <b>Israeli</b> |          | <b>Polish</b> |          | <b>Yugoslavian</b> |          |
|------------------|---------------|----------|-----------------|----------|----------------|----------|---------------|----------|--------------------|----------|
|                  | <b>M</b>      | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>        | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>       | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>      | <b>F</b> | <b>M</b>           | <b>F</b> |
| <b>Manag.</b>    |               |          |                 |          |                |          |               |          |                    |          |
| <b>Prof.</b>     | 1             |          |                 |          |                |          |               |          |                    |          |
| <b>Ass. Prof</b> |               |          |                 |          |                |          |               |          |                    |          |
| <b>Admin</b>     |               |          |                 |          |                |          |               |          | 1                  |          |
| <b>Skilled</b>   | 8             |          |                 |          |                |          | 13            |          |                    |          |
| <b>Personal</b>  |               |          |                 |          |                |          |               |          |                    |          |
| <b>Sales</b>     |               |          |                 |          | 1              |          |               |          |                    |          |
| <b>Plant</b>     |               |          |                 |          |                |          |               |          |                    |          |
| <b>Element</b>   |               |          | 1               |          |                |          |               |          |                    |          |

Contd...

Contd Answer to Question 734 of 2004

| March      | Moroccans |   | American |   | Mexican |   | Bulg. |   | Hong Kongese |   |
|------------|-----------|---|----------|---|---------|---|-------|---|--------------|---|
|            | M         | F | M        | F | M       | F | M     | F | M            | F |
| Manag.     |           |   |          |   |         |   |       |   |              |   |
| Prof.      |           |   | 1        |   |         |   |       |   |              |   |
| Ass. Prof. |           |   |          |   |         |   |       |   |              |   |
| Admin      |           |   |          |   |         |   |       |   |              |   |
| Skilled    | 1         |   |          |   | 1       |   |       |   |              |   |
| Personal   |           |   |          | 1 |         |   |       |   |              |   |
| Sales      |           |   |          |   |         |   |       |   |              | 1 |
| Plant      |           |   |          |   |         |   |       |   |              |   |
| Element    |           |   |          |   |         |   |       | 1 |              |   |

The number of Terms of Engagements that were registered with the Employment Service for the months of January, February and March of 2004, including directors and excluding directors is as follows:

|                            | January | February | March |
|----------------------------|---------|----------|-------|
| <b>Including Directors</b> | 19658   | 19764    | 19865 |
| <b>Excluding Directors</b> | 17786   | 17898    | 18008 |

**Answer to Question 734 of 2004**

The number of employment contacts terminated in January 2004

| Industry                          | Gibraltar  | Other Brit | Spanish   | Moroccan | Other EEC | Other Non-EEC | Total      |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 9          |            |           |          | 1         |               | 10         |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    |            |            | 2         | 1        |           |               | 3          |
| Printing & publishing             | 4          | 2          |           |          |           |               | 6          |
| M/F n.e.c (Clothing, etc)         | 2          |            |           |          |           |               | 2          |
| Buildng & Construction            | 13         | 19         | 27        | 1        | 2         | 14            | 76         |
| Electricity Supply                | 1          |            |           |          |           |               | 1          |
| Water Supply                      |            |            |           |          |           |               |            |
| Sea transport / shipping svcs     | 3          |            | 2         | 1        | 1         | 1             | 8          |
| Port & Services                   |            |            |           |          |           |               |            |
| Road transport & related svc      | 2          |            |           |          |           |               | 2          |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 3          |            |           |          |           |               | 3          |
| Air transport & related svc       | 4          |            | 1         |          |           |               | 5          |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 6          | 1          | 2         |          |           |               | 9          |
| W/sale-fuel                       |            | 1          |           |          |           |               | 1          |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 2          |            | 1         |          |           |               | 3          |
| Retail Food                       | 10         | 6          | 7         |          |           |               | 23         |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 2          | 1          | 1         |          |           |               | 4          |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         | 8          |            | 3         |          |           |               | 11         |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 3          | 1          | 2         |          |           |               | 6          |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 9          |            | 10        |          |           | 1             | 20         |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 3          | 2          | 2         | 1        |           |               | 8          |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 2          | 3          | 13        | 2        | 4         |               | 24         |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 1          | 3          | 2         |          |           |               | 6          |
| Tourist svcs n.e.c.. (inc Casino) | 4          | 1          | 2         |          |           |               | 7          |
| Banking & finance                 | 8          | 4          |           |          | 1         |               | 13         |
| Insurance & Real Estate           | 4          | 4          |           |          |           |               | 8          |
| Legal, account, oth bus. Svcs     | 19         | 8          | 4         |          | 1         |               | 32         |
| Public admin                      | 14         |            |           |          |           |               | 14         |
| Educa Services                    | 1          |            |           |          |           |               | 1          |
| Medical/ health services          | 4          | 2          | 5         |          |           | 1             | 12         |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   | 3          | 3          | 1         |          |           |               | 7          |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 11         | 7          | 1         |          | 1         | 3             | 23         |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 3          | 3          |           |          |           |               | 6          |
| Police / Fire Services            | 5          |            |           |          |           |               | 5          |
| Defence                           | 6          | 1          |           | 1        |           |               | 8          |
| Sanitary Services                 |            |            |           |          |           |               |            |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 7          | 4          | 11        | 3        | 1         |               | 26         |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>163</b> | <b>71</b>  | <b>88</b> | <b>6</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>20</b>     | <b>359</b> |

Contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 734 of 2004**

The number of contracts terminated in February 2004

| Industry                          | Gibraltar  | Other Brit | Spanish    | Moroccan  | Other EEC | Other Non-EEC | Total      |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 9          | 3          | 5          | 3         | 0         | 0             | 20         |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    | 1          | 0          | 3          | 1         | 0         | 0             | 5          |
| Printing & publishing             | 1          | 1          |            | 0         | 0         | 0             | 2          |
| M/F n.e.c (Clothing, etc)         | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Buidling & Construction           | 12         | 16         | 49         | 2         | 3         | 1             | 83         |
| Electricity Supply                | 1          | 0          | 1          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 2          |
| Water Supply                      | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Sea transport / Shipping Svs      | 4          | 4          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 8          |
| Port & Services                   | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Road transport & related Svs      | 2          | 2          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 4          |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Air Transport & related Svc       | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 4          | 0          | 0          | 1         | 0         | 0             | 5          |
| W/sale-fuel                       | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 3          | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 4          |
| Retail Food                       | 3          | 2          | 4          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 9          |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 0          | 0          | 0          | 1         | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         | 0          | 3          | 4          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 7          |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 1          | 3          | 6          | 0         | 0         | 1             | 11         |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 4          | 0          | 4          | 1         | 0         | 1             | 10         |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 2          | 3          | 3          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 8          |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 4          | 11         | 8          | 2         | 0         | 0             | 25         |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 0          | 9          | 3          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 12         |
| Tourist svs n.e.c.. (inc Casino)  | 5          | 4          |            | 0         | 0         | 0             | 9          |
| Banking & Finance                 | 13         | 1          | 2          | 0         | 2         | 0             | 18         |
| Insurance& Real Estate            | 5          | 0          | 3          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 8          |
| Legal, account, oth bus. Svs      | 11         | 5          | 2          | 0         | 0         | 1             | 19         |
| Public admin                      | 14         | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 14         |
| Educa Services                    | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Medical/ health services          | 0          | 0          | 3          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 3          |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 10         | 12         | 1          | 1         | 4         | 2             | 30         |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 2          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 2          |
| Police / Fire Services            | 3          | 3          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 6          |
| Defence                           | 4          | 1          | 0          | 1         | 0         | 0             | 6          |
| Sanitary Services                 | 1          | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 30         | 17         | 11         | 2         | 2         | 1             | 63         |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>151</b> | <b>101</b> | <b>112</b> | <b>15</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>7</b>      | <b>397</b> |

Contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 734 of 2004**

The number of contracts terminated in March 2004

| Industry                          | Gibraltar  | Other Brit | Spanish   | Moroccan | Other EEC | Other Non-EEC | Total      |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 2          | 0          | 2         | 1        | 0         | 0             | 5          |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    | 0          | 0          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Printing & publishing             | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| M/F n.e.c (Clothing, etc)         | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Buidling & Construction           | 12         | 18         | 30        | 2        | 5         | 1             | 68         |
| Electricity Supply                | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Water Supply                      | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Sea transport / Shipping Svcs     | 3          | 1          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 4          |
| Port & Services                   | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Road Transport & related Svc      | 0          | 0          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Air Transport & Related Service   | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 1          | 0          | 1         | 0        | 1         | 0             | 3          |
| W/sale-fuel                       | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 3          | 1          | 1         | 0        | 1         | 0             | 6          |
| Retail Food                       | 9          | 1          | 3         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 13         |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         | 1          | 1          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 3          |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 0          | 5          | 10        | 0        | 0         | 0             | 15         |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 4          | 5          | 6         | 2        | 0         | 0             | 17         |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 5          | 2          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 8          |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 4          | 4          | 14        | 2        | 2         | 0             | 26         |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 0          | 3          | 3         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 6          |
| Tourist svcs n.e.c.. (inc Casino) | 6          | 1          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 8          |
| Banking & Finance                 | 2          | 1          | 2         | 0        | 0         | 2             | 7          |
| Insurance& Real Estate            | 2          | 2          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 4          |
| Legal, account, oth bus. services | 8          | 3          | 2         | 1        | 2         | 0             | 16         |
| Public admin                      | 11         | 0          | 0         | 1        | 0         | 0             | 12         |
| Educa Services                    | 2          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 2          |
| Medical/ health services          | 5          | 2          | 0         | 0        | 1         | 0             | 8          |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   | 5          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 5          |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 19         | 36         | 5         | 0        | 4         | 5             | 69         |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 2          | 2          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 4          |
| Police / Fire Services            | 7          | 3          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 11         |
| Defence                           | 5          | 1          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 6          |
| Sanitary Services                 | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 25         | 6          | 13        | 0        | 1         | 0             | 45         |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>149</b> | <b>98</b>  | <b>98</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>8</b>      | <b>379</b> |

Contd...

**Contd Answer to Question 734 of 2004**

The number of contracts terminated in March 2004

| Industry                          | Gibraltar  | Other Brit | Spanish   | Moroccan | Other EEC | Other Non-EEC | Total      |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 2          | 0          | 2         | 1        | 0         | 0             | 5          |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    | 0          | 0          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Printing & publishing             | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| M/F n.e.c (Clothing, etc)         | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Buidling & Construction           | 12         | 18         | 30        | 2        | 5         | 1             | 68         |
| Electricity Supply                | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Water Supply                      | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Sea transport / Shipping Svs      | 3          | 1          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 4          |
| Port & Services                   | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Road Transport & related Svc      | 0          | 0          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Air Transport & Related Service   | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 1          | 0          | 1         | 0        | 1         | 0             | 3          |
| W/sale-fuel                       | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 3          | 1          | 1         | 0        | 1         | 0             | 6          |
| Retail Food                       | 9          | 1          | 3         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 13         |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 1          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 1          |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         | 1          | 1          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 3          |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 0          | 5          | 10        | 0        | 0         | 0             | 15         |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 4          | 5          | 6         | 2        | 0         | 0             | 17         |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 5          | 2          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 8          |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 4          | 4          | 14        | 2        | 2         | 0             | 26         |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 0          | 3          | 3         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 6          |
| Tourist svs n.e.c.. (inc Casino)  | 6          | 1          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 8          |
| Banking & Finance                 | 2          | 1          | 2         | 0        | 0         | 2             | 7          |
| Insurance& Real Estate            | 2          | 2          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 4          |
| Legal, account, oth bus. services | 8          | 3          | 2         | 1        | 2         | 0             | 16         |
| Public admin                      | 11         | 0          | 0         | 1        | 0         | 0             | 12         |
| Educa Services                    | 2          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 2          |
| Medical/ health services          | 5          | 2          | 0         | 0        | 1         | 0             | 8          |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   | 5          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 5          |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 19         | 36         | 5         | 0        | 4         | 5             | 69         |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 2          | 2          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 4          |
| Police / Fire Services            | 7          | 3          | 1         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 11         |
| Defence                           | 5          | 1          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 6          |
| Sanitary Services                 | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0        | 0         | 0             | 0          |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 25         | 6          | 13        | 0        | 1         | 0             | 45         |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>149</b> | <b>98</b>  | <b>98</b> | <b>9</b> | <b>17</b> | <b>8</b>      | <b>379</b> |

Contd...



**Contd Answer to Question 734 of 2004**

Part time vacancies filled.

| Gibraltarians | Male | Female | Total |
|---------------|------|--------|-------|
| January       | 9    | 23     | 32    |
| February      | 10   | 11     | 21    |
| March         | 14   | 31     | 45    |

| Other    | Male | Female | Total |
|----------|------|--------|-------|
| January  | 11   | 42     | 53    |
| February | 23   | 23     | 46    |
| March    | 16   | 34     | 50    |

The number of work permits issued in the months of January to March 2004.

| January        | Bulgarian |   | Indian |   | Korean |   | Israeli |   | Antiguan |   | Moroccan |   | Venezuelan |   | Cypriot |   |  |
|----------------|-----------|---|--------|---|--------|---|---------|---|----------|---|----------|---|------------|---|---------|---|--|
|                | M         | F | M      | F | M      | F | M       | F | M        | F | M        | F | M          | F | M       | F |  |
| Managers       |           |   |        | 4 |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Professionals  |           |   |        | 2 |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Assoc. Prof.   |           |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Administrative |           |   |        |   |        |   | 1       |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Skilled        | 1         |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Personal       |           |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Sales          |           |   |        |   | 1      | 3 | 1       |   | 1        | 1 |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Plant Ops.     |           |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Elementary     |           |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |

| February       | Cypriot |   | Moroccan |   | Israeli |   | Polish |   | Yugoslavian |   |
|----------------|---------|---|----------|---|---------|---|--------|---|-------------|---|
|                | M       | F | M        | F | M       | F | M      | F | M           | F |
| Managers       |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Professionals  | 1       |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Assoc. Prof.   |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Administrative |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   | 1           |   |
| Skilled        | 8       |   |          |   |         |   | 13     |   |             |   |
| Personal       |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Sales          |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Plant Ops.     |         |   |          |   |         | 1 |        |   |             |   |
| Elementary     |         |   |          | 1 |         |   |        |   |             |   |

**Contd Answer to Question 734 of 2004**

| March          | Moroccans |   | Americans |   | Mexican |   | Bulgarian |   | Hong Kongese |   |
|----------------|-----------|---|-----------|---|---------|---|-----------|---|--------------|---|
|                | M         | F | M         | F | M       | F | M         | F | M            | F |
| Managers       |           |   |           |   |         |   |           |   |              |   |
| Professionals  |           |   | 1         |   |         |   |           |   |              |   |
| Assoc. Prof.   |           |   |           |   |         |   |           |   |              |   |
| Administrative |           |   |           |   |         |   |           |   |              |   |
| Skilled        | 1         |   |           |   | 1       |   |           |   |              |   |
| Personal       |           |   |           | 1 |         |   |           |   |              |   |
| Sales          |           |   |           |   |         |   |           |   |              | 1 |
| Plant Ops.     |           |   |           |   |         |   |           |   |              |   |
| Elementary     |           |   |           |   |         |   |           | 1 |              |   |

The number of Terms of Engagements that were registered with the Employment Service for the months of January, February and March of 2004, including directors and excluding directors is as follows:

|                     | January | February | March  |
|---------------------|---------|----------|--------|
| Including Directors | 19,658  | 19,764   | 19,865 |
| Excluding Directors | 17,786  | 17,898   | 18,008 |

**Contd Answer to Question 734 of 2004**

Part time vacancies filled.

| Gibraltarians | Male | Female | Total |
|---------------|------|--------|-------|
| January       | 9    | 23     | 32    |
| February      | 10   | 11     | 21    |
| March         | 14   | 31     | 45    |

| Other    | Male | Female | Total |
|----------|------|--------|-------|
| January  | 11   | 42     | 53    |
| February | 23   | 23     | 46    |
| March    | 16   | 34     | 50    |

The number of work permits issued in the months of January to March 2004.

| January        | Bulgarian |   | Indian |   | Korean |   | Israeli |   | Antiguan |   | Moroccan |   | Venezuelan |   | Cypriot |   |  |
|----------------|-----------|---|--------|---|--------|---|---------|---|----------|---|----------|---|------------|---|---------|---|--|
|                | M         | F | M      | F | M      | F | M       | F | M        | F | M        | F | M          | F | M       | F |  |
| Managers       |           |   | 4      |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Professionals  |           |   | 2      |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Assoc. Prof.   |           |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Administrative |           |   |        |   |        |   | 1       |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Skilled        | 1         |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Personal       |           |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Sales          |           |   |        |   | 1      | 3 | 1       |   | 1        | 1 |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Plant Ops.     |           |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |
| Elementary     |           |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |          |   |          |   |            |   |         |   |  |

| February       | Cypriot |   | Moroccan |   | Israeli |   | Polish |   | Yugoslavian |   |
|----------------|---------|---|----------|---|---------|---|--------|---|-------------|---|
|                | M       | F | M        | F | M       | F | M      | F | M           | F |
| Managers       |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Professionals  | 1       |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Assoc. Prof.   |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Administrative |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   | 1           |   |
| Skilled        | 8       |   |          |   |         |   | 13     |   |             |   |
| Personal       |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Sales          |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Plant Ops.     |         |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |
| Elementary     |         |   | 1        |   |         |   |        |   |             |   |

ORAL

**NO 735 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – DETACHED WORKERS**

Can Government state the number of workers that were registered with the Employment Agency as "Detached Workers" in the month of January 2004, giving a breakdown of their trade and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 736 and 737 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 736 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – DETACHED WORKERS**

Can Government state the number of workers that were registered with the Employment Agency as "Detached Workers" in the month of February 2004, giving a breakdown of their trade and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 735 and 737 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 737 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT - DETACHED WORKERS**

Can Government state the number of workers that were registered with the Employment Agency as "Detached Workers" in the month of March 2004, giving a breakdown of their trade and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 737 of 2004.**

'Detached Workers' registered with the Employment Service for the months of January, February and March of 2004.

| January                         | Bulgarian | Indian   | Other British | Spanish   | Other EEC |
|---------------------------------|-----------|----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Managerial</b>               |           |          |               |           |           |
| <b>Professional</b>             |           |          | 6             |           |           |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>   |           | 1        |               |           |           |
| <b>Administrative</b>           |           |          |               |           |           |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>           | 26        |          |               | 60        | 9         |
| <b>Personal Services</b>        |           |          |               |           |           |
| <b>Sales and Customer Svcs.</b> |           |          |               |           |           |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>          |           |          |               |           |           |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>   |           |          |               |           |           |
| <b>Totals</b>                   | <b>26</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>6</b>      | <b>60</b> | <b>9</b>  |

| February                          | Indian   | Other British | Spanish   | EEC       | Philipino |
|-----------------------------------|----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Managerial</b>                 |          |               |           |           |           |
| <b>Professional</b>               |          |               |           |           |           |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>     | 2        |               |           | 2         |           |
| <b>Administrative</b>             |          |               |           |           |           |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>             |          | 4             | 40        | 12        | 1         |
| <b>Personal Services</b>          |          |               |           |           |           |
| <b>Sales &amp; Customer Svcs.</b> |          |               |           |           |           |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>            |          | 1             |           |           |           |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>     |          |               |           |           |           |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>2</b> | <b>5</b>      | <b>40</b> | <b>14</b> | <b>1</b>  |

| March                             | Other British | Spanish   | Other EEC | Philipino | Israeli  |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| <b>Managerial</b>                 |               |           |           |           |          |
| <b>Professional</b>               | 4             |           | 1         |           |          |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>     |               | 1         |           |           | 1        |
| <b>Administrative</b>             |               |           |           |           |          |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>             |               | 27        | 5         | 4         |          |
| <b>Personal Services</b>          |               |           |           |           |          |
| <b>Sales &amp; Customer Svcs.</b> |               |           |           |           |          |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>            |               |           |           |           |          |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>     |               |           |           |           |          |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>4</b>      | <b>28</b> | <b>6</b>  | <b>4</b>  | <b>1</b> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 735 TO 737 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Minister have any indication of how we came to have 26 Bulgarians in skilled trades in January? Is that for a particular job?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is more or less a permanent crew of detached workers that Cammell Laird have. I think they change the individuals every year but they are more or less a group of Bulgarian workers of around that number and almost a permanent feature of the operation of the yard.



ORAL

**NO 738 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE – PROSECUTIONS**

Can Government state how many prosecutions have been commenced under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance in the month of January 2004, the date of filing of any such prosecutions and the penalties, if any, imposed by the courts in respect of any prosecutions which may have been completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 739 to 743 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 739 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE – PROSECUTIONS**

Can Government state how many prosecutions have been commenced under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance in the month of February 2004, the date of filing of any such prosecutions and the penalties, if any, imposed by the courts in respect of any prosecutions which may have been completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 738 and 740 to 743 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 740 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE – PROSECUTIONS**

Can Government state how many prosecutions have been commenced under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance in the month of March 2004, the date of filing of any such prosecutions and the penalties, if any, imposed by the courts in respect of any prosecutions which may have been completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 738, 739 and 741 to 743 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 741 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE – FIXED PENALTIES**

Can Government state how many fixed penalties have been imposed on employers and in respect of how many employees in the month of January 2004 under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance, under which sections of the Ordinance, each penalty has been imposed and whether the penalties have been paid or the matter is being pursued through further prosecution?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 738 to 740, 742 and 743 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 742 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE – FIXED PENALTIES**

Can Government state how many fixed penalties have been imposed on employers and in respect of how many employees in the month of February 2004 under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance, under which section of the Ordinance, each penalty has been imposed and whether the penalties have been paid or the matter is being pursued through further prosecution?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 738 to 741 and 743 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 743 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE – FIXED PENALTIES**

Can Government state how many fixed penalties have been imposed on employers and in respect of how many employees in the month of March 2004 under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance, under which section of the Ordinance, each penalty has been imposed and whether the penalties have been paid or the matter is being pursued through further prosecution?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 743 of 2004**

**January 2004**

Number of inspections carried out was 6.  
0 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
0 Fixed Penalty Notice were paid.  
1 pending cases with the Attorney General.

**February 2004**

Number of inspections carried out was 16.  
2 Fixed Penalty Notices were issued.  
2 Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
1 pending case with the Attorney General.

**March 2004**

Number of inspections carried out was 8.  
0 Fixed Penalty Notice was issued.  
0 Fixed Penalty Notices were paid.  
0 pending cases with the Attorney General.

The provisions are as follows:

- 1) Regulation 8(2A) of the Income Tax (Pay As You Earn) Regulations 1989 (Duty to Register).
- 2) Regulation 3 of the Employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations (Duty to Register).
- 3) Regulation 3 of the Employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations as applied by Regulation 4(1) of the Social Security (Contributions) Regulations (Duty to Register).
- 4) Regulation 3 of the Employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations as applied by Regulation 3(1) of the Social Security (Open Long Term Benefits) (Contributions) Regulations 1997 (Duty to Register).
- 5) Regulation 4 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty of notify Director of vacancy).
- 6) Regulation 6 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to notify Director of intention to engage an entitled worker).
- 7) Regulation 7 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to apply to the Director for a permit in relation to a non-entitled worker).
- 8) Regulation 13 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to notify Director of termination).
- 9) Regulation 15A(4) of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Amended by L.N.100/94) (Duty to notify Director of temporary employment of Detached workers).
- 10) Section 3 of the Business Trades and Professions (Registration) Ordinance 1989 (Duty to Register).

**Contd...**

**Contd answer to Question 743 of 2004**

Prosecutions and penalties for the months of January, February and March of 2004.

|        | <b>No OF<br/>PROSECUTIONS</b> | <b>DATE<br/>FILED</b> | <b>PENALTIES<br/>IMPOSED</b> |
|--------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Jan-04 | 0                             | ---                   | 0.00                         |
| Feb-04 | 0                             | ---                   | 0.00                         |
| Mar-04 | 0                             | ---                   | 0.00                         |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 738 TO 743 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Could the Minister help clarify whether the pending case listed for the month of January and the pending case listed for the month of February are in fact the same case that was pending two months or are they different cases pending in respect of each of those months?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know but I suspect it is really a case which is pending from, in fact before January 2004 because in January 2004 there were no fixed penalty notices issued so there could not be a prosecution following up, so it must have dated back to the previous months. I am glad to see that there is no pending case in March.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Unless the Minister finds it is not like that and he will advise me later I have nothing further.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The hon Member wants information on that?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

We assume also that the Minister is probably right, and unless he finds out that that is not the case.

ORAL

**NO 744 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – JOB CLUB**

Can Government state how many persons have used the facilities provided at the Job Club in the month of January 2004, giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 745 and 746 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 745 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – JOB CLUB**

Can Government state how many persons have used the facilities provided at the Job Club in the month of February 2004, giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 744 and 746 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 746 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – JOB CLUB**

Can Government state how many persons have used the facilities provided at the Job Club in the month of March 2004, giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 746 of 2004**

The number of persons who have used the facilities provided at the Job Club in the months of January, February and March of 2004 is as follows:

| <b>January</b>       | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 4            | 0              | 4            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 13           | 7              | 20           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 18           | 16             | 34           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>35</b>    | <b>23</b>      | <b>58</b>    |

| <b>February</b>      | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 9            | 4              | 13           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 12           | 7              | 19           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 18           | 17             | 35           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>39</b>    | <b>28</b>      | <b>67</b>    |

| <b>March</b>         | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 7            | 9              | 16           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 15           | 7              | 22           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 22           | 16             | 38           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>44</b>    | <b>32</b>      | <b>76</b>    |

ORAL

**NO 747 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – MOROCCAN NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many Moroccan nationals employed in the month of January 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 748 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 748 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – MOROCCAN NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many Moroccan nationals employed in the month of February 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 747 and 749 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 749 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – MOROCCAN NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many Moroccan nationals employed in the month of March 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 747, 748 and 750 to 761 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 750 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – OTHER BRITISH**

Can Government state of the "Other British" employed in the month of January 2004 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 747 to 749 and 751 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 751 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – OTHER BRITISH**

Can Government state of the "Other British" employed in the month of February 2004 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 747 to 750 and 752 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 752 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – OTHER BRITISH**

Can Government state of the "Other British" employed in the month of March 2004 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 747 to 751 and 753 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 753 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state of the Spanish nationals employed in the month of January 2004 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 747 to 752 and 754 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 754 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state of the Spanish nationals employed in the month of February 2004 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 747 to 753 and 755 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 755 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state of the Spanish nationals employed in the month of March 2004 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 747 to 754 and 756 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 756 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state what was the total number of employment contracts for Spanish nationals registered with the Employment Agency in January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 747 to 755 and 757 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 757 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state what was the total number of employment contracts for Spanish nationals registered with the Employment Agency in February 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 747 to 756 and 758 to 761 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 758 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state what was the total number of employment contracts for Spanish nationals registered with the Employment Agency in March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 747 to 757 and 759 to 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 759 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NON-EEC NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals in the month of January 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 747 to 758, 760 and 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 760 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NON-EEC NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals in the month of February 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 747 to 759 and 761 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 761 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NON-EEC NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals in the month of March 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 761 of 2004**

Moroccan nationals who are new entrants to the Local Labour Market in January, February and March 2004.

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>January</b>  | 1 |
| <b>February</b> | 1 |
| <b>March</b>    | 1 |

Other British nationals who are new entrants to the Local Labour Market in January, February and March 2004.

|                 | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>January</b>  | 37           | 20             | <b>57</b>    |
| <b>February</b> | 43           | 33             | <b>76</b>    |
| <b>March</b>    | 40           | 28             | <b>68</b>    |

Spanish nationals who are new entrants to the Local Labour Market in January, February and March 2004.

|                 | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>January</b>  | 59           | 29             | 88           |
| <b>February</b> | 29           | 23             | 52           |
| <b>March</b>    | 35           | 40             | 75           |

The total number of employment contracts for Spanish nationals registered with the Employment Service.

|                 |      |
|-----------------|------|
| <b>January</b>  | 2677 |
| <b>February</b> | 2676 |
| <b>March</b>    | 2700 |

Non-EEC nationals who are new entrants to the Local Labour Market in January, February and March 2004.

| <b>January</b>        | <b>Bulg.</b> | <b>Indian</b> | <b>Korean</b> | <b>Israeli</b> | <b>Antig.</b> | <b>Mor.</b> | <b>Venezu.</b> | <b>Cypr.</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Manag.</b>         |              | 4             |               |                |               |             |                |              |
| <b>Prof.</b>          |              | 2             |               |                |               |             | 1              | 1            |
| <b>Ass. Prof.</b>     |              |               |               |                |               |             |                |              |
| <b>Admin</b>          |              |               |               | 1              |               |             |                |              |
| <b>Skilled</b>        | 1            |               |               |                |               |             |                |              |
| <b>Personal</b>       |              |               |               |                |               |             |                |              |
| <b>Sales</b>          |              |               | 4             | 1              | 2             | 1           |                |              |
| <b>Plant Element.</b> |              |               |               |                |               |             |                |              |

Contd...

**Cont Answer to Question 761 of 2004**

| <b>February</b>    | <b>Cyprus</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Israeli</b> | <b>Polish</b> | <b>Yugoslavian</b> |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------|
| <b>Manag.</b>      |               |                 |                |               |                    |
| <b>Prof.</b>       | 1             |                 |                |               |                    |
| <b>Assoc.Prof.</b> |               |                 |                |               |                    |
| <b>Admin</b>       |               |                 |                |               | 1                  |
| <b>Skilled</b>     | 8             |                 |                | 13            |                    |
| <b>Personal</b>    |               |                 |                |               |                    |
| <b>Sales</b>       |               |                 | 1              |               |                    |
| <b>Plant</b>       |               |                 |                |               |                    |
| <b>Element.</b>    |               | 1               |                |               |                    |

| <b>March</b>       | <b>American</b> | <b>Mexican</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Bulgarian</b> | <b>Hong Kongese</b> |
|--------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Manag.</b>      |                 |                |                 |                  |                     |
| <b>Prof.</b>       | 1               |                |                 |                  |                     |
| <b>Assoc.Prof.</b> |                 |                |                 |                  |                     |
| <b>Admin.</b>      |                 |                |                 |                  |                     |
| <b>Skilled</b>     |                 | 1              | 1               |                  |                     |
| <b>Personal</b>    | 1               |                |                 |                  |                     |
| <b>Sales</b>       |                 |                |                 |                  | 1                   |
| <b>Plant</b>       |                 |                |                 |                  |                     |
| <b>Element</b>     |                 |                |                 | 1                |                     |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 747 TO 761 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Working both with the answer that the Minister provided to Question No. 737 and the answers provided now in relation to this batch of questions, just for the sake of understanding I am interpreting the statistics appropriately, of the 26 Bulgarians that we spoke about earlier one of them is a new entrant, 25 are renewing, is that right?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

One Bulgarian who is not a detached worker is a new entrant with a work permit.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So it does not relate to the 26. I see.

ORAL

**NO 762 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state what was the expenditure by the Employment Agency on wage subsidy in the month of January 2004 and the number of people and of employees involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 763 and 764 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 763 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state what was the expenditure by the Employment Agency on wage subsidy in the month of February 2004 and the number of people and of employees involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 762 and 764 of 2004.

**NO 764 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****EMPLOYMENT - WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state what was the expenditure by the Employment Agency on wage subsidy in the month of March 2004 and the number of people and of employees involved?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The expenditure incurred by the Employment Service on wage subsidy in the months of January, February and March 2004 is as follows:

| <b>Year 2004</b>       | <b>January</b> | <b>February</b> | <b>March</b> |
|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Expenditure (£)</b> | 9,370.38       | 7,675.32        | 7,791.46     |

| <b>Year 2004</b>          | <b>January</b> | <b>February</b> | <b>March</b> |
|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Total of Employers</b> | 30             | 30              | 30           |
| <b>Total of Employees</b> | 37             | 35              | 35           |

ORAL

**NO 765 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – CONTRACTS**

What was the number of employment contracts registered with the Employment Agency in respect of private employers excluding Government-owned and joint venture companies in the month of January 2004 giving a breakdown by nationality of employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 766 and 767 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 766 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – CONTRACTS**

What was the number of employment contracts registered with the Employment Agency in respect of private employers excluding Government-owned and joint venture companies in the month of February 2004 giving a breakdown by nationality of employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 765 and 767 of 2004.

**NO 767 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****EMPLOYMENT – CONTRACTS**

What was the number of employment contracts registered with the Employment Agency in respect of private employers excluding Government-owned and joint venture companies in the month of March 2004 giving a breakdown by nationality of employees?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to him.

**Answer to Question No. 767 of 2004**

The number of employment contracts registered with the Employment Service in respect of private employers excluding Government-owned and joint venture companies in the months of January, February and March of 2004 is as follows:

|                 | <b>Gib.</b> | <b>Other<br/>British</b> | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Other<br/>EEC</b> | <b>Other<br/>Non-<br/>EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>January</b>  | 6827        | 3115                     | 2592           | 1024            | 555                  | 509                           | 14622        |
| <b>February</b> | 6852        | 3168                     | 2586           | 1015            | 563                  | 540                           | 14724        |
| <b>March</b>    | 6893        | 3197                     | 2608           | 1022            | 563                  | 545                           | 14828        |

ORAL

**NO 768 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SELF-EMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many persons were registered as self-employed with the Employment Agency in the month of January 2004 giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 769 and 770 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 769 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SELF-EMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many persons were registered as self-employed with the Employment Agency in the month of February 2004 giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 768 and 770 of 2004.

**NO 770 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SELF-EMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many persons were registered as self-employed with the Employment Agency in the month of March 2004 giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The number of persons registered as self-employed with the Employment Service in the months of January, February and March 2004 is as follows:

|                 | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>January</b>  | 443         | 214           | 657          |
| <b>February</b> | 446         | 215           | 661          |
| <b>March</b>    | 446         | 216           | 662          |



ORAL

**NO 771 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – FRONTIER WORKERS**

Can Government state how many employment contracts were registered with the Employment Agency for frontier workers in the month of January 2004 giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 772 and 773 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 772 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – FRONTIER WORKERS**

Can Government state how many employment contracts were registered with the Employment Agency for frontier workers in the month of February 2004 giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 771 and 773 of 2004.

**NO 773 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – FRONTIER WORKERS**

Can Government state how many employment contracts were registered with the Employment Agency for frontier workers in the month of March 2004 giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The answer to this question remains the same as provided in respect of Question No. 260 of 2004 and indeed, even earlier on, Question No. 65 of 2003, but I am afraid the answer is not sexist orientated, it gives a total number of 2,294. That is the figure that we have from the Employment Survey Report for October 2002. There has been no subsequent report. I am told that the October 2003 Report will soon be published but therefore the figures remain as known to us from the Survey, which is 2,294 is the total number of frontier workers in the month of March 2004. Obviously it is a notional figure but that is the information that we have. The latest information we have is from the Employment Survey Report of October 2002.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 771 TO 773 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Minister not aware that in fact we have been provided before with figures based on contracts opened with the ETB giving us the number of frontier workers, indeed giving us a breakdown by nationality of the frontier workers?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am not aware of that and I am told by the Employment Service that they rely on the question being how many employment contracts were registered in the Employment Agency for frontier workers for the months of January, February and March, and that the answer to this question remains as provided in the Employment Survey Report, the last of which was published in October 2002. The figure I have for this is 2,294. Certainly I will look into this, I can see the point that the Leader of the Opposition is making that there has been information before on entries and registrations in the Employment Agency.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Since the question is the numbers registered with the ETB, now in fact the numbers given by the Employment Survey Report is not the numbers registered with the ETB, it is the numbers shown in the returns from the employers. They are two separate sources. We have been given the numbers registered with the ETB before.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I think that the answer to all this is that frontier workers as such, as a particular type, specimen of worker, is not registered in the Employment Service as such. I mean they are just workers who are entitled and who are registered for employment with particular firms but they are not defined or declared as frontier workers. Therefore, the Employment Service relies on this other information that I have mentioned. I think this may be the answer but I will pursue it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The answer, I think we both accept, is clearly wrong. That cannot be the updated figure. If we have a difference in the number of Spanish nationals for example, who are employed and there is an increase in that and we assume that those Spanish nationals are not residing also in Gibraltar, then we have a figure that must have been changing and evolving. There is a discrepancy and that discrepancy can surely be worked from the engagement form where the home address of the individual given is not a Gibraltar address. Is that information which the hon Minister can give or can seek to provide?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

This is a very likely explanation but I have to of course check it with the Report.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister undertake to get back to me when he can with the information in the next 10 days?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will make a quick note because I tend to forget.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am obliged.

ORAL

NO 774 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY POSTERS PROJECT**

Can Government say in what respect the "Tercentenary Posters Project" required "careful sensitive planning"?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Answered together with Question Nos. 775 to 777 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 775 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY POSTERS PROJECT**

Can Government say who were the multi-disciplinary team of professionals who produced the "Tercentenary Posters Project"?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 774 and 776 to 777 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 776 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY POSTERS PROJECT**

What was the cost of the "Tercentenary Posters Project" and where were the posters and notes printed and published?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 774 to 775 and 777 of 2004.

**NO 777 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY POSTERS PROJECT**

Can Government say whether and when the "Tercentenary Posters Project" was put to tender, and if so how many parties bid for the work?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question No. 774**

All educational projects require and receive "careful sensitive planning".

**Answer to Question No. 775**

The multi-disciplinary team of professionals who produced the "Tercentenary Posters Project" were:

Pat Scott – Senior Education Adviser  
Darren Fa – Education & Research Officer, Gibraltar Museum  
Julio Alcantara – ex-Director of Education and History specialist  
Brian Bear – History teacher  
Dennis Beiso – Archivist designate – Gibraltar Archives  
Robert Beiso – retired Headteacher – History specialist  
Clive Finlayson – Archaeologist & Director of the Gibraltar Museum  
Geraldine Finlayson – Director John Mackintosh Hall & Heritage specialist  
Richard Garcia – Historian, teacher and Chairman, Tercentenary Heritage Committee  
Eddie Gonzalez – History teacher (Head of History Department, Westside)  
Dennis King – retired Deputy Head & member of the Heritage Trust  
Leslie Lester – Director of Education and Training  
Colin Skinner – Head of History Department, Bayside School  
Claire Valarino – Archaeologist.

**Answer to Question No. 776**

The cost of the "Tercentenary Posters Project" was £5,300 and the posters and notes were printed by "Gibsport". It was funded entirely by the Tercentenary Sub-Committee on Heritage.



**Answer to Question No. 777**

The "Tercentenary Posters Project" was put to tender by public notice in October 2003. No bid was found eligible. Subsequently, information on the requirements for the series of posters on "300 Years of British Gibraltar" was faxed to all the companies on the Government's list of approved printers. These companies were requested to send in quotes for their production. "Gibsport" provided the Project Coordinators with the best samples with respect to quality and cost-effectiveness.

**NO 778 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DUTY PHARMACY**

Can Government confirm if there is in place a 24 hour duty pharmacy and, if so, what are the arrangements for access to it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The pharmacy on duty is on call on a 24-hour basis. The duty doctor is able to establish access by electronic means if he requires pharmaceutical services.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 778 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I would like to inform the Minister that we have had complaints from patients who have tried to access the service and have rang Porters Lodge at St Bernard's and have rang for example, the Police Headquarters. Do they have that information there?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

If the hon Member will go back to the answer she will have noticed that I said the duty doctor not the patient. The service is restricted to the doctor to be able to access the pharmacist to provide emergency medicines during silent hours. The service is not available to the patient himself or herself.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have understood exactly the answer that the Minister has given and it is precisely the problems that have been encountered by patients that have prompted me to put the question in the first place. That is, that there are patients that are being told by the doctors that they can have access to the service and then the patient is left on his own to find out who is the pharmacy that is open 24 hours. Would it not be appropriate therefore, for the Government to ensure that whenever a patient is told by the GP involved that he actually rings up the Police Headquarters and Porters

Lodge, that they should have there, not only the GP that is on duty but also the pharmacy that is on duty.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member should not believe everything she is told. The system is as I have described. The service is not available to the patient. The Porters Lodge does have details of who the doctor on duty is and the service is restricted to the doctor precisely to avoid abuse. If the hon Member is contacted by a member of the public who tells her what she has just told us publicly, if she would like to communicate both the name of the patient and the name of the doctor concerned to me, I will investigate it, but I cannot investigate a theoretical situation.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will most certainly, but it just struck me that if at times there is not enough communication between the doctor and the patient, if for example, Porters Lodge and the Police Headquarters have the name of the actual doctor that is on duty, it might make sense as well that they also have available the name of the pharmacy that is on duty. It is not a question that I believe everything that everybody tells me. In fact I have been in politics enough for quite a number of years, it is just that I have been told by various people. That is all. I was just trying to inform the Government that perhaps if they do this they will improve the system. That is all.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It would not be an improvement to the system. The whole purpose of the matter is that patients have never had, whether it is in our time in office or indeed in hers, the idea that the patient should have 24 hour a day, 7 day a week access to the duty pharmacist is unliveable with. Therefore the idea that the number and the name of the duty pharmacist, which is an internal matter not an external matter, should be given out by the Porters Lodge to patients so that the duty pharmacist, the service to ensure that the hospital has medicines that it may need to access after hours, that is a service for doctors not a service for patients. There is no need therefore for anybody to have the number in order to give it to the patient.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That is not my argument at all, that is a completely different argument. I agree that nobody can actually go 24 hours and have a service that they can access to if they want tablets. This is when a GP actually goes to see a patient at home after normal hours. For example, from 7.00 pm to 9.00 pm that the pharmacies are open. If there happens to be, there have been cases brought to our attention, it is not a question that the patient wants to go at 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock and ring the pharmacy on duty and say 'I want these tablets', it is that the GP has prescribed the tablets and that is a totally different matter. If it is the GP that then does not inform the patient because he is not aware which pharmacy is on duty, then all that I am saying is, is it not an improvement of the service if both Porters Lodge and the Police Headquarters have the name. I am trying to be constructive I am not trying to be critical at all.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am not sure that I entirely agree with the hon Member over the last thing that she has said. To suggest people to believe that it is reasonable to expect a 24 hour a day pharmaceutical service is not to be helpful. It is to sow deceit in peoples' mind of a completely unreasonable extent of service which this community has never provided. If what the hon Member is saying is that in respect of the normal duty chemist, meaning Calpe Pharmacy or Valmar Pharmacy or whichever is the duty chemist, that information should be available through the RGP, I can tell that it is because that is where my wife always gets it when she wants it. She rings up the RGP and the desk sergeant very helpfully says the duty chemist tonight, and he has a little list, is so and so. If that is what she means, if what she means forget the hours covered by the duty commercial chemist, let us call it that, if what she means is that a doctor may come to my house at midnight or at one o'clock in the morning and sees one of my family members and prescribes a medicine, and that I should have the ability at 2 o'clock in the morning to access the hospital's duty chemist in order to obtain process of that prescription, the answer is that that service is simply not available. If a doctor visits my house at 2 o'clock in the morning and considers that any member of my family needs medication before the pharmacies open at 9 o'clock in the morning, then he has two options. He can procure this medicine himself through the facility available to him for that purpose, or he can regard the matter as an emergency and send me or my child, or my wife or me to the hospital as an emergency admission where the medication is then available. What is not available is for doctors to rush around in the middle of the night issuing prescriptions and then leave it to the patient to cash their prescriptions in and obtain their medicines at 2 o'clock in the morning by ringing up the Government Dispensary Duty Chemist. That service has never been available, is not realistic to expect that it should be available. However, I accept something of what the hon Member is saying and that is that if there are doctors, this is why she asked for the name, I think the name of the doctor is more important than the name of the patient, if there are doctors going around misrepresenting the system and leading patients to believe that a service that does not exist, or rather does not exist available to the patient it exists available to the doctor, and if there is a doctor leading patients to believe that they can access, they the patient, can access the duty GHA dispensing chemist, then I would be very interested in knowing who that is to re-educate the doctor, not the patient, not to change the system but to make sure that that doctor is told 'do not cause trouble by leading patients to believe that they can access this when they can not. The person who has to access this is you not the patient'. If the problem is being caused by a doctor misinforming patients then the matter should be dealt with by pointing out to the doctor that he should stop misinforming patients, rather than by making the service available to the patient.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I do not want to drag on and on about this but when the Chief Minister says that this service has never been in place, surely it has. If for example a doctor visits a patient at 10 o'clock in the evening and finds that that patient needs urgent medication, is the Chief Minister saying that the pharmacy that is on duty does not open for that emergency medication, or is it that the Chief Minister is saying that the patient has to go to the hospital and that therefore the doctor then tells the patient 'this is required and this is urgent' . When I was Minister I remember that the service was there. It was either the pharmacy that was open 24 hours for emergency medication, or it was the pharmacy in the hospital. That the Chief Minister says that if the doctor tells the patient 'you require this medication now', obviously he has to get it from one source

or the other. When I say he I mean the patient. It is the doctor of course who tells the patient 'you have to take this medication as from now'. If the doctor says 'as from now', what does the patient do? He waits until 9 o'clock in the morning, is that correct?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Let me try to explain the system once again and as clearly as I can. There are two types of situations that are likely to arise outside the hours in which the duty chemist is open, or maybe three. The patient who is so sick that he needs to be rushed to the hospital, the patient who is not so sick and is prescribed aspirins or alka seltzers or whatever, which in the judgement of the doctor, neither in her judgement or in my judgement, can wait until the following morning when the chemist opens. The third case is the one which I presume the hon Member is referring to, is the case where the patient needs medication immediately, that night, at that moment whether it is 10 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning. In that situation, because the other two do not arise, it is the doctor who has the access by phone or by bleeper to the chemist on duty, to ring him up and say to him 'Mr So and So I need this medicine now', that is what the doctor says not the patient, he does not give the prescription to the patient and goes home and waits for the patient to find the chemist. He rings up the chemist and says to the chemist 'go down open your shop and provide the medicine', and the medicine if it is needed that night that urgently is provided, is being provided, has been provided and will be provided, and that is the service that is available, but as has probably happened in the cases that have been mentioned to the hon Member I suspect is where the doctor has not found it necessary to use the emergency provisions but has written out a prescription and left it with a patient by implication meaning that the medicine is not needed until the following day, and maybe the doctor has not explained that clearly enough to the patient and the patient armed with the prescription is then ringing up the hospital, the police and everybody else right left and sundry, trying to find the chemist. So that is why the Chief Minister has said 'if the hon Member would like to let me know who the doctor is, we can then try to educate the doctor'. But the system is there and works.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So I was right after all, there is a 24 hour service that there is a pharmacist on duty. How can one expect a pharmacist to be rang by a patient and say 'can I have such and such a medicine?'. The Chief Minister should not think that we are going down that route at all but after having heard the Chief Minister I can tell him that perhaps, as I said earlier, there must have been bad communication between the GP and the patient, because if there happens to be a pharmacy on duty and the pharmacy closes at 9 o'clock and say as we were given an example, the doctor comes in and then he prescribes a medicine that is required, of course, then as the Minister is saying it is up to the doctor to ring the pharmacist and say 'look open because this patient requires this medication'. Therefore, I will give the Minister the name, I was just trying to be constructive because what I wanted to tell him is that perhaps in cases where the GP just leave the prescription, even though they tell the patient that they have to take it and there has been bad communication, perhaps it would be wise for the hospital and the Police Headquarters to have the name, and in any case for the patient's benefit because then the medicine that is required by the patient would have to be a medicine that is necessary to the extent that if the patient knows and rings up the pharmacy and the pharmacist says 'wel, I do not think this is something which is required now', there can be a sort of a communication from the pharmacy back to the

duty doctor on call. I am glad that the Minister for Health has clarified the situation in that indeed there is a pharmacy open 24 hours and that it is the patients that need to actually communicate with the doctors or vice versa for the patient to know where he has to go for that medicine.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We will leave it because there does not seem to be a disagreement. Except that the hon Member appears to believe, having accepted that the service exists and that it is a service accessed by doctors and not by patients, there is no need to leave the number of the duty chemist with the Porters Lodge or the Police, because the doctors know how to access the duty chemist. There is a bleeper, there is a number, it is a system. The duty doctors do not need to phone the Police to be told how to conduct the duty chemist. This is the point. The point that I have been trying to address to the hon Lady is that the system does not require anything to be left at the Porter. The only thing that might be required to be left at the Porter or with the Police would be for the benefit of a patient getting the number and the patient directly getting in touch with them, and that is not the system, is not intended to be the system and will not be the system. That is the only point I wanted to declare.

**NO 779 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

What changes, if any, have the Government introduced to the appointments system at the Primary Care Centre, and if so, when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

A computerised electronic appointments system was introduced in the summer of 2003. The appointments system is in the process of continuous incremental development and improvement. The statistics and feedback generated by the new system are essential in permitting this improvement. We are confident that the new system is better than the old one and that it will continue to improve.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 779 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Minister says that it was introduced in the summer, can he be more specific because when he says the summer I think he must be referring to the months of June, July August of last year. I have a copy I have made a copy of what the actual report by the Healthcare Development Team says about the system, and the report was published in September of last year. If the system was introduced in the summer then it must mean that they are criticising the system that was introduced which the Minister has just communicated to us, where they say that an appointment at the Primary Care Centre involves up to 19 steps. That a patient will wait up to an hour before being seen by a clinician and the amount spent waiting is excessive when compared to the actual consultation time, that the administrative process that has been designed to support the appointments process is very complex and poorly understood by the patients that are required to use it. Therefore, can the Minister be more specific? Can he say, as he said in the summer, and the report was published in September and most of the pages that carry the word 'produced' carry the month 'July', is the Minister saying that it was introduced before July or after July? I do not think that after July is the summer.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member assumes, because she does not know it was not there at the time, that the criticisms in the report refer to the previous system, not to the current system. It is the nature of the time span, the report was published in September but research must have been done before September. If this was presented in the summer, I do not have an exact date for her whether it was June, July or August so I cannot pin it down. Be that as it may, this is as I said a process of continuous incremental development. There is still work being carried out by the Clinical Governance Development Team. The appointments system is one of the work streams on which they are working, work stream No. 7. What is in place was developed in-house. The system as it is in place now is being analysed and looked at for possible improvements and when those recommendations come to the Government there will then, if we accept those recommendations, there will be another change, but I think what the hon Member is referring to is past history, she should be looking forward and not back.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The deficiencies that were identified then no longer exist, is the Minister saying that those deficiencies are now history and have been dealt with?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

That is a different question altogether, I will need notice of that question. The question is have we introduced an appointment system and the answer is yes, last summer. Whether the comparatives, I do not have that information.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The question is 'what changes, if any, have been introduced?'. The Minister says there are changes taking place all the time and he has told us that we should regard the deficiencies that were identified in the Clinical Governance Report that they commissioned, as being history. Well, that suggests to me that if they say one of the deficiencies is that there are 19 steps it means that there are no longer 19 steps, is that the case or not?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I think by the very nature of the new system there cannot be 19 steps. For example, a larger number of appointments are now done by telephone than were being done before, as much now as 45 per cent of the appointments are being done by telephone. The other advantage which obviously negates the criticism read out by his hon Colleague is that appointments are now given on a time specific to the patient basis as opposed to what was happening in the past which was a block appointment for a number of patients for a given time. So I think it is implicit in the changes that those must apply to the previous system. In any case what I am saying is that the current system, be that as it may, the current system is not cast in stone either, and that could possibly change, I do not know, maybe not, but could possibly change in the coming months.



**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Did I hear the Minister correctly when he said that the arrangements had been put in place in-house, which means that they have been prompted to the Government by the professionals working within the GHA and not the experts?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, that is exactly what I have said. I have said the computerisation of the system had been developed in-house from resources within the GHA. Presumably prior to the entry of the Clinical Governance Team onto the scene or either before or in parallel. A system like that would not be developed over five hours, it would take a bit longer than that. Then to test it and then to put it into place. I know when I first visited the Primary Care Centre as Minister it was already there in place but was still being tested and still being developed, as it probably is still now. So yes, the resources were available from within the GHA, was done from within the GHA. I cannot say positively but it seems to me that they were not prompted by the Clinical Governance Team. The Clinical Governance Team had come there to look at what was there, at the same time as the new system was being put into place and now what they are assessing is the new system in place and to see how it is working.

**ORAL**

**NO 780 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre from 1 March 2003 to the end of December 2003, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 781 to 783 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 781 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENTS ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre from 1 January 2004 to the end of March 2004, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 780, 782 and 783 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 782 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of GP attendances at the primary care centre for the year 2000, 2001 and 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 780, 781 and 783 of 2004.

**NO 783 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF HOUSE CALLS**

Can Government state how many house-calls were attended to by Health Centre doctors from 1 January 2004 to end March 2004 specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Question No. 780 of 2004 is identical to Question No. 214 of 2004, which was asked during the meeting of the House last January and the information in answer to which has been made available to the hon Member. The answers to Question Nos. 781 to 783 are contained in the Schedules that have now been handed to her.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 781**

| <b>Department</b>         | <b>January</b> | <b>February</b> | <b>March</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Audiology                 | 215            | 232             | 199          | 646          |
| Dietitian                 | 73             | 66              | 83           | 222          |
| Nursing                   | 1140           | 1428            | 1517         | 4085         |
| School Health Service     | 460            | 404             | 441          | 1305         |
| Speech & Language PAED    | 31             | 37              | 43           | 111          |
| Speech & Language (Adult) | 110            | 112             | 117          | 339          |
| Mental Welfare            | 76             | 122             | 117          | 315          |
| Optometrist               | 165            | 157             | 102          | 424          |
| Orthoptist                | 90             | 79              | 121          | 290          |
| G P Clinics               | 10191          | 7611            | 9654         | 27456        |
| Dermatologist             | 18             | 18              | 18           | 54           |
| Dental                    | 1430           | 1587            | 1624         | 4641         |
| Child Welfare             | 826            | 792             | 849          | 2467         |
| Nurse Practitioner        | 882            | 519             | 324          | 1725         |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>15707</b>   | <b>13164</b>    | <b>15209</b> | <b>44080</b> |

Answer to Question 782 of 2004

2000

| DEPARTMENT | JAN   | FEB   | MAR   | APR   | MAY   | JUN   | JUL   | AUG   | SEPT  | OCT   | NOV   | DEC   | TOTAL  |
|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| GP CLINIC  | 7,014 | 6,908 | 7,005 | 6,266 | 7,721 | 6,585 | 7,215 | 7,149 | 7,593 | 8,563 | 7,854 | 6,726 | 86,599 |

2001

| DEPARTMENT | JAN  | FEB  | MAR  | APR  | MAY  | JUN  | JUL  | AUG  | SEPT | OCT   | NOV  | DEC  | TOTAL   |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|---------|
| GP CLINIC  | 8858 | 9392 | 9324 | 7779 | 9479 | 8446 | 8389 | 8710 | 7988 | 10013 | 9591 | 6982 | 104,951 |

2002

| DEPARTMENT | JAN  | FEB  | MAR  | APR  | MAY  | JUN  | JUL  | AUG  | SEPT | OCT  | NOV  | DEC  | TOTAL  |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|
| GP CLINIC  | 6416 | 8477 | 7479 | 8097 | 8212 | 6490 | 7639 | 6703 | 6911 | 9207 | 7481 | 6790 | 89,902 |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 783**

The number of house-calls attended to by Health Centre doctors are as follows:

|          |     |
|----------|-----|
| January  | 655 |
| February | 363 |
| March    | 564 |

These figures are for house calls logged during emergency clinic hours at the Primary Care Centre - 9.00 a.m. - 11. a.m. and 2.00 p.m. - 4.00 p.m.



## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 780 TO 783 OF 2004**

### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have done a comprehensive exercise as regards the figures that I have been provided in this House, and have also taken the trouble to compare them with the figures that appear in the Government Abstract of Statistics. Also with the figures that appear in the Healthcare Report, and I would like to inform the Minister that they baffle me. They do not coincide at all. So what I would like the Minister to do is perhaps to get somebody to do the exercise for him that I have done and then he will realise that when we are talking about the number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre, let us look at the year 2000 for example. For the year 2000 I have done the exercise and I have come up with all the answers that I have been given by the Government for that year and I come to the figure of 123,049. The Government Abstract of Statistics, who the GHA provide them with the figures for the same year gives the figure of 128,298, and in the Healthcare Report for that same year the figure of 120,204 appears. So we have 123,049 for Government answers in the House, Government Abstract of Statistics for that year 128,298 and the Healthcare Report 120,204. Now if we continue, and I have spent quite a number of days and perhaps weeks looking at these statistics because they are important, that is why we always ask for questions on statistical information. When we look for example at Question No. 782 we have discrepancies as well. When we ask the Government for the total number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre for 2000, 2001 and 2002 I am provided with the following. For 2000 86,599; for 2001 104,951; for 2002 89,902. When we look at the Report for the same years, GP Attendances 92,359 compared to what the Minister has provided me with 86,599. 96,885 compared to 104,951 and 96,959 compared with 89,902. Therefore if I continue I do not think I have got to the other ones, I would urge the Minister if he would actually get somebody in his Department to actually tell us which of the figures are the correct ones. If he can confirm that the correct ones are the ones that I have been provided in this House by them, the ones that appear in the Government Abstract of Statistics or the ones that appear in the Healthcare Development Team Report of September 2003, because none of them are the same.

### **HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Either someone needs a new battery for their calculator or maybe even a new calculator, or alternatively the hon Member is not comparing apples with apples. I cannot on my feet, and I know she is not asking me to do that, answer which one it is. I am happy to get people to go and check up the figures but before I do that I think the hon Member should be more specific on what the figure is that she wants to get. What I would suggest is that she asks me, I am not going to go and check the Abstract of Statistics or whatever the other source was that she mentioned, I will check the validity of the answers that I have given in this House. If the hon Member wants me just to check that answer, I can get it checked but if she wants me to compare it with other sources then if she could give me the comparative sources and specify the question a bit more accurately in a letter to me I will get the right people to look at it. What I do not want to do is get people to do a mathematical exercise unless I am sure that we are looking at the same question or the same comparative.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am referring Question No. 781 and 782 and we are talking about GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre and we are talking about Out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre. In the three areas that I have actually done the exercise on, the figures do not coincide.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

That is exactly what I am saying. If the hon Member would like to write to me and say to me 'the figure for out-patient attendances in this period of time, in the House you give me this', tell me what it is that needs to be checked. The hon Member should be specific and do it in writing so I can make sure that what I am checking, I do not want to do it on the basis of a verbal exchange. If she tells me what she wants checked I will get it checked.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister also, taking into account that the Abstract of Statistics quotes as the source the Health Authority, check with them what it is that they have provided the Statistics Office with?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes obviously. That is why I am saying that before I start anybody doing the exercise, which is time consuming and which moves people away from doing more important things in health, I want to make sure that I am tasking them with a specific task. For example, in preparing the answers to questions today, something that looks relatively simple that was asked in two separate questions of the Minister for Social Services and myself in relation to people on waiting lists for something or other, the GHA and Social Services came to a different answer. The reason for that is very simple, unless one says on Friday 14<sup>th</sup> of such a month at 5 o'clock what was the number of people on the waiting list, the answer is different. The GHA have calculated it as at the beginning of April and Social Services have calculated it as at last week, and there was a difference. What I want to avoid is the same sort of exercise. So if she is specific and tells me exactly what it is that is to be compared, and if I am not clear I will get some one to come back to it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Definitely. I have done the exercise myself and it has taken me weeks but I will provide the Minister with the information because we are talking about substantial differences in the three sets of figures, and therefore I will send it over to him and I will show him the figures that I have come up with and I will actually photocopy the information that I have come up with so that the work that is required is not going to be so tiresome as the one that I had to do.

**NO 784 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – STRESS MACHINES**

Can Government confirm whether there is a stress machine at the Primary Care Centre, which was donated last year, which is not being used?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The GHA does not have a stress machine at the Primary Care Centre.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 784 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

This is rather surprising because the actual donors, the people who donated the machine, contacted us and said that they had handed it over last year. Is it that the machine has disappeared or it was not donated? Because as far as the private entities that donated the machine, or is it kept somewhere else, where is it? I am laughing but I should not be because we are talking about a stress machine which was donated by private entities in Gibraltar, but if the Minister would enlighten us as to where it is or what has happened to it.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

It is not anywhere, a stress machine has not been donated to the GHA or to the Primary Care Centre, and there is not one there and there has never been one there. I assume what the hon Member is referring to is a treadmill or an exercise bicycle that was donated last year, but it is not a stress machine.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

This is rather surprising because the information that we got was information from the people who actually donated it, but I suspect that a lot of people when they are talking about a treadmill, that in effect is sometimes referred to as a stress machine. If it is a treadmill is that there at the Health Centre?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes there is a treadmill at the Health Centre, the Primary Care Centre which was donated last year. To clarify because I am not trying to be deliberately obtuse, I am trying to clarify the situation so that the hon Member can understand it better. There was an offer of a stress machine, there is a whole story to that and if she wishes to ask more questions then it is up to her. What was donated was not a stress machine, it was a piece of equipment minus the necessary software, bits and pieces that would turn it into a stress machine. At the moment it is only a treadmill and it is being used at the Cardiac Rehabilitation Centre for exercise but it is not a stress machine and it is not capable of being a stress machine until more bits and pieces, including software, are purchased, added on to it, loaded on to it, whatever needs to be done. I trust that is clearer.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In view of what the Minister has said, and he has stressed it in exclamation marks, will the bits and pieces be purchased by the Government so that in fact it is converted into a stress machine?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

At the moment there are no plans to do so.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In that case I am totally distressed about it.

ORAL

**NO 785 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to Pharmacists for the months of January, February and March of 2004 and the comparable figure for the same months in the previous year in respect of £1.80 per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 786 to 795 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 786 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items, and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of 2002/2003, in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to dispensing pharmacists and the total value of the medicines so dispensed and the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 785 and 787 to 795 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 787 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the account periods in respect of 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 785 and 786 and 788 to 795 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 788 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50, for the accounting periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 784 to 787 and 789 to 795 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 789 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state what was the amount paid to pharmacists for the months of March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December of 2003, and the comparable figure for the same months in the previous year, in respect of £1.80 per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 785 to 788 and 790 to 795 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 790 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items, and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting periods 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2003/2004, in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to dispensing pharmacists and the total value of the medicines so dispensed and the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 786 to 789 and 791 to 795 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 791 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods in respect of 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 785 to 790 and 792 to 795 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 792 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50, for the accounting periods 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 785 to 791 and 793 to 795 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 793 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods 12, 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2003/2004 as a result of their having increased prescription charges from £1.20 to £2.50, also updating the previous information given in answer to Question No 256 of 2003, which was incomplete?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 785 to 792 and 794 to 795 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 794 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the pharmacists as a result of the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines, in respect of each financial year since it was first introduced?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 785 to 793 and 795 of 2004.

**NO 795 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the pharmacists as dispensing fees in each financial year beginning with 1997/1998?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Question Nos. 786, 787, 788 and 789 are identical to Question Nos. 215, 216, 217 and 218 of 2004 which were asked during the meeting of the House last January and the information in answer to which has been made available to the hon Member. With regard to the other questions, the answers are set out in the schedules that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question 785 of 2004.**

| <b><u>2004</u></b>                           |            | <b><u>2003</u></b> |
|----------------------------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Period 11- starts 11 <sup>th</sup> January - | No payment | No payment         |
| Period 12                                    | No payment | No payment         |
| Period 13                                    | No payment | No payment         |

**Answer to Question 790 of 2004**

**Year 2003/2004**

Periods 11 & 12 are incomplete as some Pharmacies still have to submit accounts.

|           | <b>Prescriptions</b> | <b>Items</b> | <b>Cost</b> |
|-----------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Period 9  | 5968                 | 14812        | £199206.97  |
| Period 10 | 5594                 | 14169        | £182990.65  |
| Period 11 | 5428                 | 13173        | £169621.22  |
| Period 12 | 5123                 | 12460        | £157177.83  |

**Year 2002/2003**

|           |      |       |            |
|-----------|------|-------|------------|
| Period 9  | 5719 | 13690 | £181477.63 |
| Period 10 | 5582 | 13064 | £171917.59 |
| Period 11 | 5834 | 14001 | £178839.95 |
| Period 12 | 6231 | 14647 | £190650.94 |

Total value not available

**Answer to Question 791 of 2004**

|           | <b>Prescriptions</b> | <b>Items</b> | <b>Cost</b> |
|-----------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Period 9  | 13325                | 46790        | £562454.75  |
| Period 10 | 12822                | 46843        | £549486.81  |
| Period 11 | 11971                | 41579        | £487830.41  |
| Period 12 | 10793                | 36864        | £433798.75  |

Periods 11 & 12 are incomplete as some Pharmacies still have to submit accounts.

**Answer to Question 792 of 2004.**

The number of items on paying prescriptions that did not pay £2.50 were:

| <b>Period</b> | <b>Items</b> |
|---------------|--------------|
| 9             | 3312         |
| 10            | 3308         |
| 11            | 2823         |
| 12            | 2755         |

Periods 11 and 12 are incomplete as some pharmacies still have to submit accounts.



**Answer to Question 793 of 2004.**

|                                                                                                               |             |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Revenue raised for period 12 - 13 & 1 - 12 is                                                                 | £380,895.00 |
| Before increase in prescription charges revenue raised would be 194621 @ £1.20                                | £233,545.20 |
| Also approximate 66% of 425272 items would have paid 20p                                                      | £56,135.80  |
| Total revenue that would have been raised would have been £289,681.00 therefore extra revenue raised would be | £91,214.00  |

This also updates Question 256 of 2003 but is incomplete because periods 11 & 12 of 2003/2004 are incomplete.

**Answer to Question 794 of 2004.**

| <u>Year</u> | <u>15% Paid</u>                |
|-------------|--------------------------------|
| 99/00       | £300,785.40 (period 6-13 only) |
| 00/01       | £563,357.94                    |
| 01/02       | £689,124.41                    |
| 02/03       | £787,484.42                    |
| 03/04       | £886,611.45 (incomplete)       |

**Answer to Question 795 of 2004.**

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|---------------|
| 1997/98     | £747,645      |
| 1998/99     | £659,907.36   |
| 1999/2000   | £750,000      |
| 2000/2001   | £750,000      |
| 2001/2002   | £750,000      |
| 2002/2003   | £750,000      |
| 2003/2004   | £750,000      |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 785 TO 795 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm, because this is something that I spoke to him about, that the answers that he has actually given to me today will be recorded in Hansard? That is the idea is it not?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

There are two different situations here. The arrangement that we made in your presence was that the hon Member would give me advance notice of the statistical questions, I would provide the statistics in answer ahead of the meeting and then she would ask the question at the meeting and I would give her the answer at the meeting. This is what I am doing in relation to all the questions except the ones I have said have already been answered. The questions that she asked at the last meeting that I said I would answer in 10 days time are Question Nos. 215, 216, 217 and 218 which as my hon Colleague earlier on and in fact myself in an earlier answer, it would be to give the same information again. In those cases there has been no arrangement to provide the answer, whether it is recorded or not that is up to the Speaker.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well that was the idea, if I remember rightly, in the presence of Mr Speaker I said I would ask the question again and the answer that I was given would be recorded, and that is the arrangement we came to with Mr Speaker.

**MR SPEAKER:**

No, there was no arrangement with me. There was arrangement between you two. As far as I am concerned there is no arrangement with me.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The arrangement that I agreed to after a lot of discussion was that I offered to provide the statistical information at intervals to be agreed between us, for example quarterly, but we established with Mr Speaker that that would not allow it to be published in Hansard. So what we agreed to was that that information, either published quarterly or provided quarterly or provided in correspondence so she would get it periodically at fixed periods of time, the hon Member could then ask again and I would provide the answer, which is what I am doing. I have already provided information ahead of the meeting just as she provided the questions to me I have provided answers to her ahead of the question, but the various questions which at the last meeting I undertook to answer in 10 days time, I have never considered part of that arrangement. Otherwise I would be answering the same question twice in this House, and as Mr Speaker said before half jokingly, if we establish the practice where because we are unable to answer the question, we want to answer it but we are unable to answer in the time available and say we are going to give the answer in 10 days time, if then the same question is going to be asked again, it is

going to increase the number of questions by 20 per cent. Let us be clear, the information has been provided what we are discussing is whether it has been provided here so that it is available in Hansard. In any case the question is being asked again within six months of the original question which is another issue altogether, but if the hon Member is that insistent on it being in Hansard I am not sure what the solution is.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I remind the Minister that the solution that was given in answer today to Question No. 588 is the solution that is now being rejected. When the Hon Mr Bruzon asked 'can Government provide the answers given in writing to Questions 123 to 131 of 2004 by the Minister for Housing for the purpose of the record in Hansard?', the Minister for Housing told us that if we wanted the answers given for the purpose of the record of the answer, we should ask again the questions that have already been answered in writing, namely Questions 123 to 131. Now my hon Colleague has asked again and the answer she has been given is 'I have already given you the answer'. Well, the answer that the Minister has given to my Colleague is in fact what we were recommended to do earlier today by the Minister for Housing in answer to Question No. 588, and what I said we would do at the next meeting of the House. That is to table again questions 123 to 131 and if the Minister recollects what I said before was well look I assume that in the answer what we will get is what we get in other questions, which is '*I will now pass the statistical information over to the hon Member*', and even though it is not read out it is recorded.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I have copies of the previous answer here and I do not have a problem in providing it. I am worried about the principle, this is not something that has been discussed in the Government, I am worried about the principle of a question being asked as we are talking about, the question was asked last time I said '*I cannot provide the answer now, I will provide it in 10 days time*', in 10 days time or less I provided it in writing, if we accept the principle that every time we do that then it is going to be asked again in the House, it is just artificially extending the number of questions, that is the principle I am worried about.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I agree entirely with what the Minister is saying, that is why if he cares to look at the way Question No. 588 is drafted, it is not drafted as a repetition of the previous questions in a period of less than six months, which in fact the Standing Orders do not permit, it is drafted in a way which acknowledges that we have already got the information and we are simply asking by putting a question which covers the group, as opposed to each individual one, that is why it says here Questions 123 to 131 on the basis that that would enable the Minister to say '*I now pass over the information I have already provided in writing*' and that passing over, as happens with all the other questions, would be a sufficient trigger to get it recorded.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not want to hold up the procedure unnecessarily. I am quite happy to carry on until we get a chance to discuss and make policy decisions internally, but it will take me a couple of seconds to bring out the copies from here and I can hand it over later. Then for the record I will hand over the written answers that I supplied to the hon Member to Question Nos. 215, 216, 217 and 218 during this meeting.

**NO 796 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF PHARMACEUTICALS**

Can the Government state whether the growth in the costs of pharmaceuticals, has resumed at an even faster rate of increase, 18 per cent per year, in the last three years, as compared with 13 per cent per year from 1990 to 1998?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No Sir. The increases over the past 3 years have been as follows:-

|                       |               |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| 2000/2001 – 2001/2002 | 15.9 per cent |
| 2001/2002 – 2002/2003 | 10.8 per cent |
| 2002/2003 – 2003/2004 | 7.8 per cent  |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 796 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister then explain the difference in the figures that he has given to me in relation to the figures that are published in the Healthcare Development Team Report, where it specifies that there has been an 18 per cent increase?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

If this is an example of comparing apples to apples then it explains why the hon Member can not square the abstract with the answers given in this House to whatever the third source is, because this is exactly the problem. The hon Member is not reading the report correctly and she is not comparing apples with apples. The report says, 'after 1998', the question says 'in the last three years' and that is why the percentages are different. The raw data is different.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is not different, I am reading the report and it says that it has shifted significantly over not the last three years as the Minister has said, over the last five years. I have got it in front of me. It has shifted significantly.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Precisely, over the last five years but her question is in the last three years so the percentages have got to be different. One is five years and her question is over the last three years.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But the Minister can confirm that they have increased in the last three years.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I have just given the hon Member the percentages, that they have increased, not as much as they used to increase in her time by the way, but that is a different issue. The figures that I have for the increases in her time are much bigger, 26 per cent, 17 per cent, 22 per cent, but that is a different issue.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is definitely a different issue because I have never, ever recalled the increases the Minister is mentioning today when we were in government. Another thing I wish to remind the Minister is that having had a government that sadly decided to increase prescription charges because they said that there were abuses, and then having introduced generics because they wanted to introduce cost-saving measures, sadly it appears that all that they have tried to do has completely backfired on them, because when they actually introduced, and I know that the hon the previous Minister will remember, I was constantly telling him that why had he increased prescription charges which they did from £1.20 to £2.50, I think that the actual campaign against that measure, because we were talking about people who were ill and who need medicinal products and we thought that it was not prudent on the part of the Government that whereby they were spending huge sums of money in other areas they decide to increase prescription charges but now it seems that we have a situation because of the figures that we have arrived at and the figures provided by the Report of the Healthcare Development Team, that it is in fact the Government that have changed the system and have actually done the opposite of what they said they aimed to do whereby after £7.50 all items in prescriptions are free of charge. Has that not conducted the increases that are actually here highlighted by the Report which actually says '*increases in number of items per script*' that is one of the reasons for the increases, are we not correct in our analysis? I know the Chief Minister will say no.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I do not think anything has been conducted or even induced by anything that the hon Member has said. It really is not easy to calculate. I do not know if the hon Member genuinely simply does not understand the concepts that she refers to in debate in this House, or whether she does understand them but goes out of her way to abuse the principles and the concepts, simply to suit her political objectives. Look, she refers to generics, as if introducing generics was somehow a negative thing. The Government introduced the same generics formulary as applies in the UK and throughout Western Europe. So, she may think that introducing what she calls generics, by which I assume she means the medicine formulary which includes generic medicines as well, the Government do not feel a need to apologise or explain it. It is a perfectly normal thing to do, the only country in Europe which was lining the pockets of proprietary drugs manufacturers when there were identical chemical compositions in the form of medicines with exactly the same medical effect available for less money, the only country left in Europe being taken for a ride in that way was Gibraltar, and the hon Lady may still be trying to pretend that joining the rest of the world in not being taken to the cleaners by the medicine companies is somehow a retrograde step. Well she can continue until the day she gives up her health portfolio trying to argue that. She can continue to argue that the entire world is wrong and she, who is the only human being under the sun that I have ever heard argue against the introduction of generic medicines, is right.

Secondly, if she wants to make allusions to the fact that we increased prescriptions, or does she think that this community can continue to fund itself indefinitely, lowering taxes, raising public expenditure and never raising revenue-raising methods. She expects the price of prescription medicines to remain in Gibraltar the same as they were in 1985 and that any decision by the Government to increase them is somehow the equivalent of slaughtering babies at birth. Well, she has an extraordinary approach to that which I find mindless. She may be for example, interested in knowing that the prescription charges in the United Kingdom are higher than the prescription charges in Gibraltar. So we have got a long way to go before she can start complaining. If she is going to start mentioning, as she does in every question, the Government's policy to raise prescription charges, I mean she is still going on about this four years after the event. Four years after the event she is still referring but I do not mind, in fact we may raise the prescription charges again as responsible governments should when there is a need to do so, but she should add, if she is interested in reflecting the policy accurately, she should say that we have increased some prescription charges and abolished them for others. The hon Member never says whilst acknowledging that they abolished prescription charges for pensioners, she never says that, '*you raise prescription charges*' but does not add '*but abolished them for pensioners*'. Now the hon Lady claims to be a socialist, I have never noticed an enormous amount of socialism in any of them but still, they claim to be socialist and when we removed prescription charges for elderly people instead of welcoming it she ignores it. Or is it that she does not ignore it, that she does not think it is politically convenient to refer to it, which calls into question issues of integrity and objectivity and accuracy of facts.

The most astonishing part of her last intervention is the suggestion, it really is an astonishing abuse of statistics that because the prescription medicine bill for generic medicines, or for medicines post the introduction of the generic formula has now overtaken or increased higher than it was when the measure was taken, that this must mean that the measure was wrong. Does the obvious not occur to her? Namely, that without the use of the formulary, without the use of generic medicines, the figure would be even higher, that we would have reached these levels on the

basis of using only proprietary branded drugs, these excessive levels of medicine costs would have been reached years ago, and that the cost today would be even more millions of pounds than they are now. Is that not the obvious answer? By what logical application of the statistics does she come to the conclusion that these percentage increases, which incidentally are smaller than the percentage increases that she, she may not be aware of it because she was not perhaps even conscious of the rising costs of medicines in her day, but if she calculates the cost of medicines during her term of office, she will see that what the Minister for Health has said is correct, and the explanation is not that the costs of medicines are rising because of the formulary, the use of generics has retarded the increase in the cost of medicines. I have to say that these costs of medicines are still far too high. The hon Lady if she were really interested in statistics, Jersey with a much larger population than Gibraltar spends less on the prescription medicines for its health service than we do with a population nearly three times the size. Now, fine, they may be different services, but I think none of what she has just said is a reasonable analysis of the matter. As she ended her last supplementary by asking whether the Government agreed with her analysis, the answer is that for all the reasons that I have just taken her through, that the Government do not agree with her analysis.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Opposition Members agree that we are hearing a lot of waffle, as we always do, from the Chief Minister, because if the Chief Minister is now saying that perhaps they will have to increase the prescriptions, that they are far too high, and I have taken note of what the Chief Minister has said, then why did they change the system when they increased prescription charges from £1.20 to £2.50 and then suddenly they came back to the House and said *'there is abuse and that is why we have done it, and now we are going to change the system and the system now is that patients after three items, every other item in the prescription is free of charge'*. So what is the Chief Minister talking about?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot make any sense whatsoever of the question.



ORAL

NO 797 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – PRIMARY/SECONDARY CARE**

Have the Government any evidence that suggests that there is little communication between Primary and Secondary Care Services?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question No. 798 of 2004.

**NO 798 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY/SECONDARY CARE**

Can the Government confirm whether there is lack of communication between doctors and other health professionals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The interface between primary and secondary care involves large volumes of interactions covering a substantial range of services between practitioners, their patients and their colleagues.

There will always be room to improve communications between different staff groups. The GHA has therefore established a group, led by a lay member of the Authority, to develop ways to improve internal communications within the GHA. In addition, the Clinical Development Team's proposals for improving health service delivery in Gibraltar envisage significant improvement, via new multi-disciplinary working arrangements, which will lead to better communications between staff groups and better services for patients.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 797 TO 798 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore, by definition, the Minister is saying that yes, there is evidence that suggests that there is little communication and that there is evidence that there is lack of communication between doctors and other health professionals. Now, can the Minister confirm whether he was aware that this was happening before the Report was actually published?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

First of all what I said was the interface between primary and secondary care involves et cetera, the hon Member will have to look at Hansard and she will see what I said, which is not what she said I said. Secondly, before the Report was prepared by the Clinical Development Team, as she has asked me, I was looking after other portfolios in Government and therefore, I was not aware.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, I know, but when talking about a Government the Minister can not just say '*I do not know because I was not the Minister for Health*', I will ask the Government then.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I am very happy, the Government are very happy to answer the question. The hon Lady is living on another planet and certainly living in another country if she does not know that there has been historically in Gibraltar, including during her term in office with the responsibility for health, a permanent situation of tension between a number, not all, a number of GPs at the hospital and a number, not all, of consultants at the hospital. The hon Member must know this and for her to feign that she does not know it is unbelievable, because it is a well known fact. It is a well known fact in public circles let alone to somebody who has been Minister for Health for eight years, and she will see, when we start publishing the implementation. Well, I suppose she is interested in the answer to the question that she has asked, if she is not I have got better things to do with my time.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is extraordinary that the Chief Minister suddenly comes up dishing out allegations that he knows what happened when I was in government. How does he know? In any case, we are talking about a Government that have been in office for eight years. Does the Chief Minister then not accept that after eight years, I think that the people of Gibraltar are starting to get a bit fed up. The Government have been in office for eight years, and the Chief Minister has said that he knows what happened when I was in government. He cannot, and secondly, he does not want to know what is happening now within the eight years that his party has been in Government, because this is definitely something that has come out from a Report that he has commissioned, and therefore how can he try to waffle his way out of a situation that is existing in the Health Services today and for which they are responsible. They have been eight years in Government, will they be 20 years or 30 years and still blame the AACR?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The way things are going there is every likelihood that we will be in office for the next 20 or 30 years, that part of the hon Member's answer is certainly true, because frankly, I do not know what the hon Lady, I am quite prepared to continue this exchange with her on the basis that at least she is going to listen to what one says. What I would have carried on to say, had she been interested in listening to the answer that I was trying to give her before, what I was going to say was that she will see when we start publishing the implementation recommendations in Phase 2 of the Health Review, that what I am saying is true, and that there are instances of what I said before about the tension between Primary and Care Centre. I did not need to answer her specific supplementary of earlier, I did not need experts to come from the United Kingdom to tell me that there was tension but that is what she does not understand. She can never understand the distinction between identifying a problem and the necessary expertise to remedy it, and she never recognises that distinction. This is why she introduced no health reform whatsoever in her eight years in office. I did not need a consultant from the United Kingdom, however expert, to come to tell

me that the problem existed. That is true of most of the problems in the Health Authority, but we do need expertise from the United Kingdom to tell us how they can be fixed. I know the hon Member does not agree but this is the sort of the political arrogance of it. There is a problem. Sometimes I think that what makes the hon Lady most nervous is that we might succeed in fixing the problems, because she is going to have to find another political toy to play with. I cannot understand this, Governments all over the world when there are structural reforms to be introduced in a highly technical specialist area like health, Governments all over the world consult the experts, not the hon Lady. We differ and we are perfectly happy to spend the substantial sums of public money that we are spending on the consultants, because we know that the result will be a long overdue, overhaul of 40 years work of accumulated bad practice in the health service, not all of it the result of the eight years that the hon Member was in office, but those eight years accrued bad practice as well, because every year that passes without reform adds to the problem. We decided to initiate the reforms when we did, we could say that from the two years before then we were contributing. We started three years ago, this process has been on-going. No changes yet, but the reforms that are coming are long, deep and wide and by the time they are finished, which is not a never never process, we are talking about a process that might last between 12 and 18 months at the most, the Health Service will not be recognisable from what it is today. It is all very well for the hon Lady to say, *'why has it taken us eight years'*, it has not taken us eight years it has taken us six years to start the process. The Opposition Members did not do it and they did not even address their minds to the need for the process in eight years in government. When the hon Lady starts seeing some of these reports that are going to be published, she will see what I mean when I say that there is tension and lack of communication and that this is ingrained in the system, the system is not right.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just make clear, because the Chief Minister has said two things which appears to contradict the other. One is that we do not support the bringing of this Clinical Governance Team, we do not but he just said that my hon Colleague was criticising him as to why it took him so long. We are not criticising why it took him so long to have the Clinical Governance because we would not have done it and we do not support it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Another thing that the Chief Minister said, he said he knew the problems and he has accepted that he needs the experts to fix them. Well, I can tell him that the whole of Gibraltar knows that the problems that exist today did not exist when we were in government at all and they can laugh. There were no measures that we had to take like they have had to take. We did not have people having to wait for beds to go into the hospital, we did not have to mix the wards and I can go on and on and on. We knew the problems and the difference between them and us, is that we solved them and they did not. When they came into Government the problems started to exacerbate.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I see. So when the British Medical Council described the Health Services under her stewardship as 'third world' this was a figment of their imagination, was it?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Chief Minister is saying nonsense, because when he says the British Medical Council, people hearing might say 'oh this is a council'. Who are the people who said it? The Branch of the BMA and they did not say it was in third world standards, what they said was it could go down because we were actually tackling private practice, which we did and which has been another fiasco with this Government, but the British Medical Council does not exist. It is the BMA, the union of the doctors who were very concerned that we were going to tackle private practice. So the Chief Minister should know that when he talks in this House he should say what is actually factual information and not what suits him.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Let us be clear of the enormity of what the hon Lady is saying. The hon Lady is saying that on 15<sup>th</sup> May 1996 there was in the Gibraltar Health Authority no private practice, lies. The Gibraltar Health Authority, the hospital has been rife with private practice which she was specifically not just permitting but encouraging by giving contracts to consultants that allowed them to do it. The hon Lady is also suggesting that in her time in St Bernard's Hospital there was never any shortage of beds, no one was ever asked to leave the hospital because they had been discharged. In other words, that none of the things that she presently complains about, about the Health Authority existed. So, before the 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996 the people of Gibraltar were entirely satisfied with their public health service which did not require them to have recourse to private practice. Who on earth does she think that she is trying to con? The problem with the hon Lady is that she repeats this nonsense so often, she has played this gramophone record so many times in her own earshot that she has ended up actually persuading herself that it is true. This is the problem, there is a grave psychological problem here. The hon Lady has convinced herself that this is true. It is terribly, terribly sad. I am not going to enter into a balance sheet with her about whether it was more bad or less bad in her time of office, or more bad or less bad in our time of office. What I can tell her is this, that there have been huge reforms and huge improvements since 1996 and far from the Health Service having slipped into the mire since 1996, some of the things that needed fixing have been done. Some of the non-existent services that she did not even make available to the people of Gibraltar, are now made available to the people of Gibraltar. Does that mean that the Health Service is now all right? Evidently not. If we thought that the Health Service was now all right, we would not have commissioned the studies that we have commissioned and embarked on the reform that we have embarked. Is the Health Service now better than it was when the hon Lady left office? Incalculably better, ask anybody who works in the Health Service. [Interruption] So the hon Member thinks that this never happened in their time in office? It is clear that the hon Members are completely and utterly blind or obtuse to the realities, which are (1) that the Health Authority today by any measure, the Health Service today is better than it has been. (2) That what requires to be done, not to tinker with linoleum on the floors as she used to do, or not to sack ophthalmologists on her whim as she used to do, but what needs to be done is being done. (3) I am entirely convinced, as I think by now are most people in Gibraltar, that the hon Lady is simply now milking the health issue. Never mind that she has not succeeded in three General Elections in persuading the people of this, but she continues to milk shamelessly the health service, and abuse it for her own purposes because she knows that what she does not want to happen is about to happen. That is that for the first time in Gibraltar's medical history a Government are not only going to deliver a new hospital to the people of Gibraltar, but with it is going to tackle areas of difficulty and reform in our

Health Service which no Government of Gibraltar, least of all hers, has had the courage, the determination, the commitment to tackle, and I am no longer willing to debate these issues over and over again. We fought an election as recently as five months ago on this issue and there is not going to be another general election for another four years. By then it will not turn on what she says or what I say, the time for spin will be over. The people will see the new hospital, it will be up and running and they will decide whether they like it or whether they think it is an improvement, and the reforms to the service will have been delivered and the people will know, will see, whether it is for real or they will know whether it is not for real.

Therefore there really does not seem any point in her and I bantering any longer about this, there is not another electoral contest between now and turkey time. Therefore I suggest that we agree to allow time for the facts to speak for themselves, because there is no point of the hon Lady constantly making statements and constantly making complaints as if a thorough review process was not under way. She ignores the fact that a review process is under way and she says *'yesterday somebody rang me to complain about this or that'*, as if there was not a general review process under way that is going to deal with issues of that sort and many more. So the hon Member can continue to make hay for a little bit longer but not for very much longer, I must warn her.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO;**

It is always the Chief Minister that does not like the word 'lies' in this House and he has introduced the word 'lies'. I have always said, that I am not in the habit of saying things in the House that I cannot back up with factual information.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I think that is not true.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well in that case, if the Chief Minister has used the word 'lies', I think that this is a word which is not commonly used in parliamentary procedures. Secondly, we were phasing out private practice and they used to criticise us because we were phasing it out, because they said that we were actually going to attract the doctors who did not have the right qualities to come over. That did not happen, and another thing that I can tell him is, does he not realise that the people of Gibraltar do not believe what he is saying? The people of Gibraltar have got long memories and they know that the Health Services are now worse then ever before. Does he not realise that he accepted it? When the elections were over, he actually said in his speech that he accepted there had been a reprimand from the people of Gibraltar because of our health services.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes of course I accepted that, but that is not an acknowledgement.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, the psychological problem is on his side not our side.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I fear that the hon Lady has been contagiously influenced by the Hon Stephen Linares.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Point of order. What is the Chief Minister saying about the Hon Stephen Linares? Because I have been giggling and laughing, yes I admit to that, the same as he does when I speak, he giggles and laughs, so what is the allegation the Chief Minister is saying to Stephen Linares?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I was about to tell him but he interrupted to ask a point of order, to ask me what is the allegation, when I was in the process of making it. If he had just let me finish he would not have had to make the point of order, he would by now know the answer. The allegation of contagion to the Hon Stephen Linares is the one that I put to him this morning during his address, which is that the hon Lady, as I said to him this morning, accuses of distortion and attributes to me things that I have not said either for myself or for them. Look, the fact that I after the election acknowledged that the results suggested that the electorate wanted us to concentrate a little bit on local affairs, which was both health and housing as I recall, so let us just stay on the health aspect of it for now. That is not an acknowledgement that the Health Service was then worse than it was under the hon Lady, it was that despite the improvements there had not been enough improvements. I do not see why the hon Member should interpret an acknowledgement on my part that the electorate thinks that more needs to be done on health, as an acknowledgement of my acceptance, to use her words, of the fact that the Health Services were worse under us than under her. I happen to think that they are not. The hon Lady obviously believes the contrary, well that is Okay. [Interruption] Well, I do not know whether that is true, because if things were as bad as the hon Members make out, well then they have got a real big political problem, because for goodness sake, if they could not beat us in three elections in a row having presided over the collapse of the Health Service, which is something which the people of Gibraltar hold most dear, how on earth are they going to beat us after we have fixed it all? The hon Member is in effect saying that despite having been reckless and dilatory and having presided over the collapse of the Health Authority, we were still able to beat them by a margin of 12 per cent in our third election, by which time there is usually a considerable amount of electoral erosion.

Well, I do not think the hon Members should depress themselves in this way. The answer is that the situation is not as she is describing. No, the situation is as I am describing. Namely, that the people see a Government that have resolved to tackle the issues of health, that is tackling the issues of health, that the results have already started to come through and will continue to come through, and unfortunately for her will all have come through before the next election and that they are therefore happy to have such a Government in office. Contrasted to her, now I understand why she did not take any steps to reform the Health Service, how could she take any steps to

reform the Health Service when she is convinced that there was nothing wrong with it, nothing to fix? So, the position is that on 15<sup>th</sup> May the Health Authorities were in a perfect state and with immediate effect from 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996, all the problems began to occur. Not only all the problems began to occur, but indeed that all the problems began to occur because of the fault of the GSD Ministers for Health, Keith Azopardi, Bernard Linares, all of them who personally brought about this immediate deterioration beginning the very morning after the general election result. The hon Lady is persuaded that this is true and because we are not going to be having this discussion every time we have a health question in the House, what I propose to the hon Lady is that we just allow time to tell whether we succeed or whether we do not succeed. In the meantime, she can carry on sniping from the margins, but she can carry on sniping from the margins, that is all she is doing and I intend to continue to tell the electorate that that is what she is doing, and I intend to continue to tell the electorate that in our view what the hon Members are doing is simply using the health issue, whilst they can, which as I say is not going to be for very much longer, as a political football. Of course even after the reforms it is not going to be a perfect system, there will always be things that will go wrong. Young men may still die in hospital, people die in hospitals even in the Houston Medical Centre, and of course I have no doubt that whenever there is such an incident the Opposition Members will say, *'ah you see how it was a waste of £1 million to bring the consultants because people are still dying in your hospital'*, I have no doubt that is going to be the case but the electorate is not going to buy it.



ORAL

**NO 799 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF TREATING PENSIONERS IN UK**

Can Government now state what was the latest average annual cost of treating a pensioner in the UK in 2001?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 800 and 801 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 800 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – UK SOCIAL SECURITY PENSIONERS**

Can Government confirm whether the figure of 462 UK Social Security pensioners, who were not also in receipt of a Gibraltar Social Security pension, resident to date, and registered with the Group Practice Medical Scheme, has now been validated by the Department of Health?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 799 and 801 of 2004.

**NO 801 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR SOCIAL SECURITY PENSIONERS**

Can Government now state how many Gibraltar Social Security pensioners, who were not also in receipt of a UK Social Security pension, are resident to date in the UK?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 799 OF 2004**

The UK Department of Health has not yet presented its 2001 average cost paper to the EU Audit Board, therefore the figures have not been made available.

**Answer to Question Nos. 800 and 801 of 2004**

Yes Sir. The figure of 462 has now been confirmed by the UK Department of Health and 25 Gibraltar Social Security pensioners were not in receipt of a UK Social Security pension as at 1 April 2003.

ORAL

**NO 802 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF TREATING TEMPORARY VISITORS IN UK**

Can the Minister for Health now state what was the latest available cost to the UK of treating temporary visitors from Gibraltar in respect of 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The cost of treatment of temporary visitors from Gibraltar to the UK is not yet available to the UK Department of Health.

**ORAL**

**NO 803 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SECURITY GUARDS**

Can Government state how much was paid by the Gibraltar Health Authority for security guards and give a breakdown of the amounts paid to each security company if more than one was contracted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 804 of 2004.

**NO 804 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SECURITY GUARDS**

Can Government state at what rate per man hour the Gibraltar Health Authority paid for the provision of security guards?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the attached schedules that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question No. 803 of 2004**

The amounts paid to Detectives & Security for the financial year 2003/2004 was £116,559.

**Answer to Question No. 804 of 2004**

**Rates per hour**

|              | <b>Weekdays</b> | <b>Weekends</b>    |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| <b>01/02</b> | 5.50 per hour   | £72.00 per weekend |
| <b>02/03</b> | 5.50 per hour   | £72.00 per weekend |
| <b>03/04</b> | 6.00 per hour   | £88.00 per weekend |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 803 TO 804 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the increase in the rate in the last year the result of the increase in the minimum wage being reflected in the rate when it goes up to £6.00?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not certain of the answer to that question. I think it is reflected, I will not attempt to answer it, I am not sure what the reason is. I had assumed when I saw the increase that it was purely an increase in costs, that it was the latest year, that the cost had gone up but for a number of reasons I was not able to check it. I do not know the answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the rate that the Health Authority pays the result of having asked for quotes from different people and then having selected this one?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, I was told that at the moment we are employing only one firm but in the past we have employed a different one, or two at a time, so the prices are arrived at by quotation or tender.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think it has anything to do with the minimum wage. The rate paid has never been anywhere near the minimum wage, even as far back as 2001/2002 they were being paid £5.50 an hour. So it has been nowhere near the minimum wage, so the rise to £6.00 per hour is not minimum wage linked. They have always been earning more than the minimum wage.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is not the rate the employees earn. That is the rate the Authority pays. The market is not that big, it just occurred to me that the increase might reflect the fact that the wage paid by the company to the guard had gone up as a result of the minimum wage. What I am thinking is, I assumed that if the Government have got contracts with labour suppliers.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We would not agree to them paying their staff less than the minimum wage.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Right, therefore the contractor might come back to the Government and say '*well, since you are now forcing me to pay more I have to charge you more*'. That is really what I am asking. The fact that it went up in the last year, I assume was not that the company was increasing its profit margin but that the employee was getting paid more.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, all I can say in answer to the question is that the rate goes up every year, even in years in which there has not been an increase in the minimum wage.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether they have a contract with the company and for what period of time?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No, we need notice of that question. That there is a contract yes, what the period of time is, I would need notice of.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just point out to the Chief Minister that the figures that they have given us do not show that it goes up every year, it shows that it went up in this last financial year but in the preceding two years, when the minimum wage had not gone up, it was the same £5.50 an hour.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is right, sorry.



**NO 805 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can Government confirm what was the estimated cost of study leave in the financial year 2003/2004 and in what subhead is the sum included?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The estimated cost of study leave in the financial year 2003/2004 was £52,000 and is included in subhead 30, School of Health Studies.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 805 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In the Estimates of 2002/2003 it was shown in the estimate for 2001/2002 that it was £60,000 and the previous year it had a zero there and then the forecast outturn for the same year there was nothing there and for the estimate for 2002/2003 there was nothing there. I can understand that now they have included it in the School of Health Studies but why in previous years was it not shown in 2000/2001, 2001/2002, if the estimate was there for 2001 and 2002 why was it not shown in the forecast outturn for the same year 2001 and 2002?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am afraid I would need notice of that question. I cannot give that answer.

**NO 806 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state in answer to Question No 147 of 2004, whether the provisional figure given of £975,000 has now changed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No Sir. There has been no update to this figure.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 806 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it still a provisional figure?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I understand so, that is why I said no update. We have had no indication of any change which could make it an accurate figure but there has been no indication whether there will be a change or no change.

ORAL

**NO 807 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government now update the figure for period 8, year 2003, which was given as incomplete in answer to Question No 215 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 808 and 809 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 808 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can the Government now update the figure relating to period 8 regarding prescriptions, which was given as incomplete in answer to Question No 216 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 807 and 809 of 2004.

**NO 809 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government confirm the actual figures given for periods 8, 9 and 10 in relation to Question No 218 of 2004, which were given as incomplete?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the Schedules that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question No. 807 of 2004**

The figure for period 8, year 2003 is as follows:

| <b>Period</b> | <b>Prescriptions</b> | <b>Items</b> | <b>Cost</b> |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 8             | 6157                 | 15160        | £202,325.62 |

**Answer to Question No. 808 of 2004**

| <b>Period</b> | <b>Prescriptions</b> | <b>Items</b> | <b>Cost</b> |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 8             | 13641                | 46911        | £569,803.77 |

**Answer to Question No. 809 of 2004**

|           |                         |
|-----------|-------------------------|
|           | <b><u>2003/2004</u></b> |
| Period 8  | £84,439.80              |
| Period 9  | £84,222.00              |
| Period 10 | £22,515.40              |

ORAL

NO 810 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – COST OF TREATING TEMPORARY VISITORS IN UK**

Can the Government now confirm whether the figure given in answer to Question No 195 of 2004, as around £36, 000, has now been updated?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

The situation remains as given in answer to Question No. 195 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 811 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can Government state what were the exceptional circumstances why the Gibraltar Health Authority sent a contract officer for further training to the UK, during his contract period, since the Government confirmed in the last meeting of the House, that it is not the policy of the GHA to do this?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 812 and 813 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 812 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS**

Can the Government confirm whether there is a training needs analysis in place for staff?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 811 and 813 of 2004.



**NO 813 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – TRAINING**

Can the Government confirm what are the arrangements to provide training for staff when new equipment is introduced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 811 of 2004**

A vacancy arose within the community Mental Health Team. This vacancy was advertised and, in keeping with EU legislation, contract officers were allowed to compete with staff in the permanent and pensionable establishment. All applicants were aware that the successful candidate would be required to undergo a period of training in the United Kingdom, prior to taking up the post. The candidate agreed by the selection panel as the person who best met all the needs of the service was a contract officer. He was duly offered the post and consequently the training course in the UK. When he returns he will be employed in a permanent and pensionable post and will therefore cease to be a contract officer.

**Answer to Question No. 812 of 2004**

Historically, during the time when the hon Member was Minister for Health, and prior to the School of Health Studies being set up by this Government, training requirements identified were reactive and failed to contribute to a coherent provision of training. The inception of the School of Health Studies resulted in the centralisation of resources and facilities, and with it the commencement and the development of a multi-professional, multi-disciplinary training programme. The increase in training requirements and the continued desire to produce an efficient and coherent workforce has meant that the School and the GHA recognise the need to further develop a system of staff appraisal so that the organisation's needs can be complemented by the personal and professional development needs of the staff. The School will now work closely with the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Team in one of the work streams identified to produce a more systematic and proactive manner of assessing future training requirements.

**Answer to Question No. 813 of 2004**

This is certainly a central part of the move into the new hospital and the School of Health Studies is currently working with the department responsible for

commissioning, to provide a programme of training for staff on the use of all the new equipment to be introduced.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 811 TO 813 OF 2004**

##### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, first of all it surprises me to hear the Minister saying that the officer who was brought over with a contract was sent back to the UK and is now being made permanent and pensionable. Now, there are other questions in this House over contract officers because then what the Minister is saying is that if it is not the policy of the GHA to do this, they have done it according to him, because he says that this contract officer is better than local people. That is what he has answered.

##### **HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

That is not what I have said. I have not mentioned being better than local people or English people or Chinese people. I have not mentioned being better or worse than anybody else.

##### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

What has the Minister then said?

##### **HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

It seems to me that the hon Member does not understand the situation. I explained it to her at the last Question Time and I have tried to explain it today. I will explain it again in words of one syllable. We have a vacancy in the Mental Health Department. The vacancy is advertised, because of EU legislation the applications cannot be limited to Gibraltarians or to permanent and pensionable people only. In fact it was tried and then we had to extend it so it was extended and a contract officer applied. Now let me move sideways a moment, it seems to me that what the hon Member is totally concentrating on wrongly, is the concept that she seems to think that if we bring someone on contract from the UK and we send that person away for training at the taxpayers expense, that that is in some way criminal, and if that was exactly what had been happening I would tend to agree with her. But that is not the situation, this is not a question of someone coming on contract for a period of three years and someone deciding that during that period of three years we are going to send that person off for a period of time for training in UK at taxpayers expense, then they come back, they finish their contract and they go away again and we have lost them. That is not the situation, let us get this absolutely clear because I do not intend to explain it again. What is happening, as I have said, is that there was a vacancy, people applied and this person, who was a contract officer, applied and was selected. Right, it was a condition that the person had to go to UK for training. At that moment in time the person stopped being a contract officer because the person had been accepted into a permanent and pensionable job. So he is no longer a contract officer he is now employed and he is in UK undergoing training and it is a permanent and pensionable post and we have employed a person who was formally a contract officer, because he was selected. When he comes back from training, he

will take up that post, he will be employed as a permanent and pensionable person within the GHA and he is no longer a contract officer. That is the situation and there is no question, as seems to be implied, that we are sending someone who is here for a short period of time and during that period that he is here working for us we are ill using taxpayers funds to send him away for training. I hope that clarifies the situation.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The reason why I have put this question is precisely because of the answer that I got from the Minister in January of this year, when I asked the same question and he answered the following, *'it is not the policy of the Gibraltar Health Authority to send contract officers to the UK for training'* and that was his answer. So therefore, if it is not the policy of the GHA to do this then I am entitled to ask why have they done it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They have not done it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

They have done it, the Minister has just said so.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, what the Minister has just told the hon Lady, who appears to be determined not to understand what she is being told however simple it might be or frequently it might be explained to her, is that when this person went on the course he was no longer a contract officer, by that stage he had become a permanent and pensionable officer because he had successfully applied for a permanent and pensionable post.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well then, is the position that if the Health Authority brings somebody on a short term contract while we are sending our local people to study in the UK, the people who are here to fill that gap can be converted into permanent and pensionable because it is an EU requirement, is that the information we are being given?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No that is not the information and there is no question of converting people into permanent and pensionable. There was a vacancy that was advertised and this person applied together with others I suppose, and there was a selection board, which is the management, consultants or whoever mans this board, and this chap won the contest. He was in Gibraltar as a contract officer but he could have been here in a private capacity.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well was the vacancy opened outside the Health Service?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Even if it was not, the rule about opening it outside the Health Service is not opening outside the Health Service to permanent and pensionable staff only.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If there is a promotion opened in the Health Service, we are now being told, is it not a promotion? Surely the person is applying on something that requires training, when he gets back he will not be in the same grade as he was before he went. It was a promotion, people applied and the Minister was telling us that they were told they could not restrict it to permanent and pensionable. That is what he has just said, and they extended the date so that contract officers, who would have not been allowed to do it, as has been the policy until now.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is not the Civil Service.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know but everybody in the Health Authority is a seconded Civil Servant. The Health Authority has got no direct employees.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, they become Civil Servants when they become permanent and pensionable, but the rule that one does not recruit outside the Service, it is not a rule it is a practice, the Government are free to open it out and indeed recently has begun to do so in certain areas. In the context of the Health Authority there are lots of people in the Health Authority on contracts, not just this chap, a lot of the doctors are on contracts, a lot of the consultants are on contracts, a lot of the nursing staff is on contract. The size of the contract body as opposed to the permanent and pensionable body is very large in the Health Authority compared to other activities in the public sector. Yes, what the hon Member is saying is true, it appears to have been the case, I personally do not think it is objectionable, it appears to have been the case that when this vacancy was advertised it was open to people who were only contract officers in the Health Authority.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No only permanent and pensionable.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Initially, this is the supplementary information I had here in January and I may have read to the hon Members, initially the post was advertised for permanent and pensionable staff only. However, European law did not allow for this discrimination. The person concerned was therefore entitled to apply and was successful in his application.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

We would have to look at the question of European law because we are not very sure what that particular law is, but assuming that to be a correct interpretation of the European requirement, does that not mean effectively that the policy which the Government have defended, that because we do not have the people in the numbers that they want to have qualified, we have to rely on bringing in people on a temporary basis whilst our people are being given the opportunity to qualify. Now if the people who are on a temporary basis are now being told can apply for the vacancies in the Service, then when the people who have been training come back the vacancies will not be there, surely, because the others have already qualified.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

That would assume that the contract officer is better than the people who are within the Service. In this case the interview board decided that this person was the best person for the job.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What the hon Member says may be true, in the context of this particular post, in other words if there was somebody out there from Gibraltar undergoing training, the sort of person that I know the hon Member means, a Gibraltarian, I do not know where he draws the line for these purposes, was training in the UK for community psychiatric nurse qualifications and whilst he was away training this happened, this which has just described, in other words a contract officer was selected for a permanent post, there may not then be a vacancy when the local person comes back, it is possible that that may happen as he has described it in respect of specific posts, but the real issue on training that we have debated in the House before, is about general nursing posts, and that is just a question of waiting for our staff to get the necessary qualifications and then simply not renewing the contract with contract nurses. This is a particular post, this is not a general nursing post but it could happen. What he has said, if we were not careful, could happen but it would be very unfortunate if it were to happen, but this is not such a case and the hon Member is assuming, which he should not assume is the case and I do not know whether it is or it is not but am almost certain it is not, there is nobody out there undergoing these studies. Theoretically it could happen.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If we have got x number of registered general nurses on contracts, when that has been debated in this House, the rationale of that has been that it is while we have got people who are studying to become qualified we have them here. Therefore we are

bringing people in to fill gaps. We have just been told that all those people who are here filling gaps will be able to apply for any other vacancies for which they are qualified to apply, and they may well because they are here having been many years elsewhere, perform better in a promotion board. Now that previously was not possible until this change took place because in fact previously it was limited to non contract officers. If we are being told that this practice that we have had until now is now outlawed, it is not outlawed just in this specific instance. If tomorrow there is a vacancy for a charge nurse or a sister, presumably all the contract people we have got on three year contracts will be able to compete with our permanent staff for those jobs. That was not the intention for bringing them. I find it odd that we should have a situation where we are filling a temporary gap in our needs and the people that we bring we suddenly find can in fact compete with those that have been there all the time, even though they have got preferential terms when they are on contract, even though they get provided with accommodation when they are on contract, even though they get a tax free gratuity. They have got all those advantages and yet they are able to compete on equal terms with the people that are permanently employed here. I simply would like to take a closer look at that European requirement, I must say, but that seems to be the implication.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well assuming that the European requirement is right, which I am not prepared to endorse that is with the advice that the Health Authority got, I am quite insistent on having a closer look at it myself. It may or may not be right, but assuming for the moment that the Health Authority have got the correct lead of advice from wherever it is that they have sought it, then the position is as the hon Member describes it. We are in a situation where we bring people to Gibraltar on contract, because we are just not producing enough of these people ourselves domestically, and once here on contract, if the advice that they have got is right, then they are suddenly a new source of competition for the posts that before were only available to people on permanent and pensionable, or that the Government procedure protected just for people on permanent and pensionable, and of course that meant usually local belongsers because it was usually the local belongsers and it usually takes quite a long time for it. Yes, that is true, and I suspect that we agree as to what we think that the position should be. To the extent that European law permits it we should be careful not to undermine the accessibility of long term residents as I prefer to call them, for jobs and the Gibraltar Health Authority management has got to be sensitive and manage short term needs in a way which is consistent with the long term objective, which is to give our established local resident staff the opportunity through training and qualification obtaining, to rise up through the Service. That is, as far as I am concerned, what would be the Government's policy. To the extent that the law permits it, that is what the Health Service management should ensure happens and I think the issue is sufficiently significant for the Health Authority to be encouraged to make sure that the legal advice that they acted on in that particular case is correct. It seems to me that that is a much more important issue than whatever may have happened in this particular case, which at the end of the day is just one post.

ORAL

**NO 814 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF ACCOMMODATION**

Can Government state what was the final figure for accommodation, under sub head 22 in the financial year 2002/2003 and in the forecast outturn in 2003/2004 of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 815 of 2004.

**NO 815 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – FORECAST OUTTURN**

Can Government confirm what is the forecast outturn for the revenue and expenditure of the Gibraltar Health Authority for the current financial year as at the end of December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 814 of 2004**

The expenditure in accommodation under Subhead 22 is as follows:  
Financial Year 2002/2003 - £219,692.01  
Forecast Outturn for Financial Year 2003/2004 - £330,000.

**Answer to Question No. 815 of 2004**

The forecast outturns for revenue and expenditure are calculated as at the end of the financial year. As at 31 March 2004 they were as shown in the Government's Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, a copy of which is in the possession of the hon Members.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 814 TO 815 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As regards the figure for accommodation which seems to me to be quite high, are we talking about the Government having private accommodation to house people that are on contract or people that they have brought over from the UK in the private sector?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is opportune that the hon Member should ask that question now. I have in the last few days asked the question myself within Government and I have commissioned a report, it was about 10 days ago now, and I have commissioned a report which is on my desk and have not yet had an opportunity to read. Where I have asked for full



details of the properties et cetera that the Health Authority, and the amount of rent per property and the rental levels, because frankly for these sums of money the Government could borrow money, purchase the property on mortgage and probably pay less than we are paying out in rent. The figures of rents have risen to such an extent that the Government are now stopping to review and see whether there is a more economical way, because if for a smaller amount than we are paying in rent we can service a debt, a loan, that gives us ownership of the property, which will rise in value over time, that might be an option that the Government wish to consider. So the answer to the hon Lady's question is that the Government also are concerned about the escalating cost of this rental figure and we are considering alternatives for the accommodation of our contract staff.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

We are talking about contract staff, but are we also talking about people that are engaged by the Government, like for example like the experts that come over and they are being housed by the Government in private accommodation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It may include some of them. Some of them are in Government accommodation and some of them are in private accommodation, financed by the Government I suspect through the fee, not necessarily through this vote, but yes ultimately paid for by the Government if not through here then through the fee that we are paying them for the consultancy.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the Government have a figure of how many?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is in the report that is sitting on my desk.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I then put the Government on notice that when we come to vote that money we shall be asking for detailed breakdowns of what the money covers, just so that they know?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Sorry, the hon Member was not asking me how many of the consultancy people are in the flats, he was asking how many flats in all. Yes that is how I understood it.

ORAL

**NO 816 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ADMISSIONS TO ST BERNARD'S**

Have the Government been able to establish if admissions to St Bernard's Hospital have declined by over 10 per cent between the year 2000 and 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 817 to 821 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 817 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital, from 1 March 2003 to the end of December 2003, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 816 and 818 to 821 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 818 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital from 1 January 2004 to the end of March 2004, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 816, 817 and 819 to 821 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 819 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital from 1 March 2003 to the end of December 2003, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 816 to 818 and 820 and 821 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 820 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital from 1 January 2004 to end of March 2004, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 816 to 819 and 821 of 2004.

**NO 821 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm whether there are non-entitled patients as in-patients at St Bernard's Hospital, and if so, how many and when they were admitted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 816 of 2004**

I can confirm that the difference between the admissions in 2000 and 2002 is in the order of a reduction of 10 per cent.

**Answers to Question Nos. 817 and 819 of 2004**

Question Nos. 817 and 819 are identical to Question Nos. 212 and 213 of 2004 which were asked at the last meeting of this House in January and the information in answer to which I have already made available to the hon Member. Nevertheless, in order for it to be included in this Hansard of the House, I have now handed over a schedule which contains the information again.

**Answer to Question Nos. 818 and 820 of 2004**

With regard to the other Questions, the answers are also contained in the schedules that have now been handed over to her.

**Answer to Question No. 821 of 2004**

With regard to Question No. 821, the Government can confirm that as at 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2004, the date on which the answer to this question was drafted, there were no non-entitled patients in St Bernard's Hospital.

**Answer to Question 821**

**Answer to Question 818 of 2004.**

The total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients is as follows:

|                 | <b>Admissions</b> | <b>Average Occupancy</b> |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| January         | 580               | 156                      |
| February        | 485               | 162                      |
| March           | 550               | 157                      |
| Total in Period | 1615              | 158                      |

Cont.....

**Contd Answer to Question 821**

**Answer to Question 820 of 2004.**

|          | <b>Casualty</b>            |               |                  |               |
|----------|----------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
|          | <b>Out-patient clinics</b> | <b>Clinic</b> | <b>Dressings</b> | <b>Physio</b> |
| January  | 1400                       | 1710          | 533              | 500           |
| February | 1472                       | 1530          | 546              | 526           |
| March    | 1541                       | 1767          | 554              | 521           |

Q12/04 ANNEX D

|           | <b><u>In-patient Admissions</u></b> | <b><u>Average No of patients per day</u></b> |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| March     | 542                                 | 141                                          |
| April     | 520                                 | 137                                          |
| May       | 518                                 | 134                                          |
| June      | 480                                 | 128                                          |
| July      | 499                                 | 135                                          |
| August    | 533                                 | 140                                          |
| September | 500                                 | 143                                          |
| October   | 496                                 | 137                                          |
| November  | 531                                 | 144                                          |
| December  | 509                                 | 138                                          |
|           | 5128                                |                                              |



The total number of Out-Patient attendances during the period in question were -

|           | <b>Clinics</b> | <b>A &amp; E<br/>(Doctors)</b> | <b>A&amp;E<br/>(Dressings)</b> | <b>Physiotherapy</b> |
|-----------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| March     | 1312           | 1680                           | 557                            | 544                  |
| April     | 1334           | 1649                           | 588                            | 549                  |
| May       | 1369           | 1798                           | 515                            | 645                  |
| June      | 1479           | 1785                           | 705                            | 528                  |
| July      | 1476           | 1884                           | 760                            | 559                  |
| August    | 1304           | 1937                           | 705                            | 476                  |
| September | 1344           | 1723                           | 715                            | 669                  |
| October   | 1416           | 1703                           | 564                            | 744                  |
| November  | 1341           | 1749                           | 532                            | 634                  |
| December  | <u>1053</u>    | <u>1637</u>                    | <u>426</u>                     | <u>601</u>           |
| Totals    | <u>13428</u>   | <u>17545</u>                   | <u>6067</u>                    | <u>5949</u>          |

Classification:

|                      |                                                                |
|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| "Clinic"             | Doctors' Clinics.                                              |
| "A&E<br>(Doctors)"   | Seen by Casualty Officers as accident or emergency on the day. |
| "A&E<br>(Dressings)" | Patients attended by nurses only                               |
| "Physiotherapy"      | Patients attending the department for treatment.               |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 816 TO 821 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

We are talking about that particular day, that there were no non-entitled patients?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

That is what I said, as at 23<sup>rd</sup> April, on that day there were no patients.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That does not mean that there were no patients before that date.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The question was very wide, it says '*can Government confirm whether there are non-entitled patients*'. If the hon Member had asked me during the year I would have said, but I have taken the date on which I answered the question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will ask the question again.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Let me be quite clear, it is not the policy of the Government to accept non-entitled patients. However, if someone comes in off a car accident or off a ship, or in dire need of medical attention, we do not turn them away either, but if they are admitted then they are treated and charged as a private patient, but obviously we do not encourage the practice.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Except that in the Report there is a statement that non-entitled patients require £500 deposit, and there is no record of this having been collected. So the Report does actually admit that there are non-entitled patients.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not quite sure what the Report admits, but the statement that a non-entitled patient requires a deposit of £500 does not say that there are non-entitled patients, but I am aware that there have been on occasions but they have been charged.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

There have been?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I understand so. That is the feedback that I got. When we were debating how to answer the question, it was difficult to pin it down so we decided to answer on the particular day.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Report does talk about non-entitled patients but I will rephrase the question again. As regard Question No. 816 the Minister confirms that admissions have declined by 10 per cent between the year 2000 and 2002. Therefore it strikes me as very odd, that does the Minister not see the logic that if admissions have declined by 10 per cent, from 2000 to 2002, why have we had so many shortages of beds?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I assume that is a rhetorical question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I did not quite get the answer. What did the Minister say?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Answer to a rhetorical question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So I am not getting an answer?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member has had an answer.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have been working, as usual, because I always like to look at figures that I am given, and I would like to inform the Minister that here again as regards Question No. 818, we have a situation that when we are talking about the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital, again, we have vast discrepancies. The Report of the Healthcare Development Team of September 2003, as far as the year 2000 is concerned, quotes 6,532 patients, 2001 6,380 patients, 2002 5,874 patients. Now, I have looked at the

answers that I have been given in this House by the Government and the figures that I have been given for the year 2000, 5,475 as compared to the one given in the Report which is 6,532, 5,320 as compared to 6,380 which is in the Report, and for the year 2002 5,682 as compared to 5,874 which appears in the Healthcare Development Team Report. It gets even worse because when I looked at the Abstract of Statistics again, the figures do not coincide at all, 5,424 for the year 2000, 6,380 for the year 2001 and 5,874, so here again I have been able to identify that figures being provided in this House are totally different to figures provided in the Government Abstract of Statistics and the figures that appear in the Healthcare Development Team Report for the same years. So before the Minister tells me to do the work for him, I will send him the exercise so that he will be able to confirm which of the three figures are correct.

Now, if we look at Question No. 820, again there are more discrepancies. I wish the Chief Minister would stand up and say *'the hon Member from the Opposition has done a good job'* because he never says that, but at least I am bringing to their notice that there are discrepancies in three Reports, which happen to have the GHA as the source. Now, as regards the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital, we have the Government answering questions in this House, the Minister gets up and he gives a speech and he tries to waffle his way through, I am not waffling. I think it is my legitimate right to stand up and point out to the Government that the figures that I am being given do not coincide at all with the figures that are being produced by the Government Statistics Office and by the Healthcare Development Team Report. Honestly, I think that the job that I am doing is a constructive one. So as far as the total number of patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital are concerned, the figures again do not coincide. The question is, are the Government concerned enough to want to investigate it?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Having listened to the hon Member, it has reinforced my belief in the accuracy of that famous quotation *'lies, damn lies and statistics'*.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Which of the lies and which of the statistics? This is what we want them to look into, which are the lies and which are the true statistics?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Seriously, I will repeat what I said earlier, if the hon Member is that keen on someone spending a lot of time number crunching, then will she identify exactly what the question is, what the sources she is drawing attention to are, and more importantly, to be specific on the periods concerned and the number that she wants so that we can make sure that we are comparing apples to apples. Invariably, the problem is as I pointed out earlier, that the raw data is not necessarily the same.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not a question of whether we are keen, the question is that if we are given information in answer to our questions, for which we are grateful, and then in making

an evaluation on the demand and the resources of the hospital we look at the number of in-patients. If there are three separate figures then we would like to know which of the three is the right one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We understand that. We understand that the hon Members are entitled to have accurate information to put it to whatever use they want, to analyse or just to collect it. They are entitled to accurate information. My hon Colleague has given the hon Members information in this House, they should assume that the information that they have had in this House is correct. The hon Lady is now saying *'hang on, but look there is information here in these other sources that I think is incompatible'*. We are not saying that she is right or she is wrong, what we are saying is we need to see the various sources that she is relying on to see if they purport to be a measure of the same activity, because all one needs is a slight difference in the wording between a question here and what it is a measure of that is being described in the Report for example, to justify a differentiation in the figures which would make it not a mistake, we are not comparing apples with apples. So it is not that we challenge the hon Member's right to have figures, we have undertaken to check them out but we are not conceding until she has given us the guidance of pointing out to us her sources and what she is comparing, to come to the conclusion that there is a mistake, until we have had an opportunity to assess that. In other words, are we comparing apples with apples and there is a mistake, or is the discrepancy that the hon Lady claims to have found, not because there is a mistake but because they are comparing apples and pears. So we are going to look at it but in order to make sure that the exercise that we are doing is meaningful, we just want to know the source.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Except that I wish to reiterate to the Government that I am looking at apples for apples, because if I look at the table of statistics from the Government and I see out-patient attendances are so many for the year 2000, and then I look at the Government answers exactly for the same purposes, out-patient attendances and I get a different figure. In any case, I will send the information that I have been able to compile to the Minister, to verify whether they are correct or not.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not know whether what I am going to say is the answer to the discrepancy but I will give one possible difference. How does one define an out-patient? At the moment in the Out-patients Department next to the A&E Department, there are people who go to attend for dressings, people who go to attend for accidents, people who go to attend doctors, people who go back to attend doctors but there is also an Out-patients Department somewhere else, in Maternity. Some people go to the ward back for a dressing. It does not follow that the people who drew up the statistics for the Clinical Governance Team, were not looking at the same raw data than what has been provided today. We may have decided to include everybody, they may have decided not to include maternity for example, or not to include dressings or may have forgotten to include return visits to clinicians. I am not saying that that is the answer but I am saying that unless one defines what is an out-patient, one does not have apples and apples.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I understand what the Minister is saying, but I was making particular reference and I was emphasising not so much on the out-patients but on the in-patient admission, and these are the figures that are given as far as in-patients are concerned, because I do understand that it could be that when we are talking about out-patients, we have people who go to the A&E as out-patients and then they have dressings and then they are seen by the Senior House Officer and then the figures could be different. But no, I was basing my figures basically on the question of the in-patient admissions.

ORAL

**NO 822 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – WAITING LISTS**

Can Government provide the latest comparable waiting lists for public and private patients, covering all specialities for both out-patients and in-patients, which also includes those who require surgical interventions as at the end of December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 823 to 825 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 823 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state how many private patients were seen to or treated at St Bernard's Hospital:

- (a) as out-patients and;
- (b) as in-patients during the months of March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 822, 824 and 825 of 2004.



**ORAL**

**NO 824 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state how many private patients were seen to or treated at St Bernard's Hospital:

- (a) As out-patients and;
- (b) As in-patients during the months of January, February and March of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 822, 823 and 825 of 2004.

**NO 825 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – WAITING LISTS**

Can Government provide the latest comparable waiting lists for public and private patients covering all specialties, giving a breakdown of each, for both out-patients and in-patients, which also includes those who require surgical interventions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Question Nos. 822 and 823 are identical to Question Nos. 201 and 211 of 2004 which were asked during the meeting of the House last January and the answer to which I have already supplied to the hon Member. Nevertheless, for the purposes of Hansard, I am now handing over to her a schedule giving the answer again. The position to date in respect of Question No. 825 remains as answered in Question No. 201. The answer to Question No. 824 is contained in the schedule which I have also already handed over to her.

**Answer to Question 825**

**Answer to Question 824**

(a) Out patient figures are not available.

(b) In Patient -

|               |    |
|---------------|----|
| January 2004  | 10 |
| February 2004 | 11 |
| March 2004    | 11 |

ANNEX C

(a) Out patients figures are not available.

(b) Private In-patients from March 2003 until December 2003.

| Mar | April | May | June | July | Aug | Sept. | Oct. | Nov. | Dec. | Total |
|-----|-------|-----|------|------|-----|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| 9   | 6     | 11  | 9    | 6    | 4   | 5     | 7    | 11   | 3    | 71    |

| Speciality         | Public Clinic                                                                                                         | Private Clinic                                                                      | Public Surgery                                                                                                                                                      | Private Surgery                                                      |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ear, Nose & Throat | 6 weeks                                                                                                               | 1 week                                                                              | Adults 18 to 20 months. Children 10 months                                                                                                                          | No waiting time as private surgery is rarely done in this speciality |
| General Surgery    | 12 weeks                                                                                                              | 1 week                                                                              | Up to 1 year depends on intervention                                                                                                                                | 3 weeks                                                              |
| General Medicine   | 5 to 7 weeks                                                                                                          | 2 weeks                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                      |
| Paediatrics        | 2 weeks                                                                                                               | No waiting time                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                      |
| Ophthalmology      | 4 weeks                                                                                                               | No waiting time                                                                     | No waiting time for Routine Surgery. Cataract waiting list concluded. A number of patients require surgery on 2 <sup>nd</sup> eye and time factor is being assessed | No waiting time                                                      |
| Elderologist       | 2 weeks                                                                                                               | No waiting time as no private patients have been seen during the period in question |                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                      |
| Pain Clinic        | No waiting time                                                                                                       | No waiting time                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                      |
| Psychiatry         | 1 to 3 weeks                                                                                                          | No waiting time as no private patients have been seen during the period in question |                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                      |
| Gynaecology        | 1 to 2 weeks for urgent cases. 6 weeks for cases noted as requiring attention soon. 4 months for routine appointments | 1 month                                                                             | 8 months                                                                                                                                                            | No private surgery is done                                           |

|              |                                                                                                              |         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Orthopaedics | 1 day for urgent cases. 1 week for cases noted as requiring attention soon. 8 weeks for routine appointments | 3 weeks | Waiting time for public surgery varies depending on intervention required. Major Surgery is not done privately. Public waiting time ranges from 2 weeks to years. Private waiting time is approx 4 weeks for minor surgery | Waiting time for public surgery varies depending on intervention required. Major Surgery is not done privately. Public waiting time ranges from 2 weeks to years. Private waiting time is approx 4 weeks for minor surgery |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

There is no waiting time for emergencies.

The Gibraltar Health Authority has been able to obtain private waiting time under the Private Patients Practise Agreement whereby Consultants are committed to provide information on private patients when requested.

## SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 822 TO 825 OF 2004

### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As far as Question No. 824 is concerned, there seems to be a bit of a discrepancy here but not on figures, on a statement that was made by the previous Minister for Health when I asked for information as regards out-patient clinics. Now, I have the figures here by the Minister who says out-patient figures are not available and I understand that this was his position also in January 2004. Therefore, I find that to be in total contradiction, would he not agree, because the previous Minister for Health had this to say when I asked for that information – *'we have the ability to seek the information and I apologise I have not got round to it, although there is no obligation to deliver that information and that data by the consultants, but we can investigate. I am sorry if I have said that I would do so, I have not got the figures with me but I will deliver those figures to the hon Member as soon as I obtain them'*. So is that not contradicting what the Minister is saying about the fact that now he says that out-patient figures are not available?

### **MR SPEAKER:**

There is no need to reply on that, one cannot say whether another Member is telling the truth or not.

### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am sure she was not accusing anybody of not telling the truth. I do not see that there is the contradiction that the hon Lady says. Both statements are perfectly capable of being true and correct and I believe that they are both true and correct. The more recent of the two statements is the Health Authority does not have that information, correct. The earlier statement is, with a lot of hard work I could get it. Well of course one could get it, one could go round every consultant, everybody that administers this, in other words, the statement that the information is not held, is not available to the Authority, is not inconsistent with the statement that with a lot of hard work it could be cobbled together. Both statements are true, as with so many other of the information. So I do not see that there is the inconsistency. Now if the hon Lady is saying *'we were told that we were going to get them and we have not received them yet'* that is a different matter, but it is different to whether there has been a contradiction. There has not been a contradiction.

### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am talking about the out-patient figures. The private out-patient figures. Now, if I have a previous Minister for Health telling me there is no obligation but I can actually investigate and I can get those figures and I will send them to the hon Member, now he did not say they were not available.

### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

She is now being told they are not available.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes. So what I am saying is that then the previous Minister for Health was saying the opposite, because he was saying '*I will deliver them*'. In fact he said in answer to Question No. 236, the previous Minister for Health said.....

**MR SPEAKER:**

A Member of the House cannot contradict another Member, especially if he is a Minister. One can not ask him whether a previous Minister was wrong.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

All right, then I will rephrase the question. I will rephrase the question because I have the same information here from the Minister, where he says '*consultants under the private practice agreement are committed to provide information on private patients when requested*'. So does that mean therefore, that if the Government request the out-patient figures the consultants are required to provide them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Let us separate the issues. The first issue is, is there any inconsistency between the two answers? I do not believe there is an inconsistency between the two answers. One question, the latter one says they are not available to the Health Authority, the first one was by the Hon Mr Azopardi I suppose, was 'well with a lot of hard work we can get them'. Those are the two answers that the hon Member described earlier she had received, summarised by me, precised by me by not purporting to repeat her verbatim. Well, of course the information is theoretically available if one is willing to pursue every avenue. I mean, presumably the doctors have kept a record of the patients they have seen privately. I suppose it would be possible for the Health Authority management, when the hon Member asks these questions, to go to every consultant and everybody who does private practice saying, give me the information, and then she goes to the other one, they could be tallied together and they could be provided to the hon Lady. They would not be figures that we could validate, we would necessarily rely on simply reporting to her the figures that the consultants had given us. In other words, the Health Authority, by the way she may be interested to know that this is going to be very different in the future, but the Health Authority does not have as a matter of management system a record of the appointments, and the engagements, and the commitments, and the admissions, and the attendances by private practitioners. That is the case. Now, can one go and ask the consultants to give it, yes. Has it been done? Apparently it has not been done because if she asked and the Minister said he would do it and she has not yet had the answer, well either the Minister has not tried or he has tried and failed because the consultants have not given him the information.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Or they have been so horrified with the result.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that would not be the reason. The hon Member knows that we give all information in this House regardless of whether it is good news or bad news.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

A supplementary on Question No. 825. Will the Minister not agree that as far as the waiting lists for public patients, they have more than doubled from 2001 to 2004? Here again I have done another exercise. In 2001 general surgery was six months. In 2004 general surgery was 12 months, it has doubled. On ENT in 2001 the waiting list was 12 months, ENT today, 2004, is 18 to 20 months. I can look at the Government and see the surprise in their faces because I do not think they have done the exercise themselves. In orthopaedics, well there we have a very ambiguous situation because in 2001 we got from the Government that the waiting list for elective surgery was eight months, and now we are being told weeks to years. In gynaecology, again in 2001 the waiting list was six weeks and today, the waiting list is eight months, over 32 weeks. Does the Minister for Health, is he not concerned that the figures have more than doubled during this time?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am at a disadvantage. Not having intended to give over the schedules that I have for my own use, and having handed them over in order to assist the hon Member, I no longer have the information to be able to make the comparisons. So I cannot give an opinion one way or the other, whether they have or whether they have not. That long waiting lists are a concern, of course they are to any Minister for Health, to any Government. That the Government are doing something about it, of course we are and the hon Member can watch this space, although she sniggers every time we mention the Clinical Development Programme, watch this space and the effect will be seen. We have already done it with the ophthalmic waiting list and the proposals to cut down those waiting lists for the future will soon be seen.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes but having been accused by Government that the Health Authority was worse when I was in office than with them, I am quite obliged now to give them the waiting lists that we had, but I will wait for the Budget Session, because they have had first of all eight years in which to remedy the situation, from 2001 to today the situation has worsened and it has more than doubled, and I will put to Government during Budget time that the figures that we had were far less than what they have now, what they even had in 2001.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well just two very quick points for the hon Lady. First of all, I suppose we can spend the next four years having the same old debate and I might take her last intervention as notice that she proposes to re-read her last year's Budget speech and deliver it again to us this year, because when she said '*wait for the Budget speech*' that is what I recall she said last time. Never mind, the position as the Government knows it to be, which is completely and diametrically opposed to the position as the hon



Member alleges, which is another area on which there is serious factual disagreement between us, is that she could not possibly compare waiting lists under the GSD Government with waiting lists under the GSLP government, because under the GSLP government waiting lists were not maintained.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Point of order. Will Mr Speaker not remember that two budget sessions ago, when the Chief Minister made the same accusation, I brought proof to this House and I showed to the House that here was the waiting lists, not brought by Mari Montegriffo when she was in government, but produced by the consultants. The same consultants that are there now. The same very consultants.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

For a start that is not a point of order but never mind, as the procedures appear to have gone out of the window. Look, what the hon Member produced was not Gibraltar Health Authority waiting lists, what she produced was a little piece of paper which she presumably got out of the very consultant, and which she waved in this House as if they were her government's waiting lists. The management of the Gibraltar Health Authority, and I repeat the statement now to her, in other words the Gibraltar Health Authority as an institution, its management, its board, did not under the GSLP government keep waiting list records. Of course the consultants had their own lists in their own briefcases at home and in their own PCs at home, and I have no doubt that the hon Member was able to persuade at least one of them to sort of give it to her so that she could bring it into this House and wave it as evidence. These are not waiting lists kept by the Gibraltar Health Authority. These were non waiting lists kept by them, these were the records, because there are no records in the files of the Gibraltar Health Authority covering that period, and because the management of the Gibraltar Health Authority, which is the same management under her period, tell the Government '*Minister, I am sorry, there are no records because none were kept*'. How else would we know as an incoming Government whether waiting lists were kept or not, it is because the officials in the Health Authority have told the Ministers in this Government that. Now that is the reality of the situation. My very last point, and this one I will try and keep quick, the second point that I will make to the hon Lady is that she has got to be careful the use she makes of these waiting lists comparisons. It is not true that waiting lists have increased for example by double. It may be true, wait a minute the hon Lady has got to understand the basis upon which statistics are drawn up if she is going to draw accurate conclusions. Now, of course I acknowledge that is always possible to make use of statistics for which they do not in justice serve. It may well be true that a patient, or a number of patients, may have had to wait that time but that is not a reflection of the general wait. Those waiting lists are drawn up on the basis of the maximum time that any one patient has had to wait. That is the basis of the waiting list. I mean we would have to look into the reasons why and the reasons why may not be impressive. The reasons why a patient has had to wait, all I am asking to do is to distinguish between that situation and the suggestion, I do not know if she was making it, the suggestion whether she was making it or not that everybody waits for 12 months because that is the next slot available on the list and if one went in and asked for an operation, somebody would say '*well the date for your operation is 28<sup>th</sup> April 2005*'. That is not a proper interpretation of the waiting lists.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is quite incredible that the Chief Minister, when he is cornered, he uses tactics whether it is that I am exaggerating, whether that records were not kept and waiting lists were not compiled. Of course they were, I was provided as Minister on a monthly basis with the waiting lists. I also produced in this House not only the waiting lists that the consultants provided to the administration but that the administration kept waiting lists. Of course they did, but even that aside, what I have done is a very reasonable exercise, and that is compare like with like with the information they have provided to the House, and that is that in 2001 the information they provided me with with information they are providing me now in 2004, is that waiting lists compiled by them have more than doubled and I think that is very reasonable.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

For the record. The hon Member is lucky to be able to claim to make comparisons because we give her the information. I tried to do the same exercise when I first took the job over and asked where the waiting lists were, and I said '*well show me the waiting lists going back in time*' and I was able to look at the waiting lists back during the period that this Government has been in Government, but I confirm and I stress what the Chief Minister has said, the management of the Health Authority have told me that during the period when she was a Minister, during the period when she was in government, that no records were kept, that there were no waiting lists and if anything was kept it was kept by her on the back of an envelope, because there is nothing, for the record there is nothing in the records of the GHA to show what the waiting lists were. If they had been kept as she is claiming, they would be there on the files. There is no information on the files of any waiting period for any consultant during the period that she was in government.

ORAL

**NO 826 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DISTRICT COMMUNITY SERVICES**

Have the Government been able to verify whether District Community Services are under resourced and therefore are not well provided for?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 827 to 829 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 827 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DENTAL SERVICE**

Have the Government been able to establish whether the dental service is understaffed to meet the demand which exists and that both the waiting lists and waiting times for this service are excessive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 826 and 828 to 829 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 828 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – LABORATORY SERVICES**

Can the Government state whether demand is increasing for most laboratory services?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 826, 827 and 829 of 2004.

**NO 829 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – X-RAY DEPARTMENT**

Can the Government state whether the wait for routine tests in the X-ray Department from 2002, is currently running from three to six weeks depending on the type of test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 826 of 2004**

The present complement of the District Nursing Team is able to handle the existing workload. However, there is an erroneous public perception that district nursing is a convenience service rather than a nursing care service provided to those members of the public who are temporarily or permanently housebound.

**Answer to Question No. 827 of 2004**

Dental service staffing and waiting times have recently been highlighted by the Healthcare Development Team who identified waiting times for patients under treatment of between two and six months. Several attempts made in recent months to recruit additional staff in order to meet the increased demand that has arisen from the expansion and development of dental services has proved unsuccessful. GHA currently provides a comprehensive, comprehensive free range of dental services which include orthodontics, oral surgery, pydodontics and emergency services to over 6,000 school children and university students. GHA also provides free dental services to exempt pensioners and persons of low income, as well as a free emergency service to other pensioners. Furthermore, free preventative prophylactic dental care is provided at school to all children of school entry age as well as follow up paedodontics dental care by a visiting dental officer. The service is led by a consultant orthodontist with a staff of three dental officers and four nursing assistants. To illustrate the expansion and development of the dental services under this Government, I would point out to the hon Lady that when she was Minister for Health only an emergency dental service was provided by a staff of two dental officers.

**Answer to Question No. 828 of 2004**

The Government can confirm that there has been an increase in demand for most laboratory services.

**Answer to Question No. 829 of 2004**

The waiting time for routine tests in the X-Ray Department will vary from three weeks for an X-Ray to six weeks for an ultra-sound. All other tests are carried out within this three to six week period. There is no waiting time for emergencies.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 826 TO 829 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As regards Question No. 826 I think the Minister said in relation to the District Community Services, that there was a public perception. I would inform him that it is not a public perception it is a fact, in page 4 summary of the Report which actually identifies that the District Community Services are under resourced. As regards Question No. 827, we highlighted the problem as far as the dental service is concerned, nearly two years ago and the Minister now says that recently they have tried to remedy the situation and therefore, is it not a fact that it is the Government having been in office for eight years that have not actually been at the helm and being able to establish that there was a problem in the dental service as indeed there is in laboratory services and indeed there is in the X-Ray Department?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The perception that I referred to and which obviously the hon Member misunderstood, is not that the District Nursing Team is unable to provide the service but that there is a perception amongst the public that this district nursing service is something to provide for people as a convenience, and this is not the purpose of the service. Therefore, because of this perception there are extra demands on the service by people who do not really need it and this is what is causing part of the problem.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see therefore, so what the Minister is saying is, well he has not addressed the other questions, but as far as the District Community Service is concerned if there is in the Report a statement saying that the Community Service are under resourced, is he saying that they are not under resourced and that it is because people are asking too much of the District Community Services?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I will give the hon Member an example of what I mean, which was pointed out to me when the answer to this question was being compiled and it is not an isolated case of a district nurse attending a home to take blood samples from a patient, and once the

blood sample had been taken, remember this is supposed to be a patient who is homebound, once the blood sample has been taken the patient concerned said to the visiting district nurse, *'hold on, I will come down with you, I am on my way to the hairdresser'*. That is an example of the sort of thing that is happening. This is a patient who asked for the service at home when in fact she was able to walk out of her own home and go and have her hair done. That is the sort of perception that people have, that it is a convenience service, as opposed to a service that is being provided for a specific purpose. It is an expanding service. It is something that again has been provided over and above what was being done before, and like all expanding services it may need to be adjusted. There have been, as the hon Member rightly says, problems pointed out in the first phase report and those problems will be addressed, and are being addressed in the consequent follow up to that report.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Minister not accept that it is worthwhile looking at the District Community Services, which we increased when we came into government, for the simple reason that the more community nurses that one has, the less people that are required to be admitted into a hospital?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The District Nursing Team at the moment consists of 2 sisters, 6 staff nurses, 1 staff nurse part-time, 1 senior enrolled nurse, 2 enrolled nurses, 2 nursing assistants and 1 hospice nurse. Maybe the hon Member would like to tell us what the staff was when she was the Minister for Health.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister has been in office for eight years again and it is up to him to say whether he agrees that it is not worth looking at it because it is a service that is very valuable in the sense that the patient is at home and the patient does not have to be admitted into hospital. Does the Minister not agree with that concept?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The Government are constantly looking at ways of improving all their services, not just the Health Service. This is precisely why we have got the Clinical Development Team in place, this is precisely why all aspects of the Health Service are being studied and this is one of those aspects of it, and the hon Member will just have to wait for the results to show.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Minister confirm, as far as the complement is concerned, how long this complement has been in place?



**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No I cannot confirm that, I would need notice of that question, but it is certainly whilst this Government have been in office.

**NO 830 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – A & E DEPARTMENT**

Are the Government aware that there is nearly an hour's wait for patients to be seen at the Accident and Emergency Department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Patients who are classified as emergencies are seen immediately on arrival at the A & E Department and are not subject to any waiting time. As the hon Member is well aware, the Out-patients Department is currently co-located with the A & E at St Bernard's Hospital and this is where non urgent out-patient cases are also attended. Such cases include injections, changes of dressings, follow-ups for further nursing treatment and visits to clinicians. All these out-patient cases are seen as soon as possible and the waiting time for these will vary considerably. At peak times waiting time for such cases may indeed be more than 1 hour but this reduces considerably to less than 1 hour at other times.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 830 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In the majority of cases we are talking about non emergency patients, will the Minister not accept that the A & E process typically takes from 50 to 60 minutes to complete, and the patient requires around 30 steps before he is actually attended to?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No, the Minister does not accept that at all. A & E is accident and emergency. In accident and emergency people who come in either as an emergency or suffering the results of a serious accident do not have to wait an hour and are attended immediately. The result is what I have said in the original answer, is that people who are attending the out-patients department which is co-located with A & E.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am referring to the A & E, and I am referring to what is written in the report as far as the A & E is concerned. It also confirms the many people who come to us saying that when they go to the A & E they wait for more than an hour before they are seen to. This is precisely highlighted, and I will tell the Minister, page 204 of the report says that the majority of patients attending the Accident and Emergency have minor injuries and they have to wait from 50 to 60 minutes to complete the process before they can actually be seen.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, but the hon Lady has got to understand what she is reading. Either she is doing it on purpose, in which case it is reprehensible, or she is not bothering to understand the words that she is reading. The hon Member says that the report says that it takes an hour to see the patient. It does not and she has just read it out, because I was anxious to get up to tell her, that she read it out herself from the report. It does not say it takes an hour, it says it takes an hour to complete the process, and that is jolly good. In England it takes about six hours to complete the 32 step process, because that process that takes an hour to complete with 32 steps is part of the treatment. It is not that one is waiting for an hour, waiting to be seen, the 32 step process is part of the protocol of all the checks, the ECG test, the blood test and all the other tests, that they have to submit one to in Accident and Emergency before one can safely be subjected to other medical treatment. That process takes an hour, it is not an hour waiting to be seen, it is an hour being processed and being treated and being tested, and compared to any hospital in the United Kingdom that one may care to mention, it is actually a very, very good outturn result of the period of time that it takes for the process. That is the reality. In fact I am just going to say one more thing, it is one of the areas, there are other minor criticisms that they make of Accident and Emergency, but actually it is one of the departments of the Health Authority of which the experts are least critical, and they say that excepting peak periods where there may be a need, I think they say that at certain peak times they may need another doctor, which in fact has been put on since the first report, they say that they deliver a jolly good service. It is not the case that people wait for an hour waiting to be seen in Accident and Emergency.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If I am going to read from the report, the Hon Chief Minister must understand that if in page 215 of the report it states '*typically an out-patient attendance takes over an hour*', 60 per cent of this time is spent waiting.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Waiting for results to come back from the laboratory. What does the hon Member think has happened during the other 40 per cent of the time? If she thinks that the hour is a waste, in other words one arrives in there, sit down and sitting there for an hour and say '*I am here*', and one is ignored, all the nurses are rushing past and nobody is addressing it. That would be 100 per cent of the time is spent waiting. Why does the hon Member think that the report says that only 60 per cent of the time is spent waiting? The other 40 per cent of the time is when one has had the tests done, have gone to the laboratory for the blood test and come back within the hour.

The hon Lady chooses not to understand. Now, it is true that there used to be, it does not happen any more since we doubled up the medical cover on the Accident and Emergency, it used to be the case when the hon Lady was in office, it used to be the case for all the years that she was in office and for some of the years that we were in office until it was corrected a couple of years ago, that there were certain times of the day when there was not a doctor exclusively for the Accident and Emergency. I think it was the silent hours, I cannot remember exactly. I do not know why the hon Lady looks so mysteriously, she must recognise what I am explaining to her as being correct. It was possible for somebody to arrive at Accident and Emergency and there not to be a doctor in attendance because the doctor had been called up to a ward to see a patient. Then there were instances of people genuinely coming up to Accident and Emergency, not not being seen for an hour because of course the nurses and the staff nurses were there, but not being seen by a doctor for perhaps an hour, because the doctor may have been attending to a cardiac arrest in a ward or to some situation in a ward. To correct that element of wait, that element of defect in the Accident and Emergency service, the Government now provide round the clock exclusive medical cover in the Accident and Emergency Ward. So there are now no circumstances in which it is possible for somebody to arrive at the Accident and Emergency and not be seen for an hour. Yes, as happened to me when I went up there complaining of gall stones. One arrives, they give one a first treatment, then they have got to go through this 32 step process, which includes plugging one in to an ECG and sending the results up to the cardiologist to have a look at it. Then they draw ones blood and send it up, and of course in between all those tests one waits whilst the results of the tests come back. That is waiting time but there is a difference between waiting time and delay in being attended. They are wholly different things and that is what the report is saying. It is not true any longer to say that one can be kept for an hour in the Accident and Emergency without being attended to.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I can understand why the Chief Minister perceives that there is political value in always trying to go back to 1996 et cetera, but as he himself has accepted, what he has been identifying as a symptom of the problem went on for a large part also of the time that he has been in charge of the administrations that make up the Gibraltar Government, but in the report, and it is not the part that the hon Lady is referring to, but in the report I am sure that the Minister and the Chief Minister are aware, there are case studies of individuals arriving at Accident and Emergency. In particular there are case studies of individuals arriving in Accident and Emergency with chest pain, who do not have their first contact with the doctor for over an hour, although triage starts before they see the doctor but that is identified in the report as a worrying instance of what we must be trying to remedy. Is the Chief Minister saying that since having received the report and identified that as an issue, mechanisms have been put in place to ensure that that does not happen ever again, which of course is something that would be welcome across the floor of the House?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell the hon Member exactly the date when the new arrangement was introduced. I will get that information to him. In other words, whether it coincided with the production of the report or whether it was during the course of the preparation of the report and before it was delivered. I do not want to get the chronology wrong.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

One can see the concern, which I am sure is a concern that we would share, that if we have put in place these new mechanisms before the reporting process commenced and with the new mechanisms those who prepared the report are still saying we may have a problem here, then that would obviously be something that all of us would feel needs to be addressed.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No that is not the case. The question is whether the mechanisms were put in place on sight of an early draft of the report or whether they were put in place once the final report, in other words, that is the issue here.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Therefore it is action which we have taken in consequence either of the report itself or of the reporting process.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have just in fact been reminded that it might even have been as a result of the Olivares situation actually, not the main, one or the other. When I come back on Tuesday I will give that information.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Were we not told before in the House that in fact this first phase was identifying problems that needed correction and that the remedies were to be the second phase, and therefore by definition everything that is being put into the report are things that the experts, although the experts think that here there are things that they need to be put right. I hope that when they go back they do something about the six hours the Chief Minister assures us is the normal thing in the UK.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They are not very critical of this aspect.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well they may be less critical of this than of others, but if there was nothing that they felt was needed to be put right, surely it would not be mentioned at all. The report does not mention every single facet of everything that happens in the Health Service, it is limited surely to identifying, after talking to people, talking to staff and doing a telephone survey, that is what that says at the beginning of it, that this is a result of identifying the areas of concern that need to be addressed and put right.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well with some judgement on their part.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think it follows from that that there are things on which they are silent because they feel those things are okay, so does that not suggest that what they expect is that in their recommendations, if they say there that it is an hour, whether it is an hour sitting and waiting or an hour broken up in blocks of 20 minutes waiting for results, what they expect is to come up with a recommendation that cuts down that, no?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Indeed that may be possible. I am not saying that all the 32 step process that takes an hour could not be cut back and they might well come back with authority, but it is one with suggestions of how the system can be streamlined so that it takes less time. I do not doubt that, I hope that they can, but that is not, I only got to my feet when I heard the hon Lady saying that the report says that one is kept waiting for an hour, meaning that before one is seen. I said, no, read it and then she was good enough to read it out. Then what she read out is not that it takes an hour to be seen, it takes an hour for the process to be completed. They are very different things and that is the only point I was trying to make. I am not suggesting that that hour is incapable of improvement and that may not be improved following recommendations. All I am trying to establish, it is clear from the statement, that it is not that one goes there and does not get seen for an hour. It is that the process, or what has to be done to one when one gets there, takes an hour. Now whether that hour can be converted into 30 minutes, or 40 minutes, or 45 minutes, that is a wholly different issue.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know whether the Government are aware, but on the one occasion that I had a need to go to the hospital, the feedback that I had from there was that the staff there was under considerable pressure, that there were people in the corridors and it was not certainly because people were sitting around doing nothing with their arms crossed, but they were under a great deal of stress and under a great deal of pressure and having difficulty in coping with the patients who vented their frustration on the people who were doing their best. So they seem to be under a great deal of pressure.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Absolutely. The Accident and Emergency Department is by a very long way the hardest area of the hospital to work in, because it is the one area of the hospital where one is constantly in contact not only with the patient but with the patient's family en masse, waiting there worried about what has happened. It is a very stressful area of the hospital for the staff to work in. Of course, it is a sort of demand-led service. It is an accident and emergency ward. They could be having absolutely nothing to do for hours and hours and all of a sudden there are two accidents, somebody cuts themselves, it is possible for there suddenly to be a coincidence of events which fills the place up and if it is the night shift, there are times when they are

run off their feet and there are times happily, because it means that no one is getting hurt in accidents or other emergencies, when they are less busy. It is in the nature of an emergency ward that it is resourced with a certain staffing level, which is management's best calculation of what is a reasonable staff provision for the likely demand to be put on it, and that there will be many of the times that demand will not materialise and that there will be other occasions when a greater demand will materialise. On the latter occasions they will be rushed off their feet. I do not know whether there is an internal system to re-deploy staff from elsewhere to help them out or whether they just struggle on with the shift size as it is. I would not know what the answer to that is.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just say maybe that it is in the man bites dog category, but there is in the back of that, in the schedule which deals with the patients who arrive and who are followed by the team, one instance at least where somebody is not seen for 60 minutes. I accept if it is not common even there, that that may affect the guesstimate that management has to make or has changed since having seen that.

ORAL

**NO 831 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELECTIVE SURGERY**

Can Government state how many persons there are presently waiting for elective surgery in each speciality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 832 and 833 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 832 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CANCELLATION OF ROUTINE OPERATIONS**

Can Government confirm how many routine operations were cancelled at St Bernard's Hospital due to the non-availability of beds for January, February, and March of 2004, giving a breakdown for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 831 and 833 of 2004.

**NO 833 OF 2004****THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO****GHA – ELECTIVE OPERATIONS CANCELLED**

Can Government state over what period of time the 226 elective operations that were cancelled out of the 2232 scheduled to take place, which is referred to on page 88 of the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team report of September 2003, these figures relate to?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The figures for cancelled operations were taken from the Operating Theatre Cancellation Register for the period of January to December 2002. In respect of the other questions the information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedules which I hand to her.

**Answer to Question No. 831 of 2004**

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| Ophthalmic          | 55  |
| Orthopaedic         | 300 |
| Gynaecology         | 76  |
| Otorhinolaryngology | 190 |
| General Surgery     | 97  |

**Answer to Question No. 832 of 2004**

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| January  | 35 |
| February | 2  |
| March    | 10 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 831 TO 833 OF 2004****HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As regards Question No. 831, again I have done an exercise here and even though again there seems to be a tendency in most specialities, that there are more people on the list, there seems again to be a discrepancy as far as ENT is concerned and I

would urge the Minister to look at the figure that his predecessor gave me in answer to Question No. 958 of 2002. He said that as far as ENT was concerned, there were 110 patients. As far as the report is concerned, they mention the figure which is nearly double of 204 and for the particular year, as far as Question No. 958 is concerned, there seems to be such a discrepancy that we are talking about nearly double the figure that I was given in this House. For the previous year it was 188, so if the Minister now is saying that in the list for ENT there are 190 patients, I would venture to say that the actual list of people has more than doubled. Would the Minister be able to check that for me?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I will not bore the House by saying what I said before so if the hon Member provides the information I requested, I will have the figures looked into.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will do so. As far as Question No. 832 is concerned, the Minister has confirmed that for January there were 35 operations cancelled and that to me seems to be quite a high figure when the norm for February is two, March 10 and therefore January seems to me that 35 cancellations are more than one a day. Am I right in assuming that he is going to answer what he said in an interview on GBC, that this is like the saying goes in Spanish "the hill of January"?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Obviously I cannot validate these figures on my feet but I have no reason to doubt they are accurate, from memory because it was a bit of a culture shock just shortly after having taken over the Ministry, I know it was a period of considerable difficulty with bed management, so I have no reason to doubt that those figures are probably right and that it was necessary to cancel a higher number than normal in order to meet the problem of the shortage of beds.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Was there a particular reason for there being 35 cancellations for January? Has the Minister asked what the reason was?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Like the hon Member I do my own studies, not quite as numerically orientated as hers. Yes, I did ask, yes studies were taken, yes, we have looked to see whether there is any pattern. What I can tell her is that there was no obvious, either any obvious specific reason or anything that we could do to avoid the large number of admissions, abnormally large number of admissions that were being experienced. They were not just, nothing is silly when it is a question of admissions but the information that I got back was that all the admissions were justified and that they were serious illnesses and people were not being admitted for head colds or something equally innocuous.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But that trend does not occur every January, does it? I have got the figures for previous Januarys and in the previous January there were none.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

All the senior staff concurred in their various opinions that they gave me, that this last January seems to have been abnormal. I asked if someone was plotting against me.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So it is not really what the Minister said during his interview with GBC, that it was “la cuesta de enero” he said. So all the other Januarys are different then.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I have no doubt that the winter period had something to do with it as well. There is no doubt about it, but there is no doubt that this January was particularly difficult or challenging I should say.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

One other supplementary, when I put the question how many routine operations had been cancelled due to the non availability of beds, can the Minister confirm whether these operations are cancelled when the patient is in the ward waiting to be taken to the theatre, or does it also include those patients that are sometimes called at home and told not to bother coming up because there is no bed? Is it the first or the second?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

It is both but we try, or should I say the people who manage these things, obviously try to warn people the day before they come up and if an operation is cancelled at the last minute it is the exception rather than the rule.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Why is it then that there have been instances that have been reported to us where the patient is set to go into theatre, he has a bed and then for some unknown reason theatre says that they have run over the time and then the patient, even though he has a bed, he is not operated on that day. What is the reason for that?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I cannot comment on a hypothetical and not identified case. It is highly unlikely that a patient who has come from a bed and is on his way on a trolley about to be wheeled to the theatre, to be suddenly kicked off the trolley and told to go home. It is highly

unlikely. However, I have a friend to whom that happened in St Mary's Hospital, who woke up after having been anaesthetised and said to himself, I have just had heart surgery and cannot feel a thing, and he had actually been inside the operating theatre under anaesthetic and he was wheeled out again because of whatever reason. So these things do happen but they normally tend to be exceptional. If the hon Member can give me a specific case I can certainly try to get reasons for her but not like this off the top of my head.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is just that I was there personally when it happened and the feedback that we got was that it appeared that, I mean the Minister will have to investigate this, but I think it is worth investigating because I think at the time there seemed to be a dispute between the theatre staff because of private practice with the doctors and they were refusing to actually operate over 4 o'clock or 5 o'clock in the afternoon, if I remember rightly.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

That is a more serious and a more worrying angle and I would certainly be interested in having more information and finding out more about it if it is true, but I reiterate what I said before, it is certainly the exception that anybody would have his operation cancelled at the last minute, but again it is possible. There could be an accident or there could be three people admitted in with massive heart attacks, but these things happen but these things are the exceptions.

ORAL

NO 834 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Can Government confirm how many medical practitioners are working within the pain clinic of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 835 and 836 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 835 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Can Government confirm what is the staff composition within the pain clinic of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 834 and 836 of 2004.

**NO 836 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Can Government confirm whether consultants working within the pain clinic of the Gibraltar Health Authority are able to refer patients abroad to medical institutions for specialist treatment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The pain clinic is staffed by one anaesthetist and one clinical nurse. The consultant can and has referred patients abroad. This is done within established protocols and ethical boundaries. The consultant working within the pain clinic can and has referred patients to tertiary centres in the same way as all other consultants do within their own speciality.



**NO 837 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV from 1 January to the end of March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

One psycho-geriatric patient was admitted to KGV between 1 January and 31 March 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 837 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I assume that when we are talking about figures we are talking about admissions and not persons, am I correct?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not quite sure what the difference is, but one person was admitted if that helps. One cannot have more than two persons in one admission.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, because previously I have been given figures like 5, 6, 10 and I was not sure whether the 5 were referring to admissions that could actually mean that the same person has been admitted twice, that is what I mean.

ORAL

**NO 838 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ENROLLED NURSES**

Can Government state how many enrolled nurses have now applied to be able to train up to the level of staff nurse?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 839, 840 and 841 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 839 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NURSES TRAINING IN UK**

Can the Minister for Health confirm how many of our local nurses are presently in the UK for specialist training to enable contract nurses to be replaced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 838, 840 and 841 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 840 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT NURSES**

Can the Government confirm how many contract nurses are employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority, at the end of March 2004, listing the speciality in which they are employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 838, 839 and 841 of 2004.

**NO 841 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government state what was the number of nurses in post as at the end of March 2004 with a breakdown by grade, giving the full-time equivalent of each grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

In respect of contract nurses employed and number of nurses in post, the information requested by the hon Member is set out in the attached schedules that I hand over to her.

**Answer to Question No. 838 of 2004**

Nine enrolled nurses applied to train up to first level.

**Answer to Question No. 839 of 2004**

In respect of local nurses undergoing specialist training in UK, the situation remains as given in answer to Question No. 178 of 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 840 of 2004**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 there were 48 Contract Nurses employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority.

The breakdown by specialities is as follows:

|                                  |    |   |
|----------------------------------|----|---|
| Clinical Nurse Managers          |    | 1 |
| Education Development Officer    |    | 1 |
| Nurse Tutor                      |    | 1 |
| Nurse Practitioners              |    | 1 |
| Registered General Nurses        | 18 |   |
| Registered Mental Nurses         |    | 5 |
| Registered Sick Children's Nurse |    | 4 |
| Staff Midwives                   | 10 |   |
| Enrolled Nurses                  |    | 7 |

**Answer to Question No. 841 of 2004**

The following is a breakdown of Nurses in post as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004:

|                                        |        |
|----------------------------------------|--------|
| Director of Nursing Services           | Vacant |
| Deputy Director of Nursing Services    | 1      |
| Clinical Nurse Managers                | 6      |
| Education Development Officer          | 1      |
| Senior Nurse Tutor                     | 1      |
| Nurse Tutor                            | 1      |
| Nurse Practitioner                     | 1      |
| Charge Nurses                          | 29     |
| Staff Nurses/Midwives                  | 113.5  |
| Senior Enrolled Nurses                 | 5      |
| Enrolled Nurses                        | 89.5   |
| Nursing Auxiliaries/Nursing Assistants | 104    |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 838 TO 841 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As regards Question No. 838 reference enrolled nurses, even though the Minister in January said that there were none and his predecessor had said a few months before that there were two, in any case I would like to refer to a statement that has come out from the Minister saying, as he has said now, that there are six enrolled nurses. Now, he will no doubt be aware that we have always been concerned in this House in relation to those enrolled nurses that are not in possession of GCSEs and therefore could the Minister confirm that what has appeared today as a statement from him, when he says in the statement the programme is designed to build on existing experiences and knowledge and is seen as breaking new ground for the university itself. First of all we are talking about a different university because we are now talking about the University of York where before we were talking about EMAP and the University of Sheffield. Can the Minister confirm whether those nurses that can apply are only nurses that are in possession of the required GCSEs?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I am afraid the hon Member is a little bit confused. For a start she said EMAP was different because it was EMAP and Sheffield and now it is York. It is always EMAP but it is now York instead of Sheffield. For a start. Secondly, the situation is that there are a large number of enrolled nurses many of whom probably aspire, not all of them, probably aspire to be reclassified as level 1 nurses, staff nurses. A course has now, as I told her in answer to a question in the last House, we were at that stage (in answer to Question No. 179) negotiating to provide a course that would be acceptable to provide this pathway for enrolled nurses to be able to train. That course has now been established. It has been validated by York University as opposed to Sheffield University but it is still the same EMAP course. The course was advertised, there were nine applicants, six were accepted by the interview board or whatever board valuated the interviews, and those six nurses have now started this distance learning course. The statement which the hon Member attributes to me is not mine but is from the School of Nursing, or the School of Health Studies, may have issued in my name, I have certainly not signed it, it has my name in the middle

of it and it was the statement that was given to the press at the time that I went to launch the course, Thursday or Wednesday of this week. It started off with an intensive two day course here by a Mrs Elizabeth Yeats of York University and then I think it is something like a two years long distance learning course and these six nurses were very keen but at the same time a little bit apprehensive, I sensed, in what they were tackling and what they were doing now for the first time. This, as the hon Member knows, is the only pathway that is available now for re-graduation as staff nurses and I hope that obviously we will monitor it, it is approved by the University and it will provide the means of re-classification but it does imply successful completion. If I go back to something she said at the beginning, I am not quite sure what the question was about can I confirm, something to do with GCSEs, what I can confirm is if the enrolled nurse has the GCSEs then they can move up a different pathway. With a minimum of 5 GCSEs they can take up the training tube direct to staff nurse and do not need to do this conversion course. This conversion course is designed for those enrolled nurses who do not have the qualification and therefore cannot go through the training direct and have to do this new solution that has been designed specifically for them, because at the moment there are no enrolled nurses as such in the UK and this is the pathway that has been devised, and I hope is successful for their sake and for those others who want to follow it after them.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore, what the Minister is saying is, that the six that have applied to do this course are enrolled nurses who are not in possession of the required GCSEs. Am I correct? Otherwise they would go through the different course which the Minister has just mentioned.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Correct.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore, is the Minister aware, well we have the figures here, but it just strikes me as odd that when we have so many enrolled nurses that only six have applied.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Nine applied and only six were accepted. I am not sure if I asked it but I thought the same question myself when I said how many are eligible to apply. The answer that I got was that possibly because it is a new thing, possibly because people are unsure, as well as because not all enrolled nurses are interested in conversion, but I agree with the hon Member, I would have expected on the first occasion for there to have been a bigger number. Time will tell. It is intended to provide similar future courses, if there is interest. We shall have to wait and see what the take up is.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm to the House why nine applied and three were not accepted? Can he say what the reason was for their non acceptance? If these enrolled nurses are there practising, what was the reason for them not being accepted?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I was not on the board so I do not know. I have on my desk a bundle of papers that includes all the interview notes and so on, but the board did not accept them for whatever reason that they thought they were not suitable. They had the free hand to make whatever decision they made and they decided, this does not exclude the three people who were not accepted from applying again and I understand that they have been offered coaching and advice in order to overcome whatever went wrong in their interviews or in their qualifications or whatever, so that the next time they apply they can be more successful. It most certainly is not the intention to stop people from making it. On the other hand I also understand that it is a challenging course, it is not an automatic pass situation at the end of it and of course distance learning is not easy in itself.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When the Government were originally looking at the possibility of opening up the opportunity for enrolled nurses to continue on to staff nurse with Sheffield, was there a different concept from the one that has been applied now?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I think the concept was the same, I am not quite sure why we have ended up with York and not Sheffield, but I asked the question of whether it was the same thing and it was confirmed to me that it was. The course is called EMAP, electronic map of the course, it is the same course just validated by a different university. Obviously the arrangements were easier to make or whatever, I am not sure the exact reason but it is certainly the same course.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Sheffield course was also going to be by distance learning, was it?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes indeed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do they have to actually spend any time in UK in the two years, or do they do the whole thing here?



**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Not as far as I know, what I was told is that it was this intensive two day kick start to the course that the tutor from York would monitor from there, that the tutoring would be done here in conjunction with York University and that they would come over as and when they were needed, but no mention was made to me about people needing to travel there. That does not mean that it may not be necessary at some stage.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm the statement that is attributed to him that building on the clinical skills and knowledge in the field of general nursing, it will meet the EC requirements for registration?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes that is exactly what the whole course is about. Unless they do this course they cannot be registered as staff nurses. That is what the conversion is all about. First they need to convert and once they have converted they can register. If they do not do the course they can not convert, if they do not convert they cannot register.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It means that they have to register with the UKCC before they can access the EU market, is that correct?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, that is the whole point. Unless they are registered with the UK body there is a problem, that is what the course is all about. Before, as one knows, if they had the qualification or whatever it was they could register. Now, they have got to do this course in order to be able to register. So it boils down to the same thing.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

On the question of the contract nurses, we are very concerned that the figures are going up quite a lot. In October 2002 the Government had 36, in March 2003 the Government had 39 contract nurses, in January 2004 the Government had 49 and in March now, the figure that I am being given, the Government have 48 which is one less. We are very concerned because when we look at the other question which is Question No. 839, we are told by the Minister that the situation remains the same, that there are only two local nurses training in the UK. Therefore, it would appear to me, is it not wise for the Government to encourage our nurses to go and specialise in the UK so that they can replace, especially after the explanation given earlier by the Government, so that we do not end up with half of the Health Authority with nurses being employed from abroad. Is it not about time that the Government should encourage our nurses to go and specialise as RMNs, as staff midwives, for example we have two nurse practitioners, a nurse tutor and on the other hand we have only two of our local nurses in the UK. Does the Minister not agree that this is a most unsatisfactory situation?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The Minister certainly agrees that the more local nurses the better. The GHA certainly encourages our local nurses and prospective local nurses to come onto the strengths and to qualify in the UK, but one can take a horse to water but can not make it drink. So, I certainly support the philosophy and GHA certainly would want to add more local nurses, but unless and until we have them we need to fill the gaps with contract nurses, which is not the desire of GHA, is not what the Government want to see but the alternative is less staff for the Health Service.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not the case that our nurses, as is shown in the report, are very dissatisfied that their training abroad is not sufficient and they would welcome being sent to the UK to specialise as nurses, and if we are talking about two nurses being in the UK, is the Minister saying that our local nurses are saying no and that the offer is being made to them?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not aware of any nurses saying no after an offer has been made but I am neither aware that any nurse who wants to go is not being allowed to go. So certainly it is something that I would want to encourage but we are certainly not depriving people from undertaking any training they want to undertake.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I was just wondering that if we have a situation where the Health Authority started having contract officers to the tune of 39 in the year 2002, it seems to me that after two years have elapsed we will only have two training in the UK and I believe that the Government should agree that they should look into this matter and ensure that there are more of our nurses being sent to the UK. Otherwise, as I said earlier, it appears to me that in a few years time, if the trend continues, more than half of the Health Authority will have contract nurses rather than local nurses.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I agree.

ORAL

NO 842 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – NURSING DISPUTE**

Can Government confirm whether there is a dispute from the nursing staff at St Bernard's Hospital, as a result of which they are refusing to prepare for burial the bodies of patients who pass away?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

There is no dispute with the nursing staff at St Bernard's Hospital regarding the preparation of bodies for burial and there is no known case of refusal by nursing staff to prepare for burial the bodies of patients who have passed away.

**NO 843 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ORTHOPAEDIC SPECIALIST TREATMENT**

Can Government confirm to which medical institutions our patients are being referred to abroad, with regard to orthopaedic specialist treatment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question No. 843 of 2004**

The Medical Institutions to which our patients are referred to abroad with regard to orthopaedic treatment vary from time to time depending on a number of factors, including patient choice, clinical considerations and the opinion of the referring Consultant. During this year, the following Institutions have been used:

1. Guys and St Thomas Hospital, London
2. The National Hospital for Neurology, London
3. Princess Elizabeth Orthopaedic Hospital, Exeter
4. St George's Hospital, London
5. Derbyshire Royal Infirmary, London Road, Derby
6. The Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital, London
7. Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Orthopaedic District Hospital, Shropshire
8. The Middlesex Hospital
9. Hichingbrooke Hospital, Oxford
10. Hospital General, Albacete, Spain

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 843 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether the patients that are being referred abroad for orthopaedic procedures, is it because those procedures cannot be carried out locally? Or is it because the Government are keen in sending patients abroad in order to bring down the backlog in orthopaedics?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No, this is not a reflection of any Government initiative that has been taken so far in respect of the cutting down of waiting lists. This is the routine procedure normally that is happening now and has happened for x number of years in the past. I was not quite sure what information the hon Member wanted with regard to this particular question so all we have given is the list of institutions to which patients are being referred in the normal course of referrals for tertiary treatment, in the same way as they are for any other speciality but in this case obviously, for orthopaedics which is the subject of her question, nothing to do with waiting lists.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

What prompted me, was the fact that I was getting a number of patients who had been operated in the UK and they were waiting to be referred again and as regards the Manchester Spinal Foundation, and I see now that it must have closed because it is not on the list and that is what prompted me to make the question. Is the Minister aware that the Spinal Foundation in Manchester has actually shut down?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Not particularly, I mean the hon Member asked to which institutions we were referring patients, it was not clear over what period of time she was referring to or wanted information on, so we decided to choose the calendar year 2004 and these are the hospitals or the institutions that have been used this year. That does not mean that any particular hospital has either been discarded or is no longer being used. If the question had been since the beginning of 2003, the answer would obviously have been different and there would have been more institutions on this list.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister then is not sure whether the Spinal Foundation in Manchester has closed?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Not particularly. The name of the Manchester Institution does not ring any bells with me. I obviously am not in the front line of which institution any particular patient is referred to, so I have not heard anything about it either closing or not closing.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Minister confirm, when I write to him, so that I can pass the information over to the patients?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Certainly if the hon Member cares to write to me asking a question I will provide her with the answer, of course.

**NO 844 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Do Government agree that patients who are seen by medical practitioners are entitled to have second opinions within the Gibraltar Health Authority if they so wish?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

It is a well known fact that patients can, and do on occasions, make multiple visits to different general practitioners when they are not satisfied with the medical opinion. The Government consider that it is appropriate for patients to have access to a second opinion in secondary care if the relevant practitioner considers it is necessary.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 844 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The last bit of what the Minister has said concerns me. If the relevant consultant thinks it is necessary. What if the patient is so concerned about the diagnosis that he actually seeks a second opinion because of the gravity of the diagnosis?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member well knows, because I know she has had the same sort of experiences that I am having in this area, that invariably there are always patients who are not necessarily satisfied with the first opinion by a consultant. Wherever possible the GHA seeks to meet the desire of a patient for a second opinion. For example, if there is a locum about to take post and it is possible to provide that second opinion, that facility is usually provided. If there is a visiting consultant in that speciality visiting Gibraltar, the opportunity is also taken, but invariably second opinions in secondary care, as I am sure she is aware, involves sending a patient away from Gibraltar with the consequent costs. Well if there is not a locum coming and there is not a second consultant in the speciality and there is not a visiting consultant, then it involves necessarily sending the patient away from Gibraltar and that has cost implications. So therefore, it cannot be, desirable as that would be, an automatic patient choice. However, at the same time, medicine tends to be, as she well knows, more and more patient led so as I said a moment ago, one tries, or the

GHA because it is nothing to do with me directly, the GHA tries to provide that second opinion if it is possible to provide it. Invariably there are occasions, as I am sure there have been in her experience, where a consultant does not feel that the second opinion is justified, not necessarily because of the cost but because in his clinical and professional opinion he may not think it is justified and is not possible to provide, and the patient may feel strongly about it. At the moment there is not a clear mechanism in place to over rule that, except for people like the Medical Director to become involved. It is certainly not my practice as Minister to get involved in that situation or in any way to try to influence the decision, which is essentially clinical, of that of the clinician in what needs or does not need to be done. Having said all that, I am asking the Executive Board of the GHA to see whether they can come up with some formula that provides some mechanism where the decision of a consultant can be challenged is too strong a word, but where the patient can have access of appeal as it were to some entity, group, whether it be the Board, which will be medical and management combined, which can review the decision of the consultant and try to influence that decision or try to influence the consultant to see things differently. That at the moment is on my wish list, it is not in place.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Minister not agree that in view of the fact that most specialists working medical practitioners, consultants working within the Gibraltar Health Authority are single handed and therefore they work six weeks on and two off, locums are brought in and therefore it will facilitate the process because it will mean that patients will be able to have access to these locums, and therefore I cannot see what the Minister is saying happening too often, that patients will have to be sent abroad?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes indeed, as I said I have given indications of one possible means for the patient to seek to have that opinion reviewed, or to seek to have the decision not to seek to have that opinion reviewed, if that is so, and there are also developments in the pipeline to do with the changes that we are foreseeing for the Health Authority that may indeed achieve the same thing via completely different circumstances, but those are still in the offing and not something that I can give more details of at this moment, but it may per se bring about the availability of second opinions more easily.

**ORAL**

**NO 845 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many patients have been given a choice of being treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as sponsored patients, and have elected to go to Spain since 1 January 2004 to the end of March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 846 and 847 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 846 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government explain what are the arrangements to adequately assist our sponsored patients and their escorts, when they are referred to Spanish medical institutions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 845 and 847 of 2004.

**NO 847 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm the level of subsistence allowance that is being provided to sponsored patients who are referred to Spanish medical institutions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 845 of 2004**

All patients are given the choice to be treated either in Spain or in the UK at the time of referral when considered appropriate by the referring consultant. A total of 93 patients out of 356 have elected to go to Spain during the period 1<sup>st</sup> January 2004 to the end of March 2004.

**Answer to Question Nos. 846 and 847 of 2004**

As the hon Member is aware, the maintenance allowance payable to patients referred abroad is subject to a means test. The allowance will therefore vary from patient to patient. However, I can confirm that for patients who are required to remain in Spain overnight the level of subsistence is the equivalent to what is payable to patients referred to the UK. The same applies to escorts. The maximum amount payable to patients staying in rented accommodation is £266. Patients staying with friends and relatives or in hospital accommodation receive a maximum of £98 per week. Additionally, in-patients receive £5 per day during their stay in hospital. The arrangements for patients referred to centres in Spain are similar to those made for referrals to the United Kingdom. The Sponsored Patient Department makes all the administrative arrangements in connection with the appointment and carries out the income assessment to establish the amount of maintenance payable to patients and escorts. Details of accommodation covering a range of prices and located near the hospital is provided prior to departure. Transport by ambulance is provided for all in-patients at St Bernard's and, on occasions when considered necessary by the relevant clinician, transport for outpatients by ambulance is also provided. Sponsored patients department staff are on call on a 24-hours 7 days a week basis and patients and escorts are given their telephone numbers so that they may be contacted if any further assistance is required at any time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 845 TO 847 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Am I therefore right in assuming, that when it comes to outpatients the level of subsistence they receive is not the same as if they were in the UK?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The qualification for the payment hinges on overnight stay. Obviously one cannot go to the UK for outpatient treatment and come back on the same day, so by implication there is a payment automatically if one goes to the UK. If one goes to Spain, if one goes for a day scan and do not stay overnight, then there is not a payment involved. If it involves overnight stay then yes, there is a payment.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, but I was enquiring more to the actual level of subsistence that patients receive in the UK, we are talking about the escorts.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The level is the same whether it is the UK or Spain.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Except that when the Minister mentioned the figure of £266 outpatients, I know that the figure for an outpatient in the UK is more than that, apart from the travel allowance.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No, the figures I am giving are the same whether it is Spain or UK and it is not for outpatients, it is for a sponsored patient going either to the UK or to Spain and having to stay overnight. If conceivably one could hire a private jet to take one to St Mary's Hospital to be seen by a specialist and one could come back in the evening, one would not get any money. If one goes there by the normal scheduled flight and stay overnight, then one gets the payment. Similarly with Spain, if one goes there and comes back one does not get the payment. That is, the payment is the same whether one goes to Spain or the UK, everything else being equal.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have in the back of my mind when the Minister spoke about the means testing, his predecessor was talking about a maximum of £280, and now we are given the figure of £266. That is why I am asking him to confirm whether it is the same or not. Of course I know that patients who travel to the UK have to travel by air, and of course I know that from the airport they are given a subsistence travel allowance to get to the

hospital or to wherever they are being accommodated. It is just that that figure, to me, is not the same figure as the maximum that escorts or patients who are not in hospital receive when in the UK.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

What is confusing the hon Member is her memory. The figure was £189 a week, presumably in the time when she was Minister for Health. Those figures were raised by us, by my Colleague Mr Azopardi when he was Minister for Health, to £266 a week. It has never been higher than £266 a week, it was £189 in her time, that is the figure that she has confusion over.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether that figure is now under review?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Which figure?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The last figure, the £266.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Not as far as I know.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is just that we heard a lady in public who said that she had gone to see the Minister and that she said that he had been very receptive and that she hoped that the figure would be going up.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am is always receptive when people come to see her. These were a group of patients or people who had all at one time or another been sponsored patients and the thrust of the combined representation was the present figure, present payments are not adequate for two reasons. Mainly because of the level that they were saying it should be higher but more to the point the criticism was on the means testing and the fact that the basis was on the household income as opposed to the income of the patient and the spouse. I was receptive in as much as asking for the group that was representing them, which was the new Pensioners Association, to make formal proposals to the GHA of what they thought the system should be, for consideration by GHA, but I mean obviously no figures were mentioned and no commitment was made by me other than to study any proposals that were made. Indeed, if I remember rightly, some proposals that are very, very sketchy have been put forward.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

This is something in respect of which we, I suppose, all receive representations. It is something which is spoken about quite generally, not just formally with members responsible for health. I am sure that we will agree that the right figure for sponsored patients between 1988 and 1996 and the right figure between 1996 and 2000 for example, is not necessarily the right figure when somebody is in London, traditionally one of the most expensive cities in the world, in 2004/2005 and that that should be something therefore kept under perhaps more constant review.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am sure that argument applies to any and every allowance that the Government pay or grant that Government give, any amount of money that is made available to anybody at any time, the principle of inflation and annual increases.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

But this particular one relates to something for which the Minister is responsible and which affects the quality of life for those that we send to the United Kingdom are able to enjoy. Therefore, would the Minister give a commitment to look at that?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

That is why I was receptive and responsive to the people who came to see me and I am looking forward to their proposals.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether the payments are made directly by the GHA to the Spanish medical institutions, or do the payments form part of the EU negotiations between the UK and Spain?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

If the hon Member is talking about the allowances, the subsistence allowance.....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No I am talking about the costs, the fees to the GHA of sending patients to Spanish medical institutions. Does the GHA pay the Spanish hospital directly or does the payment form part of the overall EU negotiations between the UK and Spain?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

As far as I am aware the payments are made to the institutions directly but I would not like to guarantee the accuracy of that answer, but that is I think the case, just as they are made direct to the UK institutions via the Lambeth Trust in the UK.

ORAL

NO 848 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health state how much money was spent by the Gibraltar Health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for scans in January, February and March of 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Payments made to clinics in Malaga during the period January to March 2004 amounted to £1,480.78.

**NO 849 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm whether the GHA have finalised their discussions with the Department of Health, regarding the payments for our sponsored patients' treatments in the UK, which will result in a sum of money rather than the number of people?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

These discussions are on-going and I can report to this House that we have made substantial progress in this area and we are on course for the targets that I indicated to the hon Member at the last meeting of the House, of implementation as from 1<sup>st</sup> April next year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 849 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will that mean that there will be any changes to the formula?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, as I told her last year, basically the whole basis indeed as she has indicated in the question, the whole basis will be on an annual sum of money per se as opposed to a quota of patients and an amount per patient.

ORAL

**NO 850 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state what was the total number of sponsored patients treated in the UK for the year 2003, with the cost being met by the UK, what were these costs together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 851 to 853 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 851 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state what was the total number of sponsored patients treated in the UK for the months of January, February and March of 2004, with the cost being met by the UK, what were these costs, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 850, 852 and 853 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 852 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state what was the number of sponsored patients treated in the UK from 1 January 2004 to the end of March 2004, with the fees being met by the Gibraltar Health Authority and the cost of such fees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 850, 851 and 853 of 2004.

**NO 853 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – QUOTA PATIENTS TREATED IN UK**

Can Government now state what were the costs of the 26 quota patients treated in the UK for the period 1 February to end of March 2002 with the costs being met by the UK Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 850 of 2004**

The situation remains as given in answer to Question No. 146 of 2004. The figures for 2003/2004 have not yet been provided by the UK Department of Health.

**Answer to Question No. 851 of 2004**

The total number of sponsored patients treated in the UK for the months of January, February and March of 2004, with the cost being met by the UK was 66.

**Answer to Question No. 852 of 2004**

The number of sponsored patients treated in the UK from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2004 to the end of March 2004, with the fees being met by the Gibraltar Health Authority is 197 patients. The costs identified to date are £466,951.13.

**Answer to Question No. 853 of 2004**

The latest available figure in respect of Healthcare costs provided by the UK to the 26 quota patients in question is £65,000.

**NO 854 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can the Government state what was the cost per capita in respect of sponsored patients in 2002/2003 and 2003/2004, and can they give a breakdown with regard to patients sent to the UK and patients sent to Spain?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The average cost of medical fees in respect of ex-quota patients referred to the UK in 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 is in the order of £3,100 and £3,200 respectively per patient. Referrals to Spain, other than those sent for diagnostic purposes to private clinics, are made through the E112 system and details of these costs are not available.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 854 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Did the Minister say at the end of that sentence that the patients sent to Spain are sent with the E112 system? That means therefore that if they use that then it is an EU form and therefore the payments to the hospital will not be made direct. Another question is, when we are talking about the per capita cost, the Minister has given a figure of £3,100?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

£3,100 for 2002/2003 and £3,200 for the following year.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see. It is just that it appears that it is a different figure that appears in the report again, because it says that the per capita cost has gone up from £3,125 to £5,795 for the year 2002/2003. There seems to be a discrepancy with the figure.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I am afraid the hon Member has been caught out once again comparing Granny Smiths to Pink Ladies.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Why?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

They are different kinds of apples. They are apples but different kinds of apples. I would need to know the basis. This calculation, despite the shortness of the answer, is an extremely difficult calculation to make. There are a number of variables, there are a number of overlaps from year to year and I confidently predict that it would be difficult to tie up one figure with the answer.

**NO 855 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PILLOW SHORTAGES**

Are Government aware that there has been complaints of shortages of pillows for patients in Godley Ward, and can they say whether such shortages exist in other wards and what is being done to remedy the situation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government are not aware that there have been complaints of shortages of pillows for patients in Godley or any other ward. Furthermore, GHA has confirmed that no patient has been left without a pillow in any ward. There have always been occasions when wards have required a larger number of pillows than usual causing temporary shortages. This problem has usually arisen when a number of patients have required more pillows than usual in order to be propped up in a comfortable position. On these occasions, additional pillows have always been provided to the wards by the Supplies Department. Godley, Napier, John and Victoria Wards have occasionally experienced this problem. The GHA have confirmed that adequate stocks of spare pillows are stored at St Bernard's Hospital and long term reserves at New Harbours GHA Stores.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 855 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Has the Minister not heard complaints from patients who have said that they need to wait for 2, 3 or 4 hours before they get an extra pillow?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

As a patient in a number of wards in the hospital in the past, I have heard of those complaints for myself. That does not mean that the pillows are not available but merely that either the ward staff or the ward supplies officer, or whoever, have not got their act together. The pillows are available, if people ask for them the pillows are made available.

ORAL

**NO 856 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

On what basis has the Minister for Health concluded that in January of this year, out of 167 patients in St Bernard's Hospital, 100 did not require to be in Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 857 to 863 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 857 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many long stay elderly care patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital in March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 856 and 858 to 863 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 858 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many long stay elderly care patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital in January, February and March of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 856, 857 and 859 to 863 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 859 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SHORTAGES OF BEDS**

Can Government confirm whether there still continues to be shortages of beds at St Bernard's Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 856 to 858 and 860 to 863 of 2004.

**NO 860 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the months of March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December of 2003, of the beds occupied by elderly persons who have been formally discharged, but refused to leave, how many fell into each of the 3 categories indentified by the Government:

- (1) Elderly persons living alone;
- (2) Elderly persons needing support;
- (3) Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 856 to 859 and 861 to 863 of 2004.

**NO 861 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the months of January, February and March of 2004, of the beds occupied by elderly persons who have been formally discharged, but refused to leave, how many fell into each of the 3 categories identified by the Government:

- (1) Elderly persons living alone;
- (2) Elderly persons needing support;
- (3) Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 856 to 860 and 862 to 863 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 862 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

How many elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 856 to 861 and 863 of 2004.

**NO 863 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state what is the present number of patients in St Bernard's Hospital, and how many of these does he consider now should not be there?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Question Nos. 857 and 860 are identical to Question Nos. 135 and 136 of 2004 which were asked during the meeting of this House last January and the information in answer to which has already been supplied to the hon Member. However, for the interests of Hansard and as agreed previously, I hand the information to her in a schedule.

**Answer to Question No. 856 of 2004**

Two separate and independently carried out audits, one of which was conducted by the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Team, and the other by the Bed Manager, concluded that some 100 patients did not require to be in hospital.

**Answer to Question No. 858 of 2004**

The numbers of long stay elderly patients in St Bernard's Hospital were:

|               |    |
|---------------|----|
| January 2004  | 56 |
| February 2004 | 58 |
| March 2004    | 58 |

**Answer to Question No. 859 of 2004**

In respect of bed shortages at St Bernard's Hospital the situation remains as given in answer to Question No. 137 of 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 861 of 2004**

The number of patients formally discharged but refusing to leave were as follows:

|          |      |    |
|----------|------|----|
| January  | 2004 | 13 |
| February | 2004 | 12 |
| March    | 2004 | 11 |

The information in respect of elderly patients formally discharged but refusing to leave is contained in the schedule.

- A total number of 9 elderly patients were discharged in March 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 9 elderly patients were discharged in April 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 10 elderly patients were discharged in May 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 10 elderly patients were discharged in June 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 9 elderly patients were discharged in July 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 8 elderly patients were discharged in August 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 9 elderly patients were discharged in September 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 10 elderly patients were discharged in October 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 10 elderly patients were discharged in November 2003 but refused to leave.
- A total number of 10 elderly patients were discharged in December 2003 but refused to leave.

(1) Of these the number of elderly patients living alone was as follows:

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| March     | 3 |
| April     | 3 |
| May       | 4 |
| June      | 4 |
| July      | 4 |
| August    | 3 |
| September | 3 |
| October   | 4 |
| November  | 4 |
| December  | 4 |

- (2) All elderly patients require some type of support be it physical, emotional, psychological or social.
- (3) All patients who have been officially discharged are able to be looked after.
- (4) The number of long stay elderly patients at St Bernard's Hospital for the months in question were as follows:

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| March     | 49 |
| April     | 47 |
| May       | 49 |
| June      | 50 |
| July      | 51 |
| August    | 50 |
| September | 48 |
| October   | 50 |
| November  | 52 |
| December  | 54 |

**Answer to Question No. 862 of 2004**

There are 93 persons on the waiting list for admission to Mount Alvernia, of whom 39 are in-patients at St Bernard's Hospital.

**Answer to Question No. 863 of 2004**

It is not for me to decide who should or should not be in hospital. This is a clinical decision for medical staff in accordance with GHA discharge policy. As a layman, all that I would say is that the hospitals are for people who are ill and not for people who are old but not ill. The latter either belong to their homes with their families or in residential or nursing homes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 856 TO 863 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Minister not remember that he said during an interview in GBC that he believed the experts and that he believed that Gibraltar only required a hospital with 100 beds? Therefore, if he does believe the experts, then is he saying that when the Europort hospital opens there will be 50 per cent occupancy only, in view of the fact that the number of beds there will be 211?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

What I said in a television interview I think it was, was that of the roughly 167 people in the hospital about 67 were acute cases who very, very roughly broad brush and without pinning down exact figures, out of the 167, 67 were people who were acute cases and needed to be in the hospital and of the remaining 100, 50 were people who did not need to be in the hospital at all and the other 50 were people who needed nursing or some sort of care but did not need to be in a hospital because that care could be provided elsewhere. That is what I said and that was based, as I have already said, on two independent audits, one that was carried out by the Healthcare Development Team and is part of that report which she has in front of her and which she is so fond of quoting from, and the other one was carried out by the Bed Manager at my request, and about six months later if I remember rightly at about January this year, completely unconnected one with the other, and they both came to



roughly the same decision that based on benchmarks about 100 beds was what theoretically was needed.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Then where are the rest of the patients going to be treated or where are they going to be sent?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

That is a different question altogether. The hon Member has asked me where I got the figure of 100 from and I have answered where I got the figure of 100 from. Where patients will be treated, presumably she means in the new hospital, will be up to the clinicians and the admissions people and to the various doctors to decide.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the Minister is saying that out of the number of patients that are in St Bernard's 100 should not be there, then I come to the conclusion then if he answers and he gives me that figure, what is going to happen to the rest of the patients?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

It is two different issues. She has asked me what did I base the figure of 100 from and I have explained it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Minister mentioned that this was based on benchmarks. What is the benchmark then? The population of Gibraltar?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Almost every United Kingdom expert that has come to look at our Health Service has expressed the view that this community does not need a hospital with 211 beds in it, and they apply UK benchmarks. UK benchmarks are that in the UK a population of this size would have a hospital with x number of beds. Well for a start the UK is hardly a benchmark in this respect to be followed. Secondly, as we keep on pointing out to them, Gibraltar is not comparable to the UK. In the UK if one lives in Cirencester or some other little place, and either the hospitals get all filled up or there is an epidemic, there are always more hospitals down the road, at some number of kilometres further away, there is overflow in other words and there are always patients from Cirencester who are being treated in another hospital for specialisation reasons and that this is not the case in Gibraltar. In Gibraltar whatever we cannot provide here, they have got nowhere else. So I do not know why the hon Lady insists on debating in this House the views expressed by people, the Government are building a hospital with 211 beds in it. Perhaps I could urge her to take a leaf out of her colleague the Hon Lucio Randall's example. He was just telling me earlier that he is so aggrieved with the Government's new bus service that his reaction is to

refuse to use the bus service. Well, by analogy, given that the hon Members are opposed to the clinical health practice and its report, could they respond in the same way by just not reading it and not quoting from it, ignoring it, pretending they have never seen it and that way there will be consistency of approach to the buses and to the hospital and to the health review.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister has not been listening to the question and just sort of decided if he finished what he was doing he was going to jump into the ring, because in fact she was not quoting the report, she was quoting the Minister for Health.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The original comes from there.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well we do not know where he got the original from but as he has correctly told us, it has been there in every previous report. It was there in the 1987 report when the AACR was there.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well then consider it is not a view that the Government shares or accepts.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I am glad to hear it because he seemed to be sharing it and defending it on television.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just a point of clarification, when we are dealing with a question for clarification of a point, we are dealing with Question No. 826 the Minister said that one of the problems is that the District Community Service is not under resourced, it is that too many people who use it should not be using it. Now in answer to this question there seems to be a suggestion that there are 50 people more or less in hospital who could be treated elsewhere, and I assume a part of those might be treated at home. Would that mean that domiciliary care services then is under resourced? Nursing homes rather than at home.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, no, no. There are elderly people who could be at home, who are in hospital but could be at home. There are elderly people who may not be able to be at home because they need a degree of care. Now that can be provided in a nursing home. In other words, one does not have to be occupying an acute bed in a ward resourced

and manned with the manning levels, and those could be provided for in nursing homes, which is what we are trying to convert. I mean, Mount Alvernia is increasingly staffed on that basis and when the extension to Mount Alvernia is opened, the intention is that that is what it will be used for. These people need a degree of care and supervision but they do not have to be in a room with 12 or 8 nurses and a staff sister and all that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is those 50? None of those will actually be people who go back home and are then treated at their own home by the domiciliary.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Let us be clear because otherwise the hon Members come back in three months time and throw the figure of 50 at me again. I have said very broad brush, out of the total number of people in the hospital about 50 do not need to be there, but if I quote from the report itself or from the audit, it says at this particular snapshot moment in time 71 were considered medically fit for discharge. This definition means that the patient has recovered from acute illness and does not require any active rehabilitation, acute, medical or nursing managements. Then he goes on to say somewhere else that a further 25 patients were occupying acute hospital beds who no longer required any acute medical or therapeutic intervention of any form. Hence, 71 plus 25 equals plus or minus 100. So it is not an exact figure, I said broad brush about 100.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not holding the Minister to it, I accept that figure but none of them would be people who go back home and would get care at home, that is what I am trying to establish.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They are not potential clients of the domiciliary threshold.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The resourcing of which would then be an issue to look at again.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It already is, the existing levels of demand.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have just found the quote, it is not 50 the Minister said 100. The experts tell us that in a place like Gibraltar we need less than 100 beds and if one looks at the figures,

there are 166 beds, 100 of which are occupied by non medical patients, so we will throw at his face 100 and not 50.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member is either deaf or I hesitate to say what the other d word is. I have said out of all the hospital total of 167 beds, about 100 do not need to be there. Fifty plus 50 equals 100. If one does the sum in a different way, 71 plus 25 equals 96 which is about 100.

ORAL

**NO 864 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Can the Government confirm that if they have engaged a specialist firm or consultant to advise them on the eventual move of St Bernard's Hospital to the Europort Building, how much will their services cost them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 865 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 865 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Can the Government confirm whether they have engaged a specialist firm or consultant, to advise them on the eventual move of St Bernard's Hospital, to the Europort Building?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Government have engaged a specialist migration firm to assist with the move from St Bernard's Hospital to the new Europort facility. Cyrill Swert, a migration specialist, been engaged to develop the migration plan at a cost of £90,000.

ORAL

NO 866 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

On what date do Government now expect the hospital at Europort to be fully functional and operational?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

We expect this to occur in autumn of this year.

**NO 867 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ENT CLINIC**

Can Government confirm whether they are engaged in any negotiations with a private clinic in Spain to provide ENT services at the Europort Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No, the Government are not engaged in any such negotiations.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 867 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether any approach has been made to them or to the GHA?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

In assessing options for the elimination of waiting lists, a number of options have been considered but there have been no negotiations or direct approaches. There may have been some assessments but then nothing has come back to the Government.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are the Government keen in looking at the possibility of engaging ENT services to bring down the backlog?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are awaiting, and expecting it imminently, the phase 2 implementation report from the consultants in relation to an aspect of the review of the reform of the health service which includes, but does not limit to, elimination of waiting lists and therefore it would be premature to say what the Government are keen on or not keen on. There are various ways of eliminating waiting lists. Look,



we could do what we did with the cataracts, we could bring in people and we could just operate on the backlog. There are alternative approaches which deal both with the backlog and with in-house resources going forward on a continuous basis.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I do not think that he realises that what they did with ophthalmology they did because they did not require theatre, most of the operations were carried out within the actual clinic.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are four operating theatres in the new hospital, including day surgery.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, but what I am saying is that are they now keen, because I am talking about a situation that I thought they were looking at now, but if he is saying that they will look at it once they are housed in the new hospital, then it is a completely different matter.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What the Minister has said is that we are awaiting receipt of the recommendations reports from the consultants in an area of the health reform which covers, but is not limited to, but it covers this area. The Government will form a view as to what they are keen on and what they are not keen on and approve one or another way of the various ways forward for dealing with this, when we have to hand the report of the consultants. In other words, by the time we come round to the hon Members asking all these questions all over again, which I have no doubt is what will happen at the next meeting of the House, there will be a substantive answer available to that question, because we are expecting this report literally in the next week or two.

ORAL

NO 868 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – CT SCAN**

Can Government confirm which staff will be operating the CT Scan at the Hospital in the Europort Building?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 869 and 870 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 869 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL – MEALS**

Can Government confirm whether they have now finalised the arrangements that will come into place, for meals to be provided to patients in the Europort Hospital when it becomes operational, from the new kitchen situated at the old wine factory area?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 868 and 870 of 2004.

**NO 870 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL – MEALS**

Have Government now decided which employees will be regenerating the meals on each of the Floors at the Europort Hospital, after they are transported from the old wine factory area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 868 of 2004**

Government can confirm that radiology staff who are in Government employ will be operating the CT Scan at the new hospital. Indeed, a local radiographer has been on a training course in the UK specially for this purpose, and his return is due to coincide with the opening of the new hospital.

**Answer to Question No. 869 of 2004**

Government will make announcements as to the operations of the new hospital when it is ready to do so.

**Answer to Question No. 870 of 2004**

The Government are not willing to comment publicly at this stage about staffing issues at the new hospital since consultations with the Trade Unions has not yet occurred.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 868 TO 870 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As regards the area where the meals are going to be prepared, which is the old wine factory area which the Government have said will be done by the existing staff of the Gibraltar Health Authority. If we have a situation where they contract somebody to manage the kitchen, does that mean that the GHA staff will come under the new management?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

I say again, the Government are not willing to comment publicly at this stage about staffing issues at the new hospital, since consultations with the Trade Unions have not yet occurred.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Government confirm that the staff will remain employees of the GHA?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have they started this process of consultation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not specifically in relation to this aspect of the matter. There has been agreement with the Unions about the willingness of the staff to be managed by outside management.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

On other aspects of the staffing of the new hospital has anything been finalised, or are they starting to talk? If they hope to do things by August they must be very optimistic of the pace at which they can move.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Autumn not August, but never mind it points to the same one. Well, there are not that many staffing issues. There are some, it is not that there are none, but the hon Member should not expand them in his mind.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know. I just wondered if it was going to prove to be quite a protracted issue in moving people from St Bernard's down. There are people who have got an expectation that something is being done with St Bernard's and that they are going to be able to stay there, I can tell him that, I do not know whether he is aware of it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

On the day that the migration into the new hospital is completed, St Bernard's Hospital and all the buildings in its vicinity will cease to operate as a medical facility,

and the staff, at least those that are willing to continue to work for the Health Authority, will have to move to where the Health Authority then has its hospital which will be down in Europort. There will not be a hospital for them to go to work in there after a given date, so I do not know what expectations they have.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I think the view that was going round was that the Government had some plans to retain some part of the hospital to keep the long-term elderly persons that they said would not be moved because they said there was not going to be a geriatric ward down there. It is helpful that he should make a clear statement because I can assure him that this is something that is going round, that speculation.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is a combination of things that are being put together and premature conclusions are drawn from them. The Government, added to funds provided by the trustees the old funds that were left over, is investing quite a lot of money (I cannot remember the number of extra beds, 50 or 60 odd in Mount Alvernia) and in principle, that deals with a large element of the people who should not be in St Bernard's Hospital. Now, the Government are also and quite separately from that, as I debated with the hon Lady last time, looking at the need for further provision because we see that this is an area where there is a need for more development. That is true, no decisions have been made but the Government are conscious that the extra 50 rooms in Mount Alvernia, or whatever the number they are, is not the end of the story. The Government are beginning the process of what is the future of the site of St Bernard's Hospital, which buildings are going to be knocked down, which buildings are going to be retained, because either of their usefulness, for example the modern Mackintosh Wing or the Colonial Hospital because of its heritage value, that could not be knocked down, but all the outhouses could be knocked down. Then, what to do with them, in other words what usage for the site. Is it for development, is it for some other purpose? One of the possibilities for that is a further residential home capability, other people have suggested sheltered housing generally for people in need of sheltered housing. There are lots of bids coming in with ideas for what it would be useful to use the retained buildings for but no decisions have been made. Indeed, the Government have not yet began the process of collating all the various proposals and suggestions and trying to thrash out a policy out of it all. So those are the strands, each of those is real but putting them together with the conclusion that there is going to be an elderly persons home in St Bernard's, that is not conclusions that people can come to at this stage.

**NO 871 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – STAFF CONSULTATION**

Can the Government say what indication, if any, they have had, that the staff consider there has been a lack of consultation and involvement in the design and development of the working environment of the new hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government do not accept that there has been a lack of consultation in the design development of the new hospital. In effect, the contrary is true, the GHA conducted 18 months of user group consultation during the design development stage of the project. This consultation phase not only included staff consultation, but also included voluntary and representative groups.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 871 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That means that the Minister does not agree with what has been published in the Report because that is precisely what the Report says.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that is not what the Report says. The Report, let us call it the bus that the hon Member does not want to ride in, the bus that she does not want to ride in contains in a section of it, there is a section of it which reports feedback from users. That is not the finding of the Report. In other words, this is reporting a statement made by at least one member of staff. Now, if one speaks to the Union, the suggestion that the staff had not been consulted is really, I hope the hon Member will accept this from me, completely and utterly unsustainable. In fact, my view is that there are some medical facilities that have spread themselves out over more area than they actually need precisely because it is the staff that have designed the internal layout. In my opinion, in anything, there has been too much staff involvement in the design of the hospital, not too little. The result is, has the hon Lady been around the bus that she refuses to ride in? I was astonished, areas like maternity, areas like ophthalmology which are presently squeezed into two and a half rooms at St Bernard's, one could get lost in it, if one wandered around ophthalmology without an experienced guide

one could easily get lost. I marvel at this. So believe me, there is not the remotest prospect of justification for any staff discontent, nor is there any merit to the view that there has been insufficient staff consultation. Of course, which is not to say that every single member of staff has participated, whether they have taken the opportunities offered to them, there have been meetings with staff. Some may not have taken the opportunity and then when they get asked they say there has not been enough consultation. I should tell the hon Lady that when people come to see the new hospital from Sweden and from Madrid, she will be interested to hear, whose jaws dropped to the floor when they saw the new hospital and said '*surely this cannot be a National Health Service hospital, this must be private*'. '*No this is for the Gibraltar National Health Service*'. '*No this cannot be so*'. We reassured them that it was so. So, I would regard it as an honour to personally give the hon Lady a personal tour of the entire hospital so that she understands just what a magnificent facility it is going to be.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

One's jaw drops, so one would need orthopaedic intervention. One cannot see oneself going into ophthalmology because one would get lost. I put the question for the obvious reason that this is precisely what the Report says. The Report says 'the staff expressed dissatisfaction with a number of important aspects', and then it goes on to say 'training and development, communication, the breakdown of communication, working relationships, health and safety, physical working environment' and then it says 'lack of consultation and involvement in the design and development of the working environment of the new hospital'. Then we get a speech from the Chief Minister talking about the hospital. He has said that this is not the case, it is one person, so is he actually saying that this is written here based on one person expressing this view?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We have had this exact discussion before in the last two Question Times because the hon Member has asked exactly this question before. These Question Times are becoming tape recordings of each other. We have had this conversation before, we have explained to her that consultants have explained to us that that section of the Report is not their findings, it is the feedback that they have had from staff. Yes, the staff did not all get together, all several hundred of them, and say 'we have not all been consulted, make a note of it there'. These are remarks reached for them by any member of staff and it could be anything from one to 650 people who have made that remark. I believe it is one.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just for clarification. How can this be becoming a recording with the same thing being repeated over and over again as if we were so moronic that we want to insist on the same thing, when in fact the Chief Minister has just revealed something new, namely that people from Madrid and from Sweden have come out to see the new hospital et cetera? Obviously, the questions are probing enough that we get new information all the time. I would also ask the Chief Minister to tell us who the person from Madrid was and who the person from Sweden was. What they were doing? Exactly what their role will be in the future running of the hospital and whether he is



prepared to reveal that now? That does not sound to me like a recording of something that has happened before.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The fact that I can make my answers variably interesting does not mean that the questions are not repetitious. In fact they were both suppliers of medical equipment, from both the companies that I mentioned.

**NO 872 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS EQUIPMENT**

Can the Government confirm which staff will be operating the dialysis facilities in the Europort building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government can confirm that GHA is conducting negotiations with the medical staff at the Dialysis Unit in La Linea for the provision of medical cover. Discussions are also in hand as to the provision of nursing cover, with the option of provision of training for local nurses included in the package.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 872 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are the facilities that are going to be available in the Europort building those recommended in the Report by Dr Terry Feest, who the Government commissioned?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not recall but certainly not necessarily, but I would need notice of that question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore the idea is that eventually our nurses that are going to be sent to train will replace those nurses that are engaged by the GHA from Spain, am I correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the GHA is not engaging nurses from Spain.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I thought I heard the Minister say something about the cover.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the staff. In other words, we will provide the premises and the equipment in Gibraltar and the service (personnel) will be the service personnel from La Linea, because for reasons that we have debated here a million times and I am not going to repeat today, with training provided for our local nurses.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Perhaps it was the wrong terminology that I used, but what I wanted to say is precisely what the Chief Minister has now confirmed.

**NO 873 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL – PARKING**

Can the Government give an update as to their negotiations with the developers of Europlaza for acquiring more parking spaces from them which are required for the Hospital at Europort?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government do not give updates of on-going commercial negotiations. However, I can tell the hon Lady that negotiations have not yet been completed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 873 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

How many parking spaces are available at the Europort hospital?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are a number of parking spaces available in the basement. I suppose when the hon Member says in the new hospital, the only parking spaces available in the new hospital are the ones available in the basement of the new hospital. I am not sure that those are for public use, in other words for use by visitors. I am not sure that those are intended for use by visitors, in fact I am almost certain that the plans are that they are not. Quite apart from anything else it raises security issues and all manner of things. The spaces for visitors are therefore not in the hospital, they are either in the streets outside or, if we succeed in negotiating as the question asks, they will be in the adjacent building.

ORAL

NO 874 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

Can the Minister for Health state who are the experts that came to the conclusion that only 100 beds are needed in the hospital, and when did these experts come to this conclusion?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

The new hospital has 211 beds.

WITHDRAWN

**NO 875 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GIBRALTAR HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

When do the Government expect to make public the second phase of the report by the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

As Government have explained publicly on various occasions, Phase II is not a single report but a series of implementation reports dealing with different aspects of the Health Service which will be published and acted upon, to the extent accepted by the Government, as and when issued. This process has already begun.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 875 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The process has already begun, is the Minister saying that there is already one of the Phase II stages has already been accepted, implemented and published?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it has already began meaning that we have received the first two such reports and the Government are presently considering it to see whether it will accept all or which parts of it, and then it will be published and then it will be implemented in the measures accepted.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When it is published, will the whole of the report be published or will Government only publish those recommendations that they will accept?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government are committed to publishing all the reports and any recommendations that we do not accept, to explain why we do not accept them and why we will not implement them.

ORAL

**NO 876 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT**

Can Government confirm how much money they have spent up to date on the Clinical Governance Audit they commissioned with regard to our health services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 877 of 2004.



**NO 877 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT**

Can Government confirm how much is the expected total expenditure in respect of the Clinical Governance Audit they have commissioned for our Health Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The total payments made to date to the NHS Modernisation Agency in respect of the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Programme are as follows:

|                            |             |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| Financial Year 2003 – 2004 | £427,339.29 |
| Financial Year 2004 – 2005 | £229,758.89 |

It is estimated that an additional £370,000 will be paid before the programme is completed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 876 TO 877 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are these figures over and above the migration team?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes.

**ORAL**

**NO 878 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MR LANGHAM**

Can Government confirm if they have engaged the services of Mr Langham in relation to our health services, what is the envisaged total expenditure of his contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 879 to 882 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 879 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MR LANGHAM**

Can Government state that if Mr Langham has been engaged by them on a contract basis, when does the contract expire?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 878 and 880 to 882 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 880 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MR LANGHAM**

Can Government state that if they have engaged the services of Mr John Langham, in relation to our health services, how much have they paid him up to now?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 878, 879 and 881 to 882 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 881 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – MR LANGHAM**

Can Government state whether Mr John Langham has been engaged by them in relation to our health services on a contract basis?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 878 to 880 and 882 of 2004.

**NO 882 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MR LANGHAM**

Can Government confirm whether they have engaged Mr Langham in connection with our health services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government do not have a contractual arrangement with Mr Langham. Mr Langham has a contractual arrangement with the Clinical Governance Unit of the NHS Modernisation Agency to assist in work designed to improve our health services.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 878 TO 882 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Then I take it that I am correct in assuming that his fees are part of the fees that have just been given about the clinical governance.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

Correct.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm how many people comprise the NCGST?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is a core group of people, the Project Director, Miss Marilyn Bogus, Joanna Smith, Mr Langham and John Smith. They are the four core people, but as the hon Lady will see when we start publishing reports, when it comes to specific areas of the Health Authority, specialists have been brought in. For example, if a review has been carried out, as it has, of the gynaecology service, all the clinical services have been reviewed. They have been reviewed by people engaged from the Royal

Colleges in the United Kingdom in those specialisations. So, the individuals I mentioned before were the permanent individuals working on this project, but then specialists are recruited in the various specialisations that are being reviewed, so for example there were people here from the Royal College of Surgeons reviewing the general surgery and orthopaedic surgery clinical service. Therefore, there is a specialist peer group review by the Royal Colleges in that area of clinical service. So by the end of the reports there will be lots and lots of people that will have had an input into the preparation of all the constituent parts of the report.

**NO 883 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIRECTOR OF NURSING SERVICES**

Can Government confirm whether the post of Director of Nursing Services, which became vacant in 2003, has now been filled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 883 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Has the post been re-advertised?

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

No.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does that mean that the Government are happy with the situation that is presently in place, which is what the Minister answered to my Question No. 187 when he said that the duties of the post are being carried out by the Deputy Director of Nursing Services?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it means that the Government are going to use an alternative method of recruitment other than advertising.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Do Government already have somebody in mind, and has an offer been made?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When do they expect the post to be filled?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We are hoping for the post to be filled this side of summer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When he says that he expects it to be filled this side of summer, is it that it is going to be opened again to existing employees this side of summer or is that now discontinued?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What is the alternative to advertising?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The alternative to advertising is search firms, head hunting and recruitment.

**NO 884 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – POST OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Can Government now confirm whether once they have taken a decision on the new salary for the post of Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority, the post will be advertised within the Civil Service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government do not intend to advertise this post within the Civil Service.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 884 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does that mean that the present incumbent of the post will continue to be the Chief Executive once a decision on the salary has been taken?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the management structure of the Gibraltar Health Authority is being reformed and restructured and the present incumbent in the Chief Executive post will move to another post and a new person will be engaged as Chief Executive as such.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will that be done on the same basis as what he has said in the previous question, it is a question of head hunting?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see, and will the present Chief Executive return to the Civil Service or will he form part of the team in the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have just answered that question. Within the restructured management of the Gibraltar Health Authority.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Oh yes, well that is the part that I did not hear.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What we are talking then is that there is going to be an increase in the number of posts, because the job that is being done now is going to be done by somebody from outside, and the person that is there now is going to be doing something that is not replacing an existing body, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I have said that there is going to be a substantial restructuring of management in the Health Authority and for the rest of it the Government would wish to make the announcements when it makes the announcements.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the provision for all this included in the Estimates that have been tabled today?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Some of it.

ORAL

**NO 885 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE**

Do the Government agree with the remarks made by the Ombudsman in his latest annual report of December 2003, that the GHA's Complaints Procedure has proved and continues to be, an abysmal failure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 886, 887 and 888 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 886 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE**

Do the Government consider that it is acceptable that a complaint made to the Gibraltar Health Authority in May 2002, should not have been replied to until November 2003, and then only as a result of the intervention by the Ombudsman?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 885, 887 and 888 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 887 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE**

Do the Government accept that the complaints procedure has been ineffective from everybody's point of view?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 885, 886 and 888 of 2004.

**NO 888 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE**

Given that the Government in the last meeting of the House changed their mind reference the prompt engagement of an officer with full time responsibility for the complaints procedure, which had been announced previously in the House, by the last Minister for Health, can they now state when they can expect to introduce a different and more effective procedure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question Nos. 885, 886, 887 and 888 of 2004**

The Government accept that the complaints system introduced in 1999 has not been as effective as is required nor as the Government would have wished. That is why we are establishing a new one.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 885 TO 888 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well it has taken them three years to accept that fact because we have been highlighting all the problems nearly four years ago. Will the Minister, in view of all the changes that the Chief Minister has said are going to be made in the Health Authority, will the Minister confirm whether the intention of the Government is to have a complaints procedure that is staffed by persons outside the GHA, or even the Civil Service?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government will make public announcements on the proposed new complaints procedure when it is ready to do so.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does it have an idea when it is ready to do so, seeing that the Chief Minister in a statement which he made in September of last year, said that there would be a

speedy and effective complaints procedure with an independent appeals level? Can he confirm how speedy it will, how soon they intend the complaints procedure to be in place? Can he confirm whether in fact his words still stand as regards an independent appeals level?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I repeat the answer that I gave to the hon Member in her last supplementary.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Given the statement by the Hon Mr Britto that the present system is not as effective as it should be as the Government had wished it to be when they brought it about, and all of us would wish it to be, to ensure that clients of the Health Service get the redress that they wish as soon as possible, what happens between now and the statement which will come when the Government wish to make it, of the new complaints procedure to those who wish to make complaints? Must they make it through the now accepted to be ineffective procedure, or will they have an opportunity so that time does not run against them, in making the complaint if the complaints procedure is to have a time limit of making them under the new complaints procedure when it comes?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government will make a statement about the content of the new complaints procedure when they receive it. One of the transitions between one system and another is obviously an element of the new procedure.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I appreciate that. Can I ask the Chief Minister to bear in mind the fact that there will be people who want to make complaints who are now stuck with what is admitted to be an ineffective procedure, and that that therefore should mitigate in favour of the new procedure being announced as soon as possible so that those with complaints now are not kept in limbo for longer than they need to be. If he is simply going to repeat what he said before, I will not put him to the waste of saliva.

**HON LT COL E M BRITTO:**

It has not been admitted to being ineffective, it has been claimed to be not as effective as the Government would have wished.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I did not mean to make straw whilst the sun shone there. Just that the new procedure should come as soon as possible for those who have a genuine grievance that they want to put which is not necessarily one that needs to be put through other means.



ORAL

**NO 889 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ST BERNADETTE'S OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY CENTRE**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Nothing has been spent on computers at St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre in this financial year.

ORAL

**NO 890 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ST BERNADETTE'S OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY CENTRE**

Can Government state whether any student attending St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre are listed in the Employment and Training Centre as seeking Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 891 to 893 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 891 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ST BERNADETTE'S OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY CENTRE**

Will Government state how many of the students at St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre are on an inclusion process to attend the College of Further Education?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 890 and 892 to 893 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 892 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ST BERNADETTE'S OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY CENTRE**

Will Government state how many of the students at St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre are on an inclusion process to attend Bleak House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 890, 891 and 893 of 2004.

**NO 893 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ST BERNADETTE'S OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY CENTRE**

Can Government state what educational programmes are offered to students with Special Educational Needs in St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The Employment and Training Centre does not have any of the St Bernadette's Occupational Centre service users on their lists. The College of Further Education and Bleak House do not provide an inclusion process for service users at the St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre. The service users at St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre are offered programmes that provide cooking skills, live skills outings, art and basic computer skills.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 890 TO 893 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister aware that there are educational programmes for students of special educational needs, is she aware of any?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

First of all the persons who use the St Bernadette's Occupational Therapy Centre are not considered as students. Their education finishes once they leave St Martin's from where the majority of them have come from. I can say that the Gibraltar College and Bleak House have a Special Needs Coordinator who liaises with the assessment panel and they assess each individual who, according to their individual capabilities, in entering any of the courses that are provided by either Bleak House or the Gibraltar College.

**HON S E LINARES:**

If they are not considered students, what is the politically correct way of calling them?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Service users of the Centre.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is this Centre considered to be an educational centre?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No.

**HON S E LINARES:**

If it is not considered to be an educational centre, why then has it got a calendar which is mirrored to schools and the Education Department, why is it not opened during summer?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

The Government summer hours operate on the same basis.

**HON S E LINARES:**

The summer hours have nothing to do with the fact that the Centre is closed all summer. So even if there are summer hours sessions could be offered in the morning, Civil Servants do go to work even on summer hours in the mornings.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

To some extent as far as possible some sort of education, in the general sense, is provided at the Centre but that does not mean that the Centre is an educational centre.

**ORAL**

**NO 894 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the month of January 2004 receiving:-

- (a) Unemployment Benefit;
- (b) Social Assistance;
- (c) No payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 895 and 896 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 895 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the month of February 2004 receiving:-

- (a) Unemployment Benefit;
- (b) Social Assistance;
- (c) No payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 894 and 896 of 2004.



**NO 896 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the month of March 2004 receiving:-

- (a) Unemployment Benefit;
- (b) Social Assistance;
- (c) No payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answers to Question Nos. 894 to 896 of 2004**

The following is a breakdown by month, sex and age of male and female registered unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over from January to March 2004 who have received:

A) Unemployment Benefit

| <b>2004</b> | <b>MALES</b> | <b>FEMALES</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>18/24</b> | <b>25+</b> |
|-------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| JANUARY     | 39           | 36             | 75           | 29           | 46         |
| FEBRUARY    | 37           | 27             | 64           | 29           | 35         |
| MARCH       | 40           | 25             | 65           | 32           | 33         |

B) Social Assistance

| <b>2004</b> | <b>MALES</b> | <b>FEMALES</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>18/24</b> | <b>25+</b> |
|-------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| JANUARY     | 73           | 37             | 110          | 25           | 85         |
| FEBRUARY    | 80           | 41             | 121          | 25           | 96         |
| MARCH       | 88           | 42             | 130          | 22           | 108        |

C) No payment

| <b>2004</b>     | <b>MALES</b> | <b>FEMALES</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>18/24</b> | <b>25+</b> |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| <b>JANUARY</b>  | 90           | 80             | 170          | 43           | 127        |
| <b>FEBRUARY</b> | 100          | 79             | 179          | 56           | 123        |
| <b>MARCH</b>    | 76           | 65             | 141          | 35           | 106        |

ORAL

NO 897 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**COMMUNITY CARE LTD**

Can Government state how many Community Officers employed by Community Care Ltd were either eligible for or being paid the minimum income guarantee as at December 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

Six Community Officers were being paid the minimum income guarantee as at December 2003.

**NO 898 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS**

Can Government state how many persons have had their claims for Unemployment Benefit disallowed under the provisions of section 10(2A) of the Non-contributory Benefits and Unemployment Ordinance in each year since 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The number of persons who had their claims for Unemployment Benefit disallowed under the provisions of Section 10 (2A) of the Non-Contributory Benefits and Unemployment Ordinance is as follows:

|      |    |
|------|----|
| 1996 | 2  |
| 1997 | 5  |
| 1998 | 3  |
| 1999 | 3  |
| 2000 | 17 |
| 2001 | 5  |
| 2002 | 18 |
| 2003 | 35 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 898 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say what is the explanation for the substantial increase in numbers in 2003?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No I am afraid I cannot give any reasonable explanation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say whether these are all Civil Servants? Were all the people affected former Civil Servants?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, there were some from the private sector as well.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say whether the disallowance of the claim has in any case been appealed against, and whether any of those appeals have been successful?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I would need to have prior notice of that question. I can find out for the hon Member.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister know whether the figure of those people disallowed, for example the net figure after any appeal has been successful or before the appeal, does the Minister know that?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I would not know. Obviously I do not know whether there have been any appeals so I would not know the answer to that question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I am not interested if the Minister knows how many appeals there have been, if any, she does not know for example if there were two in 1996 that would be the result of the ones that were finally disallowed or whether there was a higher number earlier and an appeal and this is a net figure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is important to have notice of that question because obviously it is statistical and it is an area that Ministers do not get personally involved, but I would guess that because the question says under section 10(2)(a), disallowed I would guess that it is at first instance, in other words, I would have thought so it would not include any case resolved one way or the other on appeal, but we would need to confirm that.

**NO 899 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY – STAFF**

Can Government state what were the staff numbers, salary scales and total personal emoluments in the Social Services Department in the year 2002/2003, provided for the delivery of the services that were transferred to the Social Services Agency, towards the end of that financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**STAFF NUMBERS (Milbury Care Services Ltd at time of transfer to Social Services Agency)**

94 (49 Support workers/45 Care Workers)

**PAY SCALE (as applied by Milbury Care Services Ltd)**

|                       |                |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Senior Support Worker | £6.51 per hour |
| Support Worker        | £5.21 per hour |
| Senior Care Worker    | £6.51 per hour |
| Care Worker           | £5.21 per hour |

**TOTAL PERSONAL EMOLUMENTS (Milbury Care Services Ltd)**

£866,833

ORAL

**NO 900 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

What were the services transferred to the social services agency towards the end of the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 901 of 2004.

**NO 901 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCY**

What was the cost, in the Financial year 2002/2003 of the provision of those services that were transferred to the social services agency towards the end of that financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No. 900**

CHILDREN'S RESIDENTIAL SERVICE  
DR GIRALDI HOME (INCLUDING RESPITE & SITTING SERVICES)  
ST BERNADETTE'S OCCUPATIONAL CENTRE  
FOSTERING & ADOPTION SERVICE  
CHILD PROTECTION SERVICE  
COMMUNITY SERVICE ORDERS  
PROBATION SERVICE  
DAY CENTRES FOR THE ELDERLY  
SOCIAL WORK IN GENERAL

**Answer to Question No. 901 of 2004**

The cost for the provision of those services that were transferred to the Social Services Agency in the financial year 2002/2003 was £1,041,466. This amount covers the period 1 April 2002 to 10 November 2002.



ORAL

**NO 902 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE (SHORT-TERM BENEFITS) FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short Term Benefit Fund in respect of each month of the first quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 903 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 903 OF 2004

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long Term Benefit Fund in respect of each month of the first quarter 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 903**

**Answer to Question 902**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE (SHORT-TERM BENEFITS)  
FUND**

|                               | <u>31-Jan-04</u>  | <u>29-Feb-04</u>  | <u>31-Mar-04</u>  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>  |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Opening Balance</u></b> | £6,010,387        | £5,990,569        | £5,966,657        |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Add</u></b>             |                   |                   |                   |
| Receipts                      | £48,851           | £37,926           | £238,827          |
|                               | <u>£6,059,238</u> | <u>£6,028,495</u> | <u>£6,205,484</u> |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Less</u></b>            |                   |                   |                   |
| Payments                      | <u>(£68,669)</u>  | <u>(£61,838)</u>  | <u>(£59,523)</u>  |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b> | <u>£5,990,569</u> | <u>£5,966,657</u> | <u>£6,145,961</u> |

**Answer to Question 903**

**OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS  
FUND**

|                               | <u>31-Jan-04</u>   | <u>29-Feb-04</u>    | <u>31-Mar-04</u>   |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>  |                    |                     |                    |
| <b><u>Opening Balance</u></b> | £10,885,301        | £12,023,378         | £11,678,951        |
| <br>                          |                    |                     |                    |
| <b><u>Add</u></b>             |                    |                     |                    |
| Receipts                      | £905,286           | £703,267            | £1,014,856         |
|                               | <u>£11,790,587</u> | <u>£12,726,645</u>  | <u>£12,693,807</u> |
| <br>                          |                    |                     |                    |
| <b><u>Less</u></b>            |                    |                     |                    |
| Advance to CLTBF              | £1,100,000 *       |                     |                    |
| <br>                          |                    |                     |                    |
| Payments                      | <u>(£867,209)</u>  | <u>(£1,047,694)</u> | <u>(£969,288)</u>  |
| <br>                          |                    |                     |                    |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b> | <u>£12,023,378</u> | <u>£11,678,951</u>  | <u>£11,724,519</u> |

\* Amount advanced to the Closed Long Term Benefits Fund due to funds claimed from the Department for International Development on 19 December 2003 being received on 6 January 2004.

**NO 904 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month in the first quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month in the first quarter 2004, are as follows:

|               |                   |
|---------------|-------------------|
| January 2004  | £800,000          |
| February 2004 | £900,000          |
| March 2004    | <u>£900,000</u>   |
|               | <u>£2,600,000</u> |

ORAL

**NO 905 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits fund for each of the months of January, February and March 2004 showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the details requested.

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

|                                                       | <u>31-Jan-04</u>      | <u>28-Feb-04</u>  | <u>31-Mar-04</u>  |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>                          |                       |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>                         | <u>£374,051</u>       | <u>£869,914</u>   | <u>£538,631</u>   |
| <b><u>"Local Account"</u></b>                         |                       |                   |                   |
| Opening Balance                                       | £21,951               | £1,059            | £38,313           |
| <u>Add</u>                                            |                       |                   |                   |
| Transfers from the<br>Open Long-Term<br>Benefits Fund | £800,000              | £900,000          | £900,000          |
| Other Receipts                                        | £2,532                | £1,882            | £4,458            |
|                                                       | <u>£824,483</u>       | <u>£902,941</u>   | <u>£942,771</u>   |
| <u>Less</u>                                           |                       |                   |                   |
| Pension Payments                                      | <u>(£823,424)</u>     | <u>(£864,628)</u> | <u>(£906,341)</u> |
| Closing Balance                                       | <u>£1,059</u>         | <u>£38,313</u>    | <u>£36,430</u>    |
| <b><u>"Spanish Account"</u></b>                       |                       |                   |                   |
| Opening Balance                                       | £352,100              | £868,855          | £500,318          |
| <u>Add</u>                                            |                       |                   |                   |
| Receipts from DFID                                    | £1,640,000            | £190,000          | £1,120,000        |
| Advance from OLTI                                     | £0                    | £0                | £0                |
|                                                       | <u>£1,992,100</u>     | <u>£1,058,855</u> | <u>£1,620,318</u> |
| <u>Less</u>                                           |                       |                   |                   |
| Advance from OLTI                                     | <u>(£1,100,000) *</u> | <u>£0</u>         | <u>£0</u>         |
| Pension Payments                                      | <u>(£23,245)</u>      | <u>(£558,537)</u> | <u>(£985,913)</u> |
| Closing Balance                                       | <u>£868,855</u>       | <u>£500,318</u>   | <u>£634,405</u>   |
| <b><u>Fund Account</u></b>                            |                       |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>                         | <u>£869,914</u>       | <u>£538,631</u>   | <u>£670,835</u>   |

\* Claim sent to the Department for International Development on 19 December 2003 and funds received on 6 January 2004.

**NO 906 OF 2004****THE HON C A BRUZON****SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in the months of January, February and March 2004 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners showing the number of Gibraltar/UK Nationals, Moroccans and other nationalities for each month?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from January 2004 – March 2004.

|                                         | <b>January 2004</b> | <b>February 2004</b> | <b>March 2004</b> |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</b>      | 6613                | 6592                 | 6573              |
| <b>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</b> | 4877                | 4883                 | 4891              |
| <b>Moroccan Pensioners</b>              | 1462                | 1487                 | 1490              |
| <b>Other Nationalities</b>              | 397                 | 397                  | 400               |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>13349</b>        | <b>13359</b>         | <b>13354</b>      |

**NO 907 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a disability allowance under the social assistance arrangements for each month of the first quarter 2004 giving a breakdown for each month, their sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE YEAR 2004 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE**

| <b>Months</b> | <b>0-10</b> | <b>11-20</b> | <b>21-30</b> | <b>31-40</b> | <b>41-50</b> | <b>51-60</b> | <b>61-70</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Jan-04        | 24          | 27           | 20           | 11           | 17           | 11           | 0            | 110          | 76          | 34            |
| Feb-04        | 25          | 27           | 20           | 11           | 17           | 10           | 0            | 110          | 76          | 34            |
| Mar-04        | 26          | 28           | 20           | 11           | 17           | 10           | 0            | 112          | 78          | 34            |



ORAL

**NO 908 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SCHEDULES**

Can Government state what is the number of the social insurance schedules returned to-date for each quarter of the year 2001?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 909 to 911 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 909 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government state what is the number of social insurance schedules returned to-date for each quarter of the year 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 908 and 910 to 911 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 910 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SCHEDULES**

Can Government state what is the number of social insurance schedules returned to-date for each quarter of the year 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 908, 909 and 911 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 911 OF 2004

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SCHEDULES**

Can Government state what is the number of social insurance schedules returned to date for the first quarter of the year 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question Nos 908-911 of 2004**

**Social Insurance Returns as at 22 April 2004**

| Qtr.            | All                                  |         |            | Private |                                           |         | Official   |         |         | Self Employed |         |         |            |         |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|-------------------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|
|                 | Number of<br>Employers<br><i>all</i> | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Number of<br>Employers<br><i>returned</i> | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Returns | Non-Return    | Pending | Returns | Non-Return | Pending |
| <b>Qtr.1/01</b> | 1281                                 | 14603   | 856        | 703     | 1058                                      | 9897    | 651        | 515     | 4151    | 172           | 62      | 555     | 33         | 126     |
| <b>Qtr.2/01</b> | 1297                                 | 14960   | 1015       | 706     | 1063                                      | 10246   | 758        | 517     | 4155    | 213           | 62      | 559     | 44         | 127     |
| <b>Qtr.3/01</b> | 1312                                 | 15074   | 1351       | 700     | 1062                                      | 10395   | 1034       | 511     | 4124    | 255           | 62      | 555     | 62         | 127     |
| <b>Qtr.4/01</b> | 1324                                 | 13157   | 3172       | 707     | 770                                       | 8651    | 2681       | 517     | 4200    | 168           | 63      | 306     | 323        | 127     |
| <b>Qtr.1/02</b> | 1348                                 | 13314   | 1148       | 3051    | 1062                                      | 10552   | 890        | 844     | 2210    | 227           | 2023    | 552     | 31         | 184     |
| <b>Qtr.2/02</b> | 1370                                 | 13380   | 1327       | 3028    | 1056                                      | 10615   | 1012       | 827     | 2211    | 277           | 2017    | 554     | 38         | 184     |
| <b>Qtr.3/02</b> | 1384                                 | 13512   | 1603       | 3025    | 1065                                      | 10725   | 1269       | 824     | 2221    | 287           | 2017    | 566     | 47         | 184     |
| <b>Qtr.4/02</b> | 1399                                 | 13354   | 1665       | 3017    | 1055                                      | 10506   | 1292       | 815     | 2294    | 297           | 2018    | 554     | 76         | 184     |

**"Contd Answer to Questions 908-911 of 201**

| Qtr.     | All                     |         |            | Private |                              |         | Official   |         |         | Self Employed |         |     |     |     |
|----------|-------------------------|---------|------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|
|          | Number of Employers all | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Number of Employers returned | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Returns | Non-Return    | Pending |     |     |     |
| Qtr.1/03 | 1423                    | 12203   | 1600       | 4499    | 1013                         | 9589    | 1335       | 1951    | 2109    | 233           | 2258    | 505 | 32  | 290 |
| Qtr.2/03 | 1450                    | 12190   | 2307       | 4450    | 994                          | 9551    | 1837       | 1907    | 2136    | 427           | 2253    | 503 | 43  | 290 |
| Qtr.3/03 | 1468                    | 11575   | 3527       | 4421    | 929                          | 8947    | 2985       | 1886    | 2148    | 461           | 2245    | 480 | 81  | 290 |
| Qtr.4/03 | 1480                    | 10610   | 4377       | 4419    | 861                          | 8115    | 3677       | 1884    | 2058    | 572           | 2247    | 437 | 128 | 288 |
| Qtr.1/04 | 1496                    | 1469    | 1407       | 16784   | 150                          | 1158    | 1289       | 11462   | 227     | 113           | 4556    | 84  | 5   | 766 |

**Note:-**  
Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2002.

ORAL

**NO 912 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of contributions required to be paid by a female contributor to the Social Insurance Fund to obtain the minimum pension and the number of contributions required to obtain the maximum pension in the year 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 913 to 915 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 913 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM FUND**

Can Government state how many female contributions to the Social Insurance Open Long Term Fund, reached the age of 60 in the financial year 2002/2003 and of this how many qualified for the payment of a pension by virtue of contributions paid in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 912, 914 and 915 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 914 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of contributions required to be paid by a male contributor to the Social Insurance Fund to obtain the minimum pension and the number of contributions required to obtain the maximum pension in the year 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 912, 913 and 915 of 2004.

**NO 915 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM FUND**

Can Government state how many male contributors to the Social Insurance Open Long Term Fund, reached the age of 65 in the financial year 2002/2003 and of these how many qualified for the payment of a pension by virtue of contributions paid in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 912**

A female contributor who attained pensionable age in the year 2003 was required to have paid or been credited with at least 520 contributions to obtain the minimum pension and 2000 contributions to obtain the maximum pension. At least 156 contributions must have been actually paid (not credited) since the date of the insured person's entry into insurance and the date of attaining pensionable age.

**Answer to Question No. 913**

The information requested in respect of female contributors who reached the age of 60 in the financial year is not readily available.

**Answer to Question No. 914**

A male contributor who attained pensionable age in the year 2003 must have paid or been credited with at least 585 contributions to obtain the minimum pension and 2250 contributions to obtain the maximum pension. At least 156 contributions must have been actually paid (not credited) since the date of the insured person's entry into insurance and the date of attaining pensionable age.

**Answer to Question No. 915**

It is also impossible to say how many male contributors reached the age of 65 in the financial year 2002/2003. The information is not readily available.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 912 TO 915 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I thank the hon Lady for the information. Could she tell me if she has discretionary powers? In the cases where some male or female workers in Gibraltar just fail by a small fraction in their contributions to qualify for a pension for example.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, it is a statutory entitlement and requirement and therefore it is not a question of having discretionary powers.

ORAL

**NO 916 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – NUMBER OF INSURED PERSONS**

Can Government provide the schedule showing the distribution of insured persons in Gibraltar as at the end of 2002 analysed by industry giving the adult and juvenile, male and female numbers in respect of British and other nationalities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 917 to 921 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 917 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – NUMBER OF INSURED PERSONS**

Can Government provide the schedule showing the distribution of insured persons in Gibraltar as at the end of 2001 analysed by industry giving the adult and juvenile, male and female numbers in respect of British and other nationalities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 916 and 918 to 921 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 918 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – NUMBER OF INSURED PERSONS**

Can Government provide the schedule showing the distribution of insured persons in Gibraltar as at the end of 2000 analysed by industry giving the adult and juvenile, male and female numbers in respect of British and other nationalities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 916 to 917 and 919 to 921 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 919 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – NUMBER OF INSURED PERSONS**

Can Government provide the schedule showing the distribution of insured persons in Gibraltar as at the end of 1999 analysed by industry giving the adult and juvenile, male and female numbers in respect of British and other nationalities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 916 to 918 and 920 to 921 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 920 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – NUMBER OF INSURED PERSONS**

Can Government provide the schedule showing the distribution of insured persons in Gibraltar as at the end of 1998 analysed by industry giving the adult and juvenile, male and female numbers in respect of British and other nationalities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 916 to 919 and 921 of 2004.



**NO 921 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – NUMBER OF INSURED PERSONS**

Can Government provide the schedule showing the distribution of insured persons in Gibraltar as at the end of 1997 analysed by industry giving the adult and juvenile, male and female numbers in respect of British and other nationalities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member lists showing the distribution of insured persons analysed by industry as at the end of the years 1997 to 1999. The information requested for the years 2000 to 2002 is not readily available but will be sent to the hon Member as soon as the information has been compiled.

**DISTRIBUTION OF INSURED PERSONS IN GIBRALTAR AS AT THE END OF 1997**  
**ANALISED BY INDUSTRIES**

(as at 31 July 1998)

| IND<br>NO. | DESCRIPTION                                           | BRITISH     |           |             |           | ALIEN      |          |           |          | TOTAL       |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|-------------|
|            |                                                       | MALE        |           | FEMALE      |           | MALE       |          | FEMALE    |          |             |
|            |                                                       | A           | J         | A           | J         | A          | J        | A         | J        |             |
| 01         | Shipbuilding, Shiprepairing<br>and Marine Engineering | 46          | 0         | 34          | 0         | 19         | 0        | 2         | 0        | 101         |
| 02         | Manufacture of Food, Drink<br>and Tobacco             | 5           | 0         | 7           | 0         | 20         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 32          |
| 03         | Printing & Publishing                                 | 19          | 1         | 13          | 2         | 6          | 0        | 1         | 0        | 42          |
| 04         | Manufacture (Other)                                   | 8           | 1         | 3           | 0         | 4          | 0        | 0         | 0        | 16          |
| 05         | Building & Construction                               | 864         | 13        | 84          | 2         | 334        | 0        | 13        | 0        | 1310        |
| 06         | Electricity Supply                                    | 120         | 0         | 6           | 0         | 8          | 0        | 0         | 0        | 134         |
| 07         | Water Supply                                          | 80          | 0         | 11          | 0         | 12         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 103         |
| 08         | Sea Transport & Shipping Services                     | 153         | 3         | 31          | 0         | 39         | 0        | 5         | 0        | 231         |
| 09         | Port Services                                         | 61          | 0         | 7           | 0         | 1          | 0        | 1         | 0        | 70          |
| 10         | Road Transport                                        | 10          | 0         | 6           | 1         | 5          | 0        | 0         | 0        | 22          |
| 11         | Postal & Telecommunications                           | 169         | 2         | 49          | 0         | 1          | 0        | 2         | 0        | 223         |
| 12         | Other Transport & Telecom.                            | 6           | 0         | 1           | 0         | 0          | 0        | 0         | 0        | 7           |
|            | <b><u>WHOLESALE TRADE</u></b>                         |             |           |             |           |            |          |           |          |             |
| 13         | Food & Drink                                          | 103         | 0         | 66          | 0         | 86         | 0        | 6         | 0        | 261         |
| 14         | Fuel                                                  | 15          | 0         | 7           | 0         | 15         | 0        | 0         | 0        | 37          |
| 15         | Others                                                | 40          | 3         | 24          | 0         | 11         | 0        | 2         | 0        | 80          |
|            | <b><u>RETAIL TRADE</u></b>                            |             |           |             |           |            |          |           |          |             |
| 16         | Food                                                  | 116         | 10        | 275         | 9         | 77         | 0        | 23        | 0        | 510         |
| 17         | Drink & Tobacco                                       | 67          | 1         | 26          | 0         | 17         | 0        | 2         | 0        | 113         |
| 18         | Clothing & Footwear                                   | 33          | 35        | 91          | 2         | 10         | 0        | 9         | 1        | 181         |
| 19         | Household Goods                                       | 46          | 0         | 52          | 0         | 12         | 1        | 3         | 0        | 114         |
| 20         | Other                                                 | 120         | 4         | 225         | 8         | 83         | 0        | 19        | 0        | 459         |
|            | <b>TOTAL C/F</b>                                      | <b>2081</b> | <b>73</b> | <b>1018</b> | <b>24</b> | <b>760</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>88</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>4046</b> |

**DISTRIBUTION OF INSURED PERSONS IN GIBRALTAR AS AT THE END OF 1998**  
**ANALISED BY INDUSTRIES**

(as at 30 April 1999)

| IND<br>NO. | DESCRIPTION                                           | BRITISH     |            |            |           | ALIEN      |          |            |          | TOTAL       |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|----------|------------|----------|-------------|
|            |                                                       | MALE        |            | FEMALE     |           | MALE       |          | FEMALE     |          |             |
|            |                                                       | A           | J          | A          | J         | A          | J        | A          | J        |             |
| 01         | Shipbuilding, Shiprepairing<br>and Marine Engineering | 132         | 13         | 15         | 1         | 48         | 0        | 0          | 0        | 209         |
| 02         | Manufacture of Food, Drink<br>and Tobacco             | 2           | 0          | 7          | 5         | 29         | 0        | 3          | 0        | 46          |
| 03         | Printing & Publishing                                 | 11          | 0          | 13         | 0         | 7          | 0        | 5          | 0        | 36          |
| 04         | Manufacture (Other)                                   | 16          | 1          | 3          | 0         | 3          | 0        | 0          | 0        | 23          |
| 05         | Building & Construction                               | 828         | 6          | 97         | 0         | 324        | 0        | 4          | 0        | 1259        |
| 06         | Electricity Supply                                    | 137         | 1          | 6          | 0         | 5          | 1        | 0          | 0        | 150         |
| 07         | Water Supply                                          | 78          | 1          | 12         | 0         | 12         | 0        | 0          | 0        | 103         |
| 08         | Sea Transport & Shipping Services                     | 183         | 3          | 35         | 0         | 52         | 0        | 5          | 0        | 278         |
| 09         | Port Services                                         | 54          | 0          | 6          | 0         | 4          | 0        | 1          | 0        | 65          |
| 10         | Road Transport                                        | 32          | 1          | 9          | 1         | 10         | 0        | 0          | 0        | 53          |
| 11         | Postal & Telecommunications                           | 170         | 0          | 45         | 0         | 1          | 0        | 1          | 0        | 217         |
| 12         | Other Transport & Telecom.                            | 8           | 0          | 2          | 0         | 1          | 0        | 0          | 0        | 11          |
|            | <b>WHOLESALE TRADE</b>                                |             |            |            |           |            |          |            |          |             |
| 13         | Food & Drink                                          | 109         | 2          | 65         | 0         | 93         | 0        | 26         | 0        | 295         |
| 14         | Fuel                                                  | 16          | 0          | 6          | 0         | 3          | 0        | 0          | 0        | 25          |
| 15         | Others                                                | 31          | 1          | 13         | 1         | 13         | 0        | 6          | 0        | 65          |
|            | <b>RETAIL TRADE</b>                                   |             |            |            |           |            |          |            |          |             |
| 16         | Food                                                  | 119         | 3          | 285        | 5         | 83         | 2        | 34         | 1        | 532         |
| 17         | Drink & Tobacco                                       | 34          | 69         | 22         | 0         | 15         | 0        | 1          | 0        | 141         |
| 18         | Clothing & Footwear                                   | 28          | 1          | 129        | 2         | 14         | 0        | 16         | 0        | 190         |
| 19         | Household Goods                                       | 62          | 0          | 26         | 1         | 21         | 0        | 14         | 0        | 124         |
| 20         | Other                                                 | 131         | 0          | 194        | 4         | 81         | 0        | 33         | 0        | 443         |
|            | <b>TOTAL C/F</b>                                      | <b>2181</b> | <b>102</b> | <b>990</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>819</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>149</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>4265</b> |

Table to Questions 916-921

| IND<br>NO. | DESCRIPTION                         | BRITISH |     |        |    | ALIEN |   |        |   | TOTAL |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---------|-----|--------|----|-------|---|--------|---|-------|
|            |                                     | MALE    |     | FEMALE |    | MALE  |   | FEMALE |   |       |
|            |                                     | A       | J   | A      | J  | A     | J | A      | J |       |
|            | <b>TOTAL B/F</b>                    | 2081    | 73  | 1018   | 24 | 760   | 1 | 88     | 1 | 4046  |
| 21         | Hotels, Hostels etc.                | 37      | 0   | 33     | 3  | 75    | 1 | 34     | 0 | 183   |
| 22         | Restaurants, Cafes etc.             | 54      | 2   | 60     | 1  | 82    | 0 | 42     | 0 | 241   |
| 23         | Bars                                | 10      | 0   | 15     | 0  | 13    | 0 | 11     | 0 | 49    |
| 24         | Tourist Services                    | 200     | 8   | 108    | 3  | 64    | 0 | 20     | 0 | 403   |
| 25         | Banking & Finance                   | 226     | 2   | 330    | 2  | 27    | 0 | 23     | 0 | 610   |
| 26         | Insurance & Real Estate             | 127     | 3   | 153    | 2  | 17    | 1 | 7      | 0 | 310   |
| 27         | Legal, Accounting etc.              | 155     | 3   | 324    | 4  | 28    | 0 | 13     | 0 | 527   |
| 28         | Public Administration               | 375     | 1   | 315    | 1  | 1     | 0 | 0      | 0 | 693   |
| 29         | Educational Services                | 237     | 0   | 504    | 2  | 2     | 0 | 1      | 0 | 746   |
| 30         | Medical & Health Services           | 267     | 1   | 465    | 8  | 40    | 0 | 21     | 0 | 802   |
| 31         | Welfare, Charitable & Religious Org | 16      | 1   | 112    | 1  | 1     | 0 | 6      | 0 | 137   |
| 32         | Entertainment & Sport               | 45      | 7   | 28     | 0  | 7     | 0 | 0      | 0 | 87    |
| 33         | Repairs of Consumer Goods           | 136     | 11  | 30     | 3  | 41    | 0 | 3      | 0 | 224   |
| 34         | Police & Fire Services              | 415     | 3   | 76     | 2  | 5     | 0 | 1      | 0 | 502   |
| 35         | National Defence                    | 950     | 0   | 308    | 3  | 104   | 0 | 15     | 0 | 1380  |
| 36         | Sanitary Services                   | 15      | 0   | 2      | 0  | 4     | 0 | 3      | 0 | 24    |
| 37         | Other Services                      | 180     | 31  | 103    | 3  | 42    | 1 | 84     | 0 | 444   |
|            | <b>TOTAL EMPLOYED</b>               | 5526    | 146 | 3984   | 62 | 1313  | 4 | 372    | 1 | 11408 |
|            | <b>TOTAL SELF EMPLOYED</b>          | 409     | 0   | 51     | 0  | 67    | 0 | 27     | 0 | 554   |
|            | <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>                  | 5935    | 146 | 4035   | 62 | 1380  | 4 | 399    | 1 | 11962 |
|            | <b>STATISTICS 1996</b>              | 5787    | 138 | 4044   | 72 | 1484  | 7 | 542    |   | 12074 |

Table to Questions 916-921

| IND<br>NO. | DESCRIPTION                         | BRITISH |     |        |    | ALIEN |   |        |   | TOTAL |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---------|-----|--------|----|-------|---|--------|---|-------|
|            |                                     | MALE    |     | FEMALE |    | MALE  |   | FEMALE |   |       |
|            |                                     | A       | J   | A      | J  | A     | J | A      | J |       |
|            | <b>TOTAL B/F</b>                    | 2181    | 102 | 990    | 20 | 819   | 3 | 149    | 1 | 4265  |
| 21         | Hotels, Hostels etc.                | 40      | 0   | 36     | 0  | 91    | 0 | 52     | 0 | 219   |
| 22         | Restaurants, Cafes etc.             | 41      | 1   | 42     | 1  | 95    | 0 | 41     | 0 | 221   |
| 23         | Bars                                | 16      | 1   | 21     | 0  | 15    | 0 | 7      | 0 | 60    |
| 24         | Tourist Services                    | 222     | 1   | 123    | 1  | 50    | 0 | 21     | 0 | 418   |
| 25         | Banking & Finance                   | 244     | 0   | 424    | 0  | 33    | 0 | 9      | 0 | 710   |
| 26         | Insurance & Real Estate             | 114     | 0   | 151    | 0  | 21    | 0 | 4      | 0 | 290   |
| 27         | Legal, Accounting etc.              | 155     | 1   | 270    | 9  | 35    | 0 | 25     | 0 | 495   |
| 28         | Public Administration               | 314     | 1   | 376    | 1  | 11    | 0 | 0      | 0 | 703   |
| 29         | Educational Services                | 264     | 39  | 507    | 19 | 2     | 0 | 2      | 0 | 833   |
| 30         | Medical & Health Services           | 273     | 2   | 539    | 3  | 57    | 0 | 19     | 0 | 893   |
| 31         | Welfare, Charitable & Religious Org | 10      | 0   | 104    | 0  | 0     | 0 | 6      | 0 | 120   |
| 32         | Entertainment & Sport               | 65      | 0   | 53     | 1  | 18    | 0 | 3      | 0 | 140   |
| 33         | Repairs of Consumer Goods           | 165     | 3   | 55     | 0  | 45    | 0 | 6      | 0 | 274   |
| 34         | Police & Fire Services              | 356     | 0   | 37     | 1  | 2     | 0 | 2      | 0 | 398   |
| 35         | National Defence                    | 830     | 3   | 319    | 0  | 93    | 0 | 16     | 0 | 1261  |
| 36         | Sanitary Services                   | 14      | 0   | 2      | 0  | 4     | 0 | 0      | 0 | 20    |
| 37         | Other Services                      | 159     | 1   | 74     | 1  | 62    | 1 | 173    | 0 | 471   |
|            | <b>TOTAL EMPLOYED</b>               | 5463    | 155 | 4123   | 57 | 1453  | 4 | 535    | 1 | 11791 |
|            | <b>TOTAL SELF EMPLOYED</b>          | 379     | 0   | 60     | 0  | 64    | 0 | 17     | 0 | 520   |
|            | <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>                  | 5842    | 155 | 4183   | 57 | 1517  | 4 | 552    | 1 | 12311 |
|            | <b>STATISTICS 1997</b>              | 5935    | 146 | 4035   | 62 | 1380  | 4 | 399    | 1 | 11962 |

**DISTRIBUTION OF INSURED PERSONS IN GIBRALTAR AS AT THE END OF 1999**  
**ANALISED BY INDUSTRIES**

(as at 1 August 2000)

| IND<br>NO. | DESCRIPTION                                           | BRITISH |    |        |    | ALIEN |   |        |   | TOTAL |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------|----|--------|----|-------|---|--------|---|-------|
|            |                                                       | MALE    |    | FEMALE |    | MALE  |   | FEMALE |   |       |
|            |                                                       | A       | J  | A      | J  | A     | J | A      | J |       |
| 01         | Shipbuilding, Shiprepairing<br>and Marine Engineering | 125     | 23 | 9      | 0  | 86    | 1 | 1      | 0 | 245   |
| 02         | Manufacture of Food, Drink<br>and Tobacco             | 2       | 0  | 6      | 0  | 23    | 0 | 0      | 0 | 31    |
| 03         | Printing & Publishing                                 | 22      | 0  | 18     | 0  | 7     | 0 | 5      | 0 | 52    |
| 04         | Manufacture (Other)                                   | 10      | 0  | 1      | 0  | 6     | 0 | 2      | 0 | 19    |
| 05         | Building & Construction                               | 829     | 4  | 70     | 2  | 403   | 0 | 14     | 0 | 1322  |
| 06         | Electricity Supply                                    | 118     | 0  | 10     | 0  | 4     | 0 | 1      | 0 | 133   |
| 07         | Water Supply                                          | 80      | 0  | 12     | 0  | 11    | 0 | 0      | 0 | 103   |
| 08         | Sea Transport & Shipping Services                     | 187     | 1  | 52     | 1  | 62    | 0 | 6      | 0 | 309   |
| 09         | Port Services                                         | 46      | 0  | 6      | 0  | 2     | 0 | 2      | 0 | 56    |
| 10         | Road Transport                                        | 37      | 0  | 17     | 0  | 22    | 0 | 0      | 0 | 76    |
| 11         | Postal & Telecommunications                           | 174     | 1  | 47     | 0  | 1     | 0 | 1      | 0 | 224   |
| 12         | Other Transport & Telecom.                            | 16      | 0  | 5      | 0  | 0     | 0 | 0      | 0 | 21    |
|            | <b>WHOLESALE TRADE</b>                                |         |    |        |    |       |   |        |   |       |
| 13         | Food & Drink                                          | 105     | 0  | 65     | 1  | 85    | 0 | 8      | 0 | 264   |
| 14         | Fuel                                                  | 36      | 1  | 7      | 0  | 3     | 0 | 0      | 0 | 47    |
| 15         | Others                                                | 39      | 0  | 20     | 0  | 18    | 0 | 5      | 0 | 82    |
|            | <b>RETAIL TRADE</b>                                   |         |    |        |    |       |   |        |   |       |
| 16         | Food                                                  | 93      | 1  | 252    | 5  | 98    | 0 | 44     | 0 | 493   |
| 17         | Drink & Tobacco                                       | 72      | 0  | 27     | 1  | 20    | 0 | 1      | 0 | 121   |
| 18         | Clothing & Footwear                                   | 26      | 1  | 134    | 4  | 19    | 2 | 23     | 0 | 209   |
| 19         | Household Goods                                       | 70      | 0  | 25     | 0  | 21    | 0 | 6      | 0 | 122   |
| 20         | Other                                                 | 136     | 0  | 218    | 12 | 121   | 0 | 60     | 1 | 548   |
|            | <b>TOTAL C/F</b>                                      | 2223    | 32 | 1001   | 26 | 1012  | 3 | 179    | 1 | 4477  |

Table to Q 916-921

| IND<br>NO. | DESCRIPTION                         | BRITISH |     |        |     | ALIEN |   |        |   | TOTAL |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---------|-----|--------|-----|-------|---|--------|---|-------|
|            |                                     | MALE    |     | FEMALE |     | MALE  |   | FEMALE |   |       |
|            |                                     | A       | J   | A      | J   | A     | J | A      | J |       |
|            | <b>TOTAL B/F</b>                    | 2223    | 32  | 1001   | 26  | 1012  | 3 | 179    | 1 | 4477  |
| 21         | Hotels, Hostels etc.                | 44      | 2   | 41     | 0   | 105   | 5 | 71     | 0 | 268   |
| 22         | Restaurants, Cafes etc.             | 61      | 2   | 51     | 7   | 122   | 0 | 92     | 2 | 337   |
| 23         | Bars                                | 20      | 0   | 33     | 1   | 31    | 0 | 19     | 0 | 104   |
| 24         | Tourist Services                    | 217     | 1   | 137    | 4   | 45    | 0 | 21     | 0 | 425   |
| 25         | Banking & Finance                   | 258     | 0   | 427    | 2   | 42    | 0 | 17     | 0 | 746   |
| 26         | Insurance & Real Estate             | 124     | 0   | 152    | 42  | 16    | 0 | 5      | 0 | 339   |
| 27         | Legal, Accounting etc.              | 174     | 1   | 352    | 9   | 45    | 1 | 42     | 0 | 624   |
| 28         | Public Administration               | 398     | 0   | 387    | 1   | 1     | 0 | 2      | 0 | 789   |
| 29         | Educational Services                | 268     | 51  | 578    | 15  | 1     | 0 | 4      | 0 | 917   |
| 30         | Medical & Health Services           | 243     | 1   | 485    | 2   | 47    | 0 | 12     | 0 | 790   |
| 31         | Welfare, Charitable & Religious Org | 25      | 0   | 122    | 0   | 4     | 0 | 5      | 0 | 156   |
| 32         | Entertainment & Sport               | 146     | 4   | 150    | 0   | 34    | 0 | 22     | 0 | 356   |
| 33         | Repairs of Consumer Goods           | 170     | 1   | 39     | 0   | 64    | 0 | 6      | 0 | 280   |
| 34         | Police & Fire Services              | 377     | 0   | 59     | 0   | 3     | 0 | 5      | 0 | 444   |
| 35         | National Defence                    | 820     | 1   | 361    | 2   | 73    | 0 | 14     | 0 | 1271  |
| 36         | Sanitary Services                   | 25      | 0   | 6      | 0   | 5     | 0 | 0      | 0 | 36    |
| 37         | Other Services                      | 276     | 1   | 165    | 2   | 72    | 0 | 266    | 0 | 782   |
|            | <b>TOTAL EMPLOYED</b>               | 5869    | 97  | 4546   | 113 | 1722  | 9 | 782    | 3 | 13141 |
|            | <b>TOTAL SELF EMPLOYED</b>          | 429     | 0   | 68     | 0   | 73    | 0 | 21     | 0 | 591   |
|            | <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>                  | 6298    | 97  | 4614   | 113 | 1795  | 9 | 803    | 3 | 13732 |
|            | <b>STATISTICS 1998</b>              | 5842    | 155 | 4183   | 57  | 1517  | 4 | 552    | 1 | 12311 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 916 TO 921 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister confirm that the ones that have been provided are when the system was still the insurance cards with stamps having to be affixed?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it any more difficult to do it now with the new system of schedules than it was before?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I would not know whether the fact that we have not been able to provide the information is because the new system is easier or more difficult. I do not know whether that is the reason or because they are not readily available for some other reason, so I would not be able to answer his question.



ORAL

**NO 922 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving social assistance for January, February and March 2004, giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE FIRST QUARTER 2004**

| <b>2004</b>     | <b>MALES</b> | <b>FEMALES</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>18/25</b> | <b>26/35</b> | <b>36/45</b> | <b>46/60</b> |
|-----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>JANUARY</b>  | 159          | 240            | 399          | 58           | 130          | 93           | 118          |
| <b>FEBRUARY</b> | 166          | 250            | 416          | 60           | 138          | 90           | 128          |
| <b>MARCH</b>    | 175          | 254            | 429          | 62           | 144          | 93           | 130          |

ORAL

**NO 923 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state of the persons receiving social assistance in respect of the first quarter of 2004, how many were registered with the Employment Agency as seeking employment, how many have been employed since and how many are still receiving social assistance giving a breakdown by month, sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO 923 OF 2004

PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE FIRST QUARTER 2004

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 1<br>2004 | Jan-04 | 159   | 240     | 399   | 58    | 130   | 93    | 118   |
|               | Feb-04 | 166   | 250     | 416   | 60    | 138   | 90    | 128   |
|               | Mar-04 | 175   | 254     | 429   | 62    | 144   | 93    | 130   |

PERSONS REGISTERED WITH THE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AS SEEKING EMPLOYMENT FOR THE FIRST QUARTER 2004

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 1<br>2004 | Jan-04 | 73    | 37      | 110   | 25    | 43    | 24    | 18    |
|               | Feb-04 | 80    | 41      | 121   | 25    | 46    | 24    | 26    |
|               | Mar-04 | 88    | 42      | 130   | 22    | 54    | 27    | 27    |

PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING THE FIRST QUARTER 2004

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 1<br>2004 | Jan-04 | 1     | 2       | 3     | 2     | 1     | ==    | ==    |
|               | Feb-04 | 2     | 1       | 3     | 1     | ==    | 2     | ==    |
|               | Mar-04 | 5     | 5       | 10    | 3     | 5     | 1     | 1     |

PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 26 APRIL 2004

| AS AT     | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|-----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 26-Apr-04 | 181   | 262     | 443   | 57    | 145   | 109   | 132   |

**NO 924 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE CREDITS**

Can Government state how many men aged 60 years and over were receiving social insurance credits in each month of the first quarter of 2004 giving a breakdown detailing how many of these were registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I can confirm that none of the persons on the list were registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency.

The number of men aged 60 years and over in receipt of social insurance credits during the first quarter of 2004 was:-

|          |     |
|----------|-----|
| January  | 178 |
| February | 181 |
| March    | 185 |

ORAL

**NO 925 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government give a breakdown as at the end of March 2004 showing the length of time on the waiting list of persons who have applied for Domiciliary Care Service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 926 to 929 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 926 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government state whether the time a person has been on the waiting list for Domiciliary Care Service is calculated from the date of the application or the date of the assessment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 925 and 927 to 929 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 927 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government state whether as at the end of March 2004 there was a waiting list of people who had applied for Domiciliary Care Service but had not yet been assessed, and if so, give the number of persons affected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 925, 926 and 928 to 929 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 928 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government say what was the number of individuals on the waiting list for Domiciliary Care Service who had been deemed to qualify as at the end of January, February and March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 925 to 927 and 929 of 2004.



**NO 929 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government confirm how many persons are receiving visits by the Domiciliary Care Service as at the end of March 2004, providing a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 926**

Waiting time is calculated from the date of application.

**Answer to Question No. 927**

As at 31 March 2004 there were 12 people waiting to be assessed for domiciliary care.

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information to Question Nos. 925, 928 and 929.

**Answer to Question No. 925/2004**

**The Hon the Minister for Social & Civic Affairs**

**As at end of March 2003**

| <b><u>Number of persons on waiting list</u></b> | <b><u>Time on waiting list</u></b> |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 3                                               | 13 months                          |
| 1                                               | 12 months                          |
| 2                                               | 11 months                          |
| 1                                               | 10 months                          |
| 4                                               | 9 months                           |
| 8                                               | 8 months                           |
| 1                                               | 7 months                           |
| 5                                               | 6 months                           |
| 7                                               | 5 months                           |
| 1                                               | 4 months                           |
| 3                                               | 3 months                           |
| 8                                               | 2 months                           |
| 8                                               | 1 month                            |
| 4                                               | -                                  |

**Answer to Question 929**

**Table to Question No. 928**

**The Hon the Minister for Social & Civic Affairs**

**Number of persons on waiting list qualifying for the service as at the end of:**

|                      |          |                  |
|----------------------|----------|------------------|
| <b>January 2004</b>  | <b>=</b> | <b>44</b>        |
| <b>February 2004</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>8</b>         |
| <b>March 2004</b>    | <b>=</b> | <b><u>4</u></b>  |
| <b>Total</b>         |          | <b><u>56</u></b> |

**Answer to Question No. 929**

**Answer to Questions 929**

**Current recipients of the Domiciliary Care Service = 45**

*Gender Males = 11 Females = 34*

Age Grouping (See chart below)

| <b>Age</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> |
|------------|-------------|---------------|
| 60-65      | 1           | 1             |
| 66-70      | 1           | 1             |
| 71-75      | 2           | 2             |
| 76-80      | 4           | 10            |
| 81-85      | 2           | 9             |
| 86-90      | 1           | 5             |
| 91+        |             | 6             |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 925 TO 929 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I thank the hon Lady for the information provided. Just one question. Why is it that there are at least three people who have had to wait for 13 months for domiciliary care? Is it due to some technicality, either a doctor's note or that there are not sufficient people employed to do the jobs?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, the fact that there are three people on the waiting lists waiting for 13 months does not necessarily mean that there is a lack of resources or staff on this specific occasion. During that month there could have been say nine applications and six were met and three are still on the waiting list, for which I have actually been given specific reasons. One of them being that at least one of the persons who has been waiting for that length of time was actually offered the service but declined because she felt that she still wanted to remain on the waiting list but did not feel that she needed that service at that moment in time.

**NO 930 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – CHILDREN IN CARE**

Can Government state how many flats have currently been allocated for the use of children in need of care as a replacement for the residential home?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

There are currently five flats which have been allocated for the use of children in care as a replacement for the Bishop Healey Home.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 930 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister satisfied at the number of children that there are in certain flats?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Well, I would be satisfied if there were no children at all in any of the flats, but unfortunately the number of children in care has increased and they have been accommodated, actually we started off with three flats and we have added two extra flats because of the increase in the number of children taken into care.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I meant specifically in one of the flats, as in any of the flats. What I am saying is, is the Minister satisfied that the flats adequately give the provision for children because if one has a flat that originally was for say five or six children and then suddenly it bursts out to having 11 or 12 children, this is what I mean, with the numbers within the flat.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

That is precisely why we have acquired two extra flats, to be able to distribute the children more evenly.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can Government state if there are more than one flat within a particular housing block of Government housing? Do you understand what I mean?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes, I believe that is the case in two separate housing estates.

**HON S E LINARES:**

By who are the flats manned, who looks after the children?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

The children in care in Government housing estates are looked after by carers, by support staff on a 24 hour basis.

**HON S E LINARES:**

What qualifications do those people need before they look after the children within the house?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I would not think that they require specific qualifications. I suppose that what is looked at is personal qualities and experience.

ORAL

**NO 931 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – CHILDREN IN CARE**

Can Government state how many children are held in care, giving a breakdown by age and sex as at the end of January, February and March of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**HOA Question 931/2004**

| Month  | Number | Female | 4 years | 5 years | 6 years | 9 years | 10 years | 11 years | 12 years | 13 years | 14 years | 15 years | 16 years | 17 years | 18 years | Male | 7 years | 8 years | 9 years | 10 years | 14 years | 17 years | 18 years |
|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Jan-04 | 26     | 15     | 1       | nil     | 1       | nil     | 1        | nil      | 1        | 1        | 2        | 2        | 1        | 3        | 2        | 11   | 2       | 1       | 1       | 3        | 2        | 1        | 1        |
| Feb-04 | 29     | 17     | 1       | nil     | 1       | 1       | 1        | 1        | 1        | 1        | 2        | 2        | 1        | 3        | 2        | 12   | 2       | 2       | 1       | 3        | 2        | 1        | 1        |
| Mar-04 | 29     | 17     | 1       | nil     | 1       | 1       | 1        | 1        | 1        | 1        | 2        | 2        | 1        | 3        | 2        | 12   | 2       | 2       | 1       | 3        | 2        | 1        | 1        |



ORAL

**NO 932 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government now state how many elderly citizens have applied for a place in Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital, in each month of 2003, giving a monthly breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 933 of 2004.

**NO 933 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state how many elderly citizens have applied for a place in Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital, in each month of 2004 to-date, giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The answer to Question No. 932 was already provided to the hon Member by way of a letter dated 22 January 2004, however I hand it over now for the purpose of Hansard. I also hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested in Question No. 933.

**Answer to Question No. 933/2004**

93 Elderly citizens have applied for a place in Mount Alvernia

39 are occupying a bed in St Bernard's Hospital

9 applied between January 2004 and April 2004 (see breakdown below)

| <b>2004</b>   | <b>Female</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Age Group</b> |              |              |            |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
|               |               |             | <b>65-70</b>     | <b>71-75</b> | <b>76-80</b> | <b>81+</b> |
| <b>Jan-04</b> | <b>1</b>      | <b>1</b>    |                  |              |              | <b>2</b>   |
| <b>Feb-04</b> | <b>2</b>      |             |                  |              | <b>1</b>     | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Mar-04</b> | <b>1</b>      |             |                  |              |              | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>Apr-04</b> | <b>4</b>      |             |                  | <b>1</b>     |              | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>8</b>      | <b>1</b>    |                  | <b>1</b>     | <b>1</b>     | <b>7</b>   |

ANSWER TO QUESTION N° 55 | 2004

| Month     | In Hospital | Female | Male | Age |
|-----------|-------------|--------|------|-----|
| January   | 22          | 17     | 5    |     |
| February  | 25          | 19     | 6    |     |
| March     | 27          | 21     | 6    |     |
| April     | 32          | 26     | 6    |     |
| May       | 33          | 27     | 6    |     |
| June      | 35          | 29     | 6    |     |
| July      | 37          | 31     | 6    |     |
| August    | 37          | 31     | 6    |     |
| September | 37          | 31     | 6    |     |
| October   | 37          | 31     | 6    |     |
| November  | 38          | 31     | 7    |     |
| December  | 39          | 31     | 8    |     |

Please note that all the applicants are over the age of 65

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 65/2004**

**PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE IN RESPECT OF THE FOURTH QUARTER 2002 AND EACH QUARTER OF 2003.**

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 4<br>2002 | Oct-02 | 63    | 20      | 83    | 17    | 22    | 28    | 16    |
|               | Nov-02 | 60    | 23      | 83    | 19    | 21    | 27    | 16    |
|               | Dec-02 | 69    | 21      | 90    | 20    | 25    | 28    | 17    |
| QTR 1<br>2003 | Jan-03 | 64    | 28      | 92    | 22    | 28    | 27    | 15    |
|               | Feb-03 | 73    | 21      | 94    | 21    | 29    | 26    | 18    |
|               | Mar-03 | 66    | 31      | 97    | 23    | 32    | 23    | 19    |
| QTR 2<br>2003 | Apr-03 | 70    | 27      | 97    | 23    | 30    | 25    | 19    |
|               | May-03 | 74    | 32      | 106   | 19    | 39    | 25    | 23    |
|               | Jun-03 | 66    | 31      | 97    | 19    | 34    | 26    | 18    |
| QTR 3<br>2003 | Jul-03 | 58    | 28      | 86    | 13    | 32    | 23    | 18    |
|               | Aug-03 | 64    | 30      | 94    | 17    | 35    | 24    | 18    |
|               | Sep-03 | 66    | 25      | 91    | 18    | 34    | 23    | 16    |
| QTR 4<br>2003 | Oct-03 | 62    | 31      | 93    | 10    | 38    | 22    | 23    |
|               | Nov-03 | 73    | 31      | 104   | 24    | 38    | 23    | 19    |
|               | Dec-03 | 62    | 29      | 91    | 23    | 32    | 21    | 15    |

Due to the difficulties encountered with our manual social assistance system, the lapse in time and the constant movement of people coming in and out of the system the department is unable to identify how many beneficiaries were actually employed from the fourth quarter 2002 to the end of 2003. An earlier attempt to provide similar information in connection with question 11 of 2003 has also proved unsuccessful.

I am advised that the necessary recording procedures are now in place so that in future the details requested may be provided as from 1st January 2004.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 66 of 2004**

**PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE FOURTH QUARTER 2002 AND EACH OF THE MONTHS OF 2003 BY MONTH, AGE AND SEX**

4th Quarter

| 2002     | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OCTOBER  | 135   | 203     | 338   | 63    | 103   | 102   | 70    |
| NOVEMBER | 130   | 208     | 338   | 62    | 105   | 103   | 68    |
| DECEMBER | 134   | 201     | 335   | 61    | 104   | 101   | 69    |

Year

| 2003      | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|-----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| JANUARY   | 137   | 209     | 346   | 69    | 104   | 105   | 68    |
| FEBRUARY  | 151   | 183     | 334   | 64    | 103   | 98    | 69    |
| MARCH     | 154   | 178     | 332   | 60    | 101   | 102   | 69    |
| APRIL     | 152   | 235     | 387   | 69    | 127   | 115   | 76    |
| MAY       | 148   | 245     | 393   | 71    | 124   | 119   | 79    |
| JUNE      | 132   | 251     | 383   | 64    | 123   | 122   | 74    |
| JULY      | 156   | 264     | 420   | 83    | 126   | 127   | 84    |
| AUGUST    | 159   | 257     | 416   | 74    | 128   | 118   | 96    |
| SEPTEMBER | 166   | 256     | 422   | 75    | 133   | 113   | 101   |
| OCTOBER   | 162   | 261     | 423   | 77    | 129   | 114   | 103   |
| NOVEMBER  | 173   | 265     | 438   | 80    | 134   | 117   | 107   |
| DECEMBER  | 170   | 274     | 444   | 84    | 142   | 113   | 105   |

Answer to Question No 67 of 2004.

Table showing number of men aged 60 years and over in receipt of social insurance credits during 2003.

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| January   | 182 |
| February  | 191 |
| March     | 193 |
| April     | 198 |
| May       | 199 |
| June      | 203 |
| July      | 207 |
| August    | 212 |
| September | 213 |
| October   | 218 |
| November  | 221 |
| December  | 224 |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No.68 of 2004**

**PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE YEAR 2003 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE**

| Month<br>4th Qtr | 0-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 41-50 | 51-60 | 61-70 | Total | Male | Female |
|------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|
| Jan-03           | 23   | 28    | 17    | 12    | 15    | 11    | 1     | 107   | 74   | 33     |
| Feb-03           | 24   | 29    | 17    | 12    | 15    | 11    | 1     | 109   | 76   | 33     |
| Mar-03           | 24   | 29    | 17    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 109   | 76   | 33     |
| Apr-03           | 24   | 28    | 18    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 109   | 76   | 33     |
| May-03           | 24   | 27    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 109   | 76   | 33     |
| Jun-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 77   | 33     |
| Jul-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Aug-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Sep-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Oct-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Nov-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Dec-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |



**Social Insurance Returns Statistics as at 31 December 2003**

**Answer to Question 69 of 2004**

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | All                     |         |            | Private |                              |         | Official   |         |         | Self Employed |         |         |            |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Number of Employers all | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Number of Employers returned | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Returns | Non-Return    | Pending | Returns | Non-Return | Pending |
| Qtr.1/02                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1355                    | 13162   | 1275       | 3322    | 1054                         | 10403   | 1034       | 1068    | 2212    | 206           | 2054    | 547     | 35         | 200     |
| Qtr.2/02                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1377                    | 13308   | 1397       | 3297    | 1047                         | 10547   | 1098       | 1050    | 2212    | 256           | 2047    | 549     | 43         | 200     |
| Qtr.3/02                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1393                    | 13217   | 1899       | 3286    | 1054                         | 10438   | 1578       | 1040    | 2219    | 269           | 2046    | 560     | 52         | 200     |
| Qtr.4/02                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1415                    | 12909   | 2122       | 3275    | 1042                         | 10074   | 1757       | 1031    | 2289    | 282           | 2045    | 546     | 83         | 199     |
| Qtr.1/03                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1439                    | 11145   | 1652       | 5781    | 940                          | 8573    | 1420       | 3142    | 2104    | 203           | 2294    | 468     | 29         | 345     |
| Qtr.2/03                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1463                    | 9574    | 3931       | 5719    | 887                          | 7736    | 2749       | 3088    | 1390    | 1123          | 2289    | 448     | 59         | 342     |
| Qtr.3/03                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1482                    | 7428    | 6612       | 5689    | 732                          | 6742    | 4244       | 3061    | 309     | 2227          | 2286    | 377     | 141        | 342     |
| Qtr.4/03                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 1489                    | 292     | 13607      | 5598    | 42                           | 267     | 10541      | 2979    | 0       | 2570          | 2284    | 25      | 496        | 335     |
| <b>Note:-</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
| Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2002. |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 70/2004  
OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

| <b>Fund Account -</b>  | <b>31-Jan-03</b> | <b>28-Feb-03</b> | <b>31-Mar-03</b> | <b>30-Apr-03</b> | <b>31-May-03</b> | <b>30-Jun-03</b> | <b>31-Jul-03</b> | <b>31-Aug-03</b> | <b>30-Sep-03</b> | <b>31-Oct-03</b> | <b>30-Nov-03</b> | <b>31-Dec-03</b> |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Opening Balance</b> | £14,024,807      | £14,359,286      | £14,350,982      | £14,013,251      | £14,048,781      | £13,749,200      | £13,065,932      | £13,091,982      | £12,959,175      | £12,679,790      | £12,697,567      | £12,397,644      |
| <b>Add</b>             |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| <b>Receipts</b>        | £984,989         | £745,629         | £814,451         | £846,098         | £656,555         | £676,407         | £999,394         | £543,516         | £681,568         | £1,029,899       | £675,693         | £640,602         |
|                        | £15,009,796      | £15,104,915      | £15,165,433      | £14,859,349      | £14,705,336      | £14,425,607      | £14,065,326      | £13,635,498      | £13,640,743      | £13,709,689      | £13,373,260      | £13,038,246      |
| <b>Less</b>            |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| <b>Payments</b>        | (£650,510)       | (£753,933)       | (£1,152,182)     | (£810,568)       | (£956,136)       | (£1,359,675)     | (£973,344)       | (£676,323)       | (£960,953)       | (£1,012,122)     | (£975,616)       | (£1,074,112)     |
| <b>Closing Balance</b> | £14,359,286      | £14,350,982      | £14,013,251      | £14,048,781      | £13,749,200      | £13,065,932      | £13,091,982      | £12,959,175      | £12,679,790      | £12,697,567      | £12,397,644      | £14,112,358      |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 71/2004**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month in 2003 are as follows:

|                |                    |
|----------------|--------------------|
| January 2003   | £600,000           |
| February 2003  | £700,000           |
| March 2003     | £1,100,000         |
| April 2003     | £750,000           |
| May 2003       | £900,000           |
| June 2003      | £1,300,000         |
| July 2003      | £900,000           |
| August 2003    | £600,000           |
| September 2003 | £900,000           |
| October 2003   | £900,000           |
| November 2003  | £900,000           |
| December 2003  | £1,000,000         |
|                | <u>£10,550,000</u> |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 72/2004**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for the year 2003.

|                                       | Jan-03       | Feb-03       | Mar-03       | Apr-03       | May-03       | Jun-03       | Jul-03       | Aug-03       | Sep-03       | Oct-03       | Nov-03       | Dec-03       |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| PRE-1969 SPANISH PENSIONERS           | 6859         | 6845         | 6826         | 6817         | 6793         | 6763         | 6756         | 6742         | 6716         | 6699         | 6684         | 6635         |
| BRITISH PENSIONERS (GIB/UK NATIONALS) | 4747         | 4754         | 4767         | 4779         | 4785         | 4793         | 4806         | 4813         | 4818         | 4872         | 4867         | 4867         |
| MOROCCAN PENSIONERS                   | 1341         | 1348         | 1369         | 1377         | 1383         | 1390         | 1390         | 1393         | 1430         | 1430         | 1431         | 1438         |
| OTHER NATIONALITIES                   | 368          | 367          | 369          | 376          | 376          | 380          | 381          | 381          | 388          | 391          | 393          | 397          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          | <b>13315</b> | <b>13314</b> | <b>13331</b> | <b>13349</b> | <b>13337</b> | <b>13326</b> | <b>13333</b> | <b>13329</b> | <b>13352</b> | <b>13392</b> | <b>13375</b> | <b>13337</b> |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 73 of 2004  
CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

| Fund Account -  | 31-Jan-03 | 28-Feb-03 | 31-Mar-03 | 30-Apr-03 | 31-May-03 | 30-Jun-03 | 31-Jul-03 | 31-Aug-03 | 30-Sep-03 | 31-Oct-03 | 30-Nov-03 | 31-Dec-03 |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Opening Balance | £964,257  | £519,215  | £391,271  | £482,862  | £380,513  | £418,080  | £761,199  | £758,155  | £507,185  | £477,275  | £536,592  | £606,946  |

**"Local Account"**

|                                                 |            |          |            |          |          |            |            |            |            |            |          |            |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|----------|------------|----------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|------------|
| Opening Balance                                 | £408,452   | £203,169 | £29,399    | £226,375 | £70,155  | £64,127    | £426,631   | £420,354   | £139,182   | £117,894   | £82,495  | £135,762   |
| Add                                             |            |          |            |          |          |            |            |            |            |            |          |            |
| Transfers from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund | £600,000   | £700,000 | £1,100,000 | £750,000 | £900,000 | £1,300,000 | £900,000   | £600,000   | £900,000   | £900,000   | £900,000 | £1,000,000 |
| Other Receipts                                  | £2,146     | £3,341   | £3,342     | £1,678   | £2,200   | £1,918     | £3,058     | £1,716     | £1,444     | £1,903     | £2,068   | £2,500     |
|                                                 | £1,010,598 | £906,510 | £1,132,741 | £978,053 | £972,355 | £1,366,045 | £1,329,689 | £1,022,070 | £1,040,626 | £1,019,797 | £984,563 | £1,139,262 |

**Less**

|                  |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |              |
|------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Pension Payments | (£807,429) | (£877,111) | (£906,366) | (£907,898) | (£908,228) | (£939,414) | (£909,335) | (£882,888) | (£922,732) | (£937,302) | (£948,801) | (£1,084,053) |
| Closing Balance  | £203,169   | £29,399    | £226,375   | £70,155    | £64,127    | £426,631   | £420,354   | £139,182   | £117,894   | £82,495    | £135,762   | £54,209      |

**"Spanish Account"**

|                        |            |            |            |            |            |              |            |            |              |            |            |              |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Opening Balance        | £555,805   | £316,046   | £361,872   | £256,487   | £310,358   | £353,953     | £334,568   | £337,801   | £368,003     | £359,381   | £454,097   | £471,184     |
| Add                    |            |            |            |            |            |              |            |            |              |            |            |              |
| Receipts from D.F.I.D. | £100,000   | £300,000   | £880,000   | £370,000   | £370,000   | £1,050,000   | £320,000   | £320,000   | £1,010,000   | £450,000   | £200,000   | £1,250,000   |
|                        | £655,805   | £616,046   | £1,241,872 | £626,487   | £680,358   | £1,403,953   | £654,568   | £657,801   | £1,378,003   | £809,381   | £654,097   | £1,721,184   |
| Less                   |            |            |            |            |            |              |            |            |              |            |            |              |
| Pension Payments       | (£339,759) | (£254,174) | (£985,385) | (£316,129) | (£326,405) | (£1,069,385) | (£316,767) | (£289,798) | (£1,018,622) | (£355,264) | (£182,913) | (£1,234,500) |
| Closing Balance        | £316,046   | £361,872   | £256,487   | £310,358   | £353,953   | £334,568     | £337,801   | £368,003   | £359,381     | £454,097   | £471,184   | £486,684     |

**Fund Account**

|                 |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Closing Balance | £519,215 | £391,271 | £482,862 | £380,513 | £418,080 | £761,199 | £758,155 | £507,185 | £477,275 | £536,592 | £606,946 | £540,893 |
|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 74/2004  
CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

|                        | <u>31-Jan-03</u> | <u>28-Feb-03</u> | <u>31-Mar-03</u> | <u>30-Apr-03</u> | <u>31-May-03</u> | <u>30-Jun-03</u> | <u>31-Jul-03</u> | <u>31-Aug-03</u> | <u>30-Sep-03</u> | <u>31-Oct-03</u> | <u>30-Nov-03</u> | <u>31-Dec-03</u> |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>Fund Account -</b>  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| <u>Opening Balance</u> | £6,252,443       | £6,250,508       | £6,239,495       | £6,201,342       | £6,188,421       | £6,175,343       | £6,161,753       | £6,144,750       | £6,112,892       | £6,095,836       | £6,041,456       | £6,011,945       |
| <b>Add</b>             |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Receipts               | £54,739          | £46,619          | £41,936          | £41,323          | £36,285          | £35,819          | £45,256          | £35,617          | £44,452          | £52,576          | £43,868          | £40,000          |
|                        | £6,307,182       | £6,297,127       | £6,281,431       | £6,242,666       | £6,224,706       | £6,211,161       | £6,207,009       | £6,180,367       | £6,157,344       | £6,148,413       | £6,085,324       | £6,051,945       |
| <b>Less</b>            |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Payments               | (£56,674)        | (£57,632)        | (£80,089)        | (£54,245)        | (£49,363)        | (£49,408)        | (£62,259)        | (£67,474)        | (£61,506)        | (£106,956)       | (£73,379)        | (£58,577)        |
| <u>Closing Balance</u> | £6,250,508       | £6,239,495       | £6,201,342       | £6,188,421       | £6,175,343       | £6,161,753       | £6,144,750       | £6,112,892       | £6,095,836       | £6,041,456       | £6,011,945       | £5,993,368       |

**Answer to Question No. 933/2004**

93 Elderly citizens have applied for a place in Mount Alvernia

39 are occupying a bed in St Bernard's Hospital

9 applied between January 2004 and April 2004 (see breakdown below)

| 2004         | Female   | Male     | Age Group |          |          |          |
|--------------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
|              |          |          | 65-70     | 71-75    | 76-80    | 81+      |
| Jan-04       | 1        | 1        |           |          |          | 2        |
| Feb-04       | 2        |          |           |          | 1        | 1        |
| Mar-04       | 1        |          |           |          |          | 1        |
| Apr-04       | 4        |          |           | 1        |          | 3        |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>1</b> |           | <b>1</b> | <b>1</b> | <b>7</b> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 932 TO 933 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The reason why we put the question a second time is because the first time round, when we asked about the age, the Minister gave us the following information. *"Please note that all the applicants are over the age of 65"*. Obviously when it concerns Mount Alvernia we would have assumed that that was the case, so can the Minister provide more details regarding the age of these people?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

If the hon Member looks at the information we have provided him this time round, it is specifically divided into age groups so I think that would suffice.



ORAL

NO 934 OF 2004

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government provide the answers given in writing to Question Nos 55 and 65 to 74 of 2004 by the Minister for Social Affairs, for the purpose of the record in Hansard?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

Although I have already provided the answers in writing, as the hon Member rightly says, for the purposes of Hansard I now hand them over again.

| Month     | In Hospital | Female | Male | Age |
|-----------|-------------|--------|------|-----|
| January   | 22          | 17     | 5    |     |
| February  | 25          | 19     | 6    |     |
| March     | 27          | 21     | 6    |     |
| April     | 32          | 26     | 6    |     |
| May       | 33          | 27     | 6    |     |
| June      | 35          | 29     | 6    |     |
| July      | 37          | 31     | 6    |     |
| August    | 37          | 31     | 6    |     |
| September | 37          | 31     | 6    |     |
| October   | 37          | 31     | 6    |     |
| November  | 38          | 31     | 7    |     |
| December  | 39          | 31     | 8    |     |

Please note that all the applicants are over the age of 65

ANSWER TO QUESTION 65/2004

PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE IN RESPECT OF THE FOURTH QUARTER 2002 AND EACH QUARTER OF 2003.

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 4<br>2002 | Oct-02 | 63    | 20      | 83    | 17    | 22    | 28    | 16    |
|               | Nov-02 | 60    | 23      | 83    | 19    | 21    | 27    | 16    |
|               | Dec-02 | 69    | 21      | 90    | 20    | 25    | 28    | 17    |
| QTR 1<br>2003 | Jan-03 | 64    | 28      | 92    | 22    | 28    | 27    | 15    |
|               | Feb-03 | 73    | 21      | 94    | 21    | 29    | 26    | 18    |
|               | Mar-03 | 66    | 31      | 97    | 23    | 32    | 23    | 19    |
|               | Apr-03 | 70    | 27      | 97    | 23    | 30    | 25    | 19    |
| QTR 2<br>2003 | May-03 | 74    | 32      | 106   | 19    | 39    | 25    | 23    |
|               | Jun-03 | 66    | 31      | 97    | 19    | 34    | 26    | 18    |
|               | Jul-03 | 58    | 28      | 86    | 13    | 32    | 23    | 18    |
| QTR 3<br>2003 | Aug-03 | 64    | 30      | 94    | 17    | 35    | 24    | 18    |
|               | Sep-03 | 66    | 25      | 91    | 18    | 34    | 23    | 16    |
|               | Oct-03 | 62    | 31      | 93    | 10    | 38    | 22    | 23    |
| QTR 4<br>2003 | Nov-03 | 73    | 31      | 104   | 24    | 38    | 23    | 19    |
|               | Dec-03 | 62    | 29      | 91    | 23    | 32    | 21    | 15    |

Due to the difficulties encountered with our manual social assistance system, the lapse in time and the constant movement of people coming in and out of the system the department is unable to identify how many beneficiaries were actually employed from the fourth quarter 2002 to the end of 2003. An earlier attempt to provide similar information in connection with question 11 of 2003 has also proved unsuccessful.

I am advised that the necessary recording procedures are now in place so that in future the details requested may be provided as from 1st January 2004.

ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 66 of 2004

PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE FOURTH QUARTER 2002 AND EACH OF THE MONTHS OF 2003 BY MONTH, AGE AND SEX

4th Quarter.

| 2002     | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OCTOBER  | 135   | 203     | 338   | 63    | 103   | 102   | 70    |
| NOVEMBER | 130   | 208     | 338   | 62    | 105   | 103   | 68    |
| DECEMBER | 134   | 201     | 335   | 61    | 104   | 101   | 69    |

Year

| 2003      | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|-----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| JANUARY   | 137   | 209     | 346   | 69    | 104   | 105   | 68    |
| FEBRUARY  | 151   | 183     | 334   | 64    | 103   | 98    | 69    |
| MARCH     | 154   | 178     | 332   | 60    | 101   | 102   | 69    |
| APRIL     | 152   | 235     | 387   | 69    | 127   | 115   | 76    |
| MAY       | 148   | 245     | 393   | 71    | 124   | 119   | 79    |
| JUNE      | 132   | 251     | 383   | 64    | 123   | 122   | 74    |
| JULY      | 156   | 264     | 420   | 83    | 126   | 127   | 84    |
| AUGUST    | 159   | 257     | 416   | 74    | 128   | 118   | 96    |
| SEPTEMBER | 166   | 256     | 422   | 75    | 133   | 113   | 101   |
| OCTOBER   | 162   | 261     | 423   | 77    | 129   | 114   | 103   |
| NOVEMBER  | 173   | 265     | 438   | 80    | 134   | 117   | 107   |
| DECEMBER  | 170   | 274     | 444   | 84    | 142   | 113   | 105   |

**Answer to Question No 67 of 2004.**

**Table showing number of men aged 60 years and over in receipt of social insurance credits during 2003.**

|                  |            |
|------------------|------------|
| <b>January</b>   | <b>182</b> |
| <b>February</b>  | <b>191</b> |
| <b>March</b>     | <b>193</b> |
| <b>April</b>     | <b>198</b> |
| <b>May</b>       | <b>199</b> |
| <b>June</b>      | <b>203</b> |
| <b>July</b>      | <b>207</b> |
| <b>August</b>    | <b>212</b> |
| <b>September</b> | <b>213</b> |
| <b>October</b>   | <b>218</b> |
| <b>November</b>  | <b>221</b> |
| <b>December</b>  | <b>224</b> |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No.68 of 2004**

**PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE YEAR 2003 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE**

| Month<br>4th Qtr | 0-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 41-50 | 51-60 | 61-70 | Total | Male | Female |
|------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|
| Jan-03           | 23   | 28    | 17    | 12    | 15    | 11    | 1     | 107   | 74   | 33     |
| Feb-03           | 24   | 29    | 17    | 12    | 15    | 11    | 1     | 109   | 76   | 33     |
| Mar-03           | 24   | 29    | 17    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 109   | 76   | 33     |
| Apr-03           | 24   | 28    | 18    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 109   | 76   | 33     |
| May-03           | 24   | 27    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 109   | 76   | 33     |
| Jun-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 77   | 33     |
| Jul-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Aug-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Sep-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Oct-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Nov-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |
| Dec-03           | 24   | 28    | 19    | 12    | 16    | 11    | 0     | 110   | 76   | 34     |

**Answer to Question 69 of 2004**

|           | All                     |         |            | Private |                              |         | Official   |         |         | Self Employed |         |         |            |         |
|-----------|-------------------------|---------|------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|
|           | Number of Employers all | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Number of Employers returned | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Returns | Non-Return    | Pending | Returns | Non-Return | Pending |
| Qtr. 1/02 | 1355                    | 13162   | 1275       | 3322    | 1054                         | 10403   | 1034       | 1068    | 2212    | 206           | 2054    | 547     | 35         | 200     |
| Qtr. 2/02 | 1377                    | 13308   | 1397       | 3297    | 1047                         | 10547   | 1098       | 1050    | 2212    | 256           | 2047    | 549     | 43         | 200     |
| Qtr. 3/02 | 1393                    | 13217   | 1899       | 3286    | 1054                         | 10438   | 1578       | 1040    | 2219    | 269           | 2046    | 560     | 52         | 200     |
| Qtr. 4/02 | 1415                    | 12909   | 2122       | 3275    | 1042                         | 10074   | 1757       | 1031    | 2289    | 282           | 2045    | 546     | 83         | 199     |
| Qtr. 1/03 | 1439                    | 11145   | 1652       | 5781    | 940                          | 8573    | 1420       | 3142    | 2104    | 203           | 2294    | 468     | 29         | 345     |
| Qtr. 2/03 | 1463                    | 9574    | 3931       | 5719    | 887                          | 7736    | 2749       | 3088    | 1390    | 1123          | 2289    | 448     | 59         | 342     |
| Qtr. 3/03 | 1482                    | 7428    | 6612       | 5689    | 732                          | 6742    | 4244       | 3061    | 309     | 2227          | 2286    | 377     | 141        | 342     |
| Qtr. 4/03 | 1489                    | 292     | 13607      | 5598    | 42                           | 267     | 10541      | 2979    | 0       | 2570          | 2284    | 25      | 496        | 335     |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |
|           |                         |         |            |         |                              |         |            |         |         |               |         |         |            |         |

**Note:-**  
Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2002.

ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 70/2004  
OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND

| Fund Account -  | 31-Jan-03   | 28-Feb-03   | 31-Mar-03    | 30-Apr-03   | 31-May-03   | 30-Jun-03    | 31-Jul-03   | 31-Aug-03   | 30-Sep-03   | 31-Oct-03    | 30-Nov-03   | 31-Dec-03    |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Opening Balance | £14,024,807 | £14,359,286 | £14,350,982  | £14,013,251 | £14,048,781 | £13,749,200  | £13,065,932 | £13,091,982 | £12,959,175 | £12,679,790  | £12,697,567 | £12,397,644  |
| Add             |             |             |              |             |             |              |             |             |             |              |             |              |
| Receipts        | £984,989    | £745,629    | £814,451     | £846,098    | £656,555    | £676,407     | £999,394    | £543,516    | £681,568    | £1,029,899   | £675,693    | £640,602     |
|                 | £15,009,796 | £15,104,915 | £15,165,433  | £14,859,349 | £14,705,336 | £14,425,607  | £14,065,326 | £13,635,498 | £13,640,743 | £13,709,689  | £13,373,260 | £13,038,246  |
| Less            |             |             |              |             |             |              |             |             |             |              |             |              |
| Payments        | (£650,510)  | (£753,933)  | (£1,152,182) | (£810,568)  | (£956,136)  | (£1,359,675) | (£973,344)  | (£676,323)  | (£960,953)  | (£1,012,122) | (£975,616)  | (£1,074,112) |
| Closing Balance | £14,359,286 | £14,350,982 | £14,013,251  | £14,048,781 | £13,749,200 | £13,065,932  | £13,091,982 | £12,959,175 | £12,679,790 | £12,697,567  | £12,397,644 | £14,112,358  |



**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 71/2004**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month in 2003 are as follows:

|                |                    |
|----------------|--------------------|
| January 2003   | £600,000           |
| February 2003  | £700,000           |
| March 2003     | £1,100,000         |
| April 2003     | £750,000           |
| May 2003       | £900,000           |
| June 2003      | £1,300,000         |
| July 2003      | £900,000           |
| August 2003    | £600,000           |
| September 2003 | £900,000           |
| October 2003   | £900,000           |
| November 2003  | £900,000           |
| December 2003  | £1,000,000         |
|                | <u>£10,550,000</u> |

ANSWER TO QUESTION 72/2004

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for the year 2003.

|                                       | Jan-03       | Feb-03       | Mar-03       | Apr-03       | May-03       | Jun-03       | Jul-03       | Aug-03       | Sep-03       | Oct-03       | Nov-03       | Dec-03       |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| PRE-1969 SPANISH PENSIONERS           | 6859         | 6845         | 6826         | 6817         | 6793         | 6763         | 6756         | 6742         | 6716         | 6699         | 6684         | 6635         |
| BRITISH PENSIONERS (GIB/UK NATIONALS) | 4747         | 4754         | 4767         | 4779         | 4785         | 4793         | 4806         | 4813         | 4818         | 4872         | 4867         | 4867         |
| MOROCCAN PENSIONERS                   | 1341         | 1348         | 1369         | 1377         | 1383         | 1390         | 1390         | 1393         | 1430         | 1430         | 1431         | 1438         |
| OTHER NATIONALITIES                   | 368          | 367          | 369          | 376          | 376          | 380          | 381          | 381          | 388          | 391          | 393          | 397          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          | <b>13315</b> | <b>13314</b> | <b>13331</b> | <b>13349</b> | <b>13337</b> | <b>13326</b> | <b>13333</b> | <b>13329</b> | <b>13352</b> | <b>13392</b> | <b>13375</b> | <b>13337</b> |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 73 of 2004  
CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

| <u>Fund Account -</u>                                 | <u>31-Jan-03</u> | <u>28-Feb-03</u> | <u>31-Mar-03</u> | <u>30-Apr-03</u> | <u>31-May-03</u> | <u>30-Jun-03</u> | <u>31-Jul-03</u> | <u>31-Aug-03</u> | <u>30-Sep-03</u> | <u>31-Oct-03</u> | <u>30-Nov-03</u> | <u>31-Dec-03</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <u>Opening Balance</u>                                | £964,257         | £519,215         | £391,271         | £482,862         | £380,513         | £418,080         | £761,199         | £768,155         | £507,185         | £477,275         | £536,592         | £606,946         |
| <u>"Local Account"</u>                                |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Opening Balance                                       | £408,452         | £203,169         | £29,399          | £226,375         | £70,155          | £64,127          | £426,631         | £420,354         | £139,182         | £117,894         | £82,495          | £135,762         |
| Add                                                   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Transfers from the<br>Open Long-Term<br>Benefits Fund | £600,000         | £700,000         | £1,100,000       | £750,000         | £900,000         | £1,300,000       | £900,000         | £600,000         | £900,000         | £900,000         | £900,000         | £1,000,000       |
| Other Receipts                                        | £2,146           | £3,341           | £3,342           | £1,678           | £2,200           | £1,918           | £3,058           | £1,716           | £1,444           | £1,903           | £2,068           | £2,500           |
|                                                       | £1,010,598       | £906,510         | £1,132,741       | £978,053         | £972,355         | £1,366,045       | £1,329,689       | £1,022,070       | £1,040,626       | £1,019,797       | £984,563         | £1,138,262       |
| Less                                                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Pension Payments                                      | (£807,429)       | (£877,111)       | (£906,366)       | (£907,898)       | (£908,228)       | (£939,414)       | (£909,335)       | (£882,868)       | (£922,732)       | (£937,302)       | (£848,801)       | (£1,084,053)     |
| Closing Balance                                       | £203,169         | £29,399          | £226,375         | £70,155          | £64,127          | £426,631         | £420,354         | £139,182         | £117,894         | £82,495          | £135,762         | £54,209          |
| <u>"Spanish Account"</u>                              |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Opening Balance                                       | £555,805         | £316,046         | £361,872         | £256,487         | £310,358         | £353,953         | £334,568         | £337,801         | £368,003         | £359,381         | £454,097         | £471,184         |
| Add                                                   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Receipts from D.F.I.D.                                | £100,000         | £300,000         | £860,000         | £370,000         | £370,000         | £1,050,000       | £320,000         | £320,000         | £1,010,000       | £450,000         | £200,000         | £1,250,000       |
|                                                       | £655,805         | £616,046         | £1,241,872       | £626,487         | £680,358         | £1,403,953       | £654,568         | £657,801         | £1,378,003       | £809,381         | £654,097         | £1,721,184       |
| Less                                                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Pension Payments                                      | (£339,759)       | (£254,174)       | (£385,385)       | (£316,129)       | (£326,405)       | (£1,089,385)     | (£316,767)       | (£289,798)       | (£1,018,622)     | (£355,284)       | (£182,913)       | (£1,234,500)     |
| Closing Balance                                       | £316,046         | £361,872         | £256,487         | £310,358         | £353,953         | £334,568         | £337,801         | £368,003         | £359,381         | £454,097         | £471,184         | £486,684         |
| <u>Fund Account</u>                                   |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| <u>Closing Balance</u>                                | £519,215         | £391,271         | £482,862         | £380,513         | £418,080         | £761,199         | £758,155         | £507,185         | £477,275         | £536,592         | £606,946         | £540,893         |

ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 74/2004  
 CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND

|                        | 31-Jan-03  | 28-Feb-03  | 31-Mar-03  | 30-Apr-03  | 31-May-03  | 30-Jun-03  | 31-Jul-03  | 31-Aug-03  | 30-Sep-03  | 31-Oct-03  | 30-Nov-03  | 31-Dec-03  |
|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Fund Account -</b>  |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| <b>Opening Balance</b> | £6,252,443 | £6,250,508 | £6,239,495 | £6,201,342 | £6,188,421 | £6,175,343 | £6,161,753 | £6,144,750 | £6,112,892 | £6,095,836 | £6,041,456 | £6,011,945 |
| <b>Add</b>             |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Receipts               | £54,739    | £46,619    | £41,936    | £41,323    | £36,285    | £35,819    | £45,256    | £35,617    | £44,452    | £52,576    | £43,868    | £40,000    |
|                        | £6,307,182 | £6,297,127 | £6,281,431 | £6,242,666 | £6,224,706 | £6,211,161 | £6,207,009 | £6,180,367 | £6,157,344 | £6,148,413 | £6,085,324 | £6,051,945 |
| <b>Less</b>            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| Payments               | (£56,674)  | (£57,632)  | (£80,089)  | (£54,245)  | (£49,363)  | (£49,408)  | (£62,259)  | (£67,474)  | (£81,508)  | (£106,956) | (£73,379)  | (£56,577)  |
| <b>Closing Balance</b> | £6,250,508 | £6,239,495 | £6,201,342 | £6,188,421 | £6,175,343 | £6,161,753 | £6,144,750 | £6,112,892 | £6,095,836 | £6,041,456 | £6,011,945 | £5,993,368 |

**NO 935 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**H.M. PRISON**

Can Government state whether they plan to relocate HM Prison before the end of the financial year 2004-2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 935 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

What is the finishing date for the project? Is there a finishing date for the project?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Not as far as I know.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the hon Lady confirm whether that project is still on the cards?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes it is.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is it still the intention of the Government to move it to Windmill Hill?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

It is still the intention.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Will it be within this legislature?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government are happy to announce what their projects are but does not want to give an indication of timing until we have one in mind. Let me put it this way, there is no provision for it in the budget that we are going to debate for the forthcoming financial year. That of course does not mean that it will not be done because there could be a supplementary appropriation, but at the moment the intention is not to make any major progress on the project during the financial year. Therefore funds have not been specifically provided for it.

ORAL

**NO 936 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WAGE SUBSIDY SCHEME**

Can Government state whether in the month of January 2004 there has been any increase in the number of persons that have been placed in employment, giving a breakdown by age and sex, in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 937 to 941 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 937 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WAGE SUBSIDY SCHEME**

Can Government state whether in the month of February 2004 there has been any increase in the number of persons that have been placed in employment, giving a breakdown by age and sex, in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 936 and 938 to 941 of 2004.



**ORAL**

**NO 938 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WAGE SUBSIDY SCHEME**

Can Government state whether in the month of March 2004 there has been any increase in the number of persons that have been placed in employment, giving a breakdown by age and sex, in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 936, 937 and 939 to 941 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 939 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WAGE SUBSIDY SCHEME**

Can Government state whether in the month of January 2004 there has been any increase in the number of employers participating in the wage subsidy scheme that was approved under the ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 936 to 938 and 940 to 941 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 940 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WAGE SUBSIDY SCHEME**

Can Government state whether in the month of February 2004 there has been any increase in the number of employers participating in the wage subsidy scheme that was approved under the ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 936 to 939 and 941 of 2004.

**NO 941 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WAGE SUBSIDY SCHEME**

Can Government state whether in the month of March 2004 there has been any increase in the number of employers participating in the wage subsidy scheme that was approved under the ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question Nos. 936 to 938**

There has not been any increase in either the number of persons placed in employment in the wage subsidy pilot scheme during January to March 2004 or in the number of employers.

**Answer to Question Nos. 939 to 941**

There has not been any increase in the number of employers participating in the wage subsidy pilot scheme during January to March 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 936 TO 941 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What are the Government doing in order to promote the further participation of employers and employees in that scheme?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Well, the category of people who have need to use this service are perfectly aware that the service exists. There are currently nine people on the scheme and that does not necessarily mean that there is not enough promotion of the scheme. It could also mean that people do not put their names down and as the hon Member will acknowledge, it is not up to Government to physically drag them to the ETB to put their names down for such a scheme.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Bearing that in mind, surely the people who are eligible for the scheme is an ever increasing number of people because more people are going through rehabilitation et cetera. So are the Government totally confident that people who come out of Bruce's Farm or other rehabilitation schemes, are not fully aware of their rights to register for schemes such as this?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes, not everybody undergoing rehabilitation is in need of a job. Many already have a job and go up to Bruce's Farm to be rehabilitated and employers normally kindly keep their jobs for them.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Am I to assume that the yes goes to my question that the Minister is totally confident that everybody is aware of their rights to register under the scheme? Everybody who undergoes rehabilitation is aware of the right to undergo this scheme?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

As far as it is reasonably possible to make them aware, yes I am satisfied.

**NO 942 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**WORLD HERITAGE STATUS**

At what stage is the application to obtain World Heritage status for Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The application is at full nomination stage and UK and Gibraltar officials are actively involved in this process.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 942 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In what timescale is this expected to be considered by the pertinent body?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The process is a thorough and complicated one in which it is difficult to predict timescales.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister confirm to the House whether there have been any objections from the Spanish Government to Gibraltar's inclusion in this list?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Not as far as I am aware.

ORAL

**NO 943 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PARSON'S LODGE**

Can Government say whether they are providing assistance to the Heritage Trust for the provision of a caretaker at Parson's Lodge?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Government do not provide assistance to the Gibraltar Heritage Trust for the specific purpose of the provision of a caretaker at Parson's Lodge.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 943 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether the Trust has requested any such assistance?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Again, not as far as I am aware.

ORAL

**NO 944 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE TRUST ORDINANCE**

Have Government received any representations from the Gibraltar Heritage Trust seeking the changes to the Heritage Trust Ordinance, and if so on what date were the representations made and what were the changes sought?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 945 of 2004.



**NO 945 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE TRUST ORDINANCE**

Does Government intend to update the Heritage Trust Ordinance and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Government intend to bring legislation to this House in the area of Heritage conservation when we are ready to do so, which is not just yet. I cannot give the hon Member a date. Government have been in discussions with the Heritage Trust on this issue for a period of time now.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 944 TO 945 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the question seeking to know on what date representations were made by the Trust and what changes the Trust envisage to the Ordinance, are Government in a position to make any comment on that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Perhaps I can help the hon Member here because this pre-dates the Minister's membership of the Government and indeed responsibility for this portfolio. The matter was left at the stage in the run up to the last General Election, that legislation had been drafted which reflected a discussion between the then Minister and the Heritage Trust. That legislation has not yet been considered by Government collectively and that is the process. The incoming Minister and indeed I, are familiarising with it so I cannot tell the hon Member when we might be ready to bring it to the House, but it is a Government project to increase the statutory role of the Heritage Trust in the statutory framework for heritage conservation, but the current Ministers are familiarising themselves with the legislation that was drafted during the last term of office. I cannot say how long the consultations have been going between the previous Minister and the Heritage Trust, but for many, many, many months. This has been an on-going process of discussion and exchange of views.

ORAL

NO 946 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can Government state what has been the bill for water consumption in each month of the last financial year in respect of the new extension to Victoria Stadium?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT

The information requested by the hon Member is provided in a separate schedule which I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 946 of 2004**

The total water consumption in each month of the new extension to Victoria Stadium of the last financial year is:-

| <b>Month<br/>(Consumption)</b> | <b>Month<br/>(Payment)</b> | <b>Water Based<br/>Hockey Pitch</b> | <b>Other Areas Within<br/>Extension</b> |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Mar 03                         | April 03                   | 1,020.50                            | 31.46                                   |
| April 03                       | May 03                     | 2,986.00                            | 28.90                                   |
| May 03                         | June 03                    | 8,554.50                            | 61.85                                   |
| June 03                        | July 04                    | 3,857.50                            | 30.40                                   |
| July 03                        | Aug 03                     | 5,473.00                            | 30.40                                   |
| Aug                            | Sept 03                    | 4,212.50                            | 30.40                                   |
| Sept 03                        | Oct 03                     | 2,563.00                            | -                                       |
| Oct 03                         | Nov 03                     | 1,767.00                            | 74.45                                   |
| Nov 03                         | Dec 03                     | 1,771.80                            | 25.20                                   |
| Dec 03                         | Jan 04                     | 270.00                              | 22.38                                   |
| Jan 04                         | Feb 04                     | 2,297.00                            | 25.25                                   |
| Feb 04                         | Mar 04                     | <u>2,261.50</u>                     | <u>31.46</u>                            |
|                                |                            | £37,034.00                          | £392.15                                 |
|                                | <b>Combined<br/>Total</b>  | <b>£37,426.15</b>                   |                                         |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 946 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the bulk of the water is the water-based hockey pitch, how come that there was no provision made originally in the budget for this, when the total amount the House was asked to vote last year was £19,000 to cover electricity and water for everything in the stadium?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I do not have the answer to this question, I do not have last year's estimates with me and cannot compare the figures that the hon Member has given me.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the explanation about the water consumption related to the amount of rain, because I note that in January it was £270 and in June it was £8,500?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, there is a connection. The cost of the water is actually greatly reduced due to the construction of an underground 150 cubic metre water tank which enables recycling of a percentage of the water used to water the pitches, as well as rainwater. So this actually reduces the cost greatly. The pitch needs constant watering, depending on the usage and the weather. So really yes, there is a connection, that is a short answer to the question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has that facility for recycling water been there all the time or is it something that has been done during this last year?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

It has been there, it was constructed with the pitch. This was part of the planned process. This process in fact halves the cost that the pitch would have taken in watering were it not to exist.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a particular explanation for the May figure which seems to be way out on the other months? If the Minister does not know would he look at that?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think the answer to that, is that there were a particularly high number of games played during that month. All sorts of festivals and games played and the more one plays the more one needs to water the pitch. Also it probably was very hot during that month.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just as a matter of interest, is the pitch eventually going to have some floodlights? The water-based hockey pitch?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Actually I do not know the answer to that question directly, but if the requirement is there, then Government are prepared to look into it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it not the case that it is highly unlikely that the Government would be able to provide floodlights because of the proximity of the pitch to the airport?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is indeed a possibility. A fact that has to be taken into consideration with any of the lighting in that area.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Have the Government had confirmation from the MOD that it is not possible to provide floodlighting at that pitch already? Is that not the case?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

There is no such confirmation. In fact, I understand that it might indeed be possible to have lighting in that area.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So obviously, if it is indeed possible, the Government will be looking at the possibility because that would mean there would be so many further extra hours that hockey players will be able to make use of that pitch. Are the Government looking at approaching the MOD?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government presently have no such plans and it is not part of the works involved. We have answered the question hypothetically because the hon Member

expressed an interest in knowing whether it would be possible. We are not prepared to convert that into a debate about whether the Government are now intending to install floodlights. The Government presently have no plans to install floodlights there, which does not mean that as part of the future development of the stadium facilities, it might not come up for consideration at some time in the future, but it is not in the plans at present. As indeed it is pencilled in for possible consideration indeed to have floodlights in the adjoining training pitch. This is part of the future developmental potential of the facilities but which are not pencilled in at this stage.

ORAL

NO 947 OF 2004

THE HON S E LINARES

**YOUTH SERVICES**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in the Youth Services Offices?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT

Answered together with Question Nos. 948 to 950 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 948 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES – DOLPHINS YOUTH CLUB**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in the Dolphin Youth Club?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 947 and 949 to 950 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 949 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES – LAGUNA ESTATE YOUTH CLUB**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Laguna Estate Youth Club?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 947, 948 and 950 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 950 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES – PLATER YOUTH CLUB**

Can Government state how much has been spent this financial year on computers in Plater Youth Club?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

There was no identified need to provide the Youth Services Offices or Youth Clubs with computers during the financial year 2003/2004 as they were considered to be adequately provisioned.

ORAL

**NO 951 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES – LAGUNA YOUTH CLUB**

Can Government state whether the Laguna Youth Club has been closed for the last 5 to 6 months?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 952 of 2004.

**NO 952 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES – LAGUNA YOUTH CLUB**

Can Government state what maintenance programme has been carried out in the Laguna Youth Club since last year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

**Answer to Question No. 951**

The Laguna Youth Club has not been closed for the last 5 to 6 months. The Laguna Youth Club has been opening regularly on 3 to 5 days every week, during the last 5 to 6 months.

**Answer to Question No. 952**

No major works were required in the Laguna Youth Club during the financial year 2003/2004. However, as part of on-going maintenance of youth club premises, minor works and repairs have been carried out on a regular basis. This has involved mainly repairs to fencing, windows and shutters and some of the fittings and equipment in the play area.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 951 TO 952 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state at what times the Laguna Youth Club has been opening? The Minister has stated that it has been opened, can he say at what times it has opened?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I do not have the information, the exact times. Youth Clubs tend to open in the afternoons after school.

ORAL

**NO 953 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state when they commissioned the last report on the Theatre Royal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 954 to 958 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 954 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state what was the cost of the latest report on the Theatre Royal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 953 and 955 to 958 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 955 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state which entity or company or individual conducted the last Report on the Theatre Royal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 953 and 954 to 958 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 956 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state how many reports have been commissioned on the Theatre Royal to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 953, 954 and 955 to 958 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 957 OF 2004

THE HON S E LINARES

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state what has been the cost of each report commissioned on the Theatre Royal?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT

Answered together with Question Nos. 953, 954 to 956 and 958 of 2004.

**NO 958 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state when each of the reports on the Theatre Royal were completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

**Answer to Question No. 953**

The last report commissioned by Government on the Theatre Royal was on 22 September 1999.

**Answer to Question No. 954**

The cost of the latest report commissioned by Government was £5,000.

**Answer to Question No. 955**

The last report was carried out by Theatre Royal consultants.

**Answer to Question No. 956**

Two reports have been commissioned by Government on the Theatre Royal to date.

**Answer to Question No. 957**

The cost of the first report was £15,000 and that of the second was £5,000.

**Answer to Question No. 958**

The first report was completed on 18 February 1998 and the second was completed on 22 September 1999.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 953 TO 958 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The Minister mentioned the Theatre Royal Consultants. Can he state whether this is a company or just a group of people that have been put together in order to do this job?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I am informed that the correct name is Theatre Projects Consultants. I do not have the right information. It is a firm.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Government state whether any of those reports which we understand are the only reports commissioned in respect of the Theatre Royal, is a structural survey report?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, there have been a full range of reports done by Arab consultants, including full structural reports and there have been structural engineers as part of the architectural team, providing the usual structural services.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Therefore, those reports are not referred to in the answers given by the Minister.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is a difference between reports and the normal services of the architectural design team which includes structural elements, architectural elements, sound element, quantity surveying elements, the usual range of design team services to be included.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In effect is the Chief Minister telling the House that there was no structural survey report before the purchase of the building?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Chief Minister is not telling the House that in effect or otherwise.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So in effect, what the Chief Minister is telling the House that there was the structural survey report before the purchase of the Theatre Royal, is that right?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Now the hon Member is introducing the concept of before the purchase. If the hon Member is saying was there a conditioned survey report, structural or otherwise in respect of the Theatre Royal prior to its purchase, there was one by M E Belilo and Partners, but as to the content of it I would have to refresh my memory.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister agree to make available a copy of that structural survey report in this House?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No Sir.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister therefore indicate whether his recollection, which does not appear to fall and I appreciate that I have just got on my feet to ask him for this, gave any indication of the fact that the structure might be unsound?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will refresh my memory about the contents of that report and if the hon Member puts questions on notice, as if he had done on this, we would have had the information to put to him. So in the next House he should give specific notice of questions on the conditioned report of the Theatre Royal and now I am on notice that he is going to do so, I will make sure that somebody studies the report before answering his questions when he asks them.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I appreciate that, but if in fact the Chief Minister will look at the questions, they are in no way limited to the report which the Minister responsible seems to have interpreted them as being limited to and they are open-ended as to reports and structural survey reports are of course reports, but I will take him up on his invitation to put questions through the Hon Shadow Minister responsible in relation to this issue.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Could the Minister confirm he said that there were five reports commissioned in total?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I said there were two.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Could the Minister confirm whether one of them was a feasibility study as to what was going to happen to the Theatre Royal later, after it opened?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The term feasibility study does not appear in either of those two reports, as far as I can recollect.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Was one of the reports to see whether it was feasible to have the Theatre Royal?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government have never had any doubt about the feasibility of a theatre on that site. There has been one there for well over 150 years.

ORAL

**NO 959 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state when is the next completion date for the Theatre Royal Millennium Project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 960 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 960 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state whether it is still their intention that the American Opera Company performs in the grand opening of the Theatre Royal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Government are not in a position to say when the Theatre Royal Project will be completed. Government are currently reassessing the relative priority of all their capital spending projects and commitments.

**NO 961 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KING’S BASTION**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether there are any new developments as to the long standing promised conversion of King's Bastion to a leisure centre, since a leisure centre was promised in their manifesto of 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Government are in office on the basis of the manifesto it presented at the 2003 General Elections. This manifesto carried forward unfulfilled commitments in relation to a Leisure Centre at King's Bastion that had been in the previous manifesto. We hope and indeed expect to fulfil that commitment during this term of office.



**NO 962 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether any agreement has been reached with the Union as to the transfer of staff to the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

No agreement has been reached yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 962 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm to the House whether there have been any meetings recently with the Unions on the matter or whether any meetings are envisaged?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not give on-going accounts of on-going negotiations. The Government do intend that this negotiation will take place and we hope that it will be entirely successful. Of course, the negotiations to transfer the existing staff to the Gibraltar Sports Authority is entirely different to the question of the establishment of the Gibraltar Sports Authority which will be established anyway in relation to new facilities, regardless of the other question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So what the Chief Minister is saying is that the opening of the new Sports City will open irrespective of whether agreement has been reached or it has not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What the Chief Minister has said is actually quite clear and does not need to be put in different words by the hon Lady, particularly not for the purposes of changing the nuance. What I have said to her is that they are two quite unrelated issues here.

There is a Sports Authority which exists and will employ staff to run the new facilities which will be opened when they are ready by the Sports Authority, and there is a completely separate issue of whether the existing staff and the existing sports facilities wish to join the Authority or not, and therefore in the latter case stay out of it. There are no circumstances in which the new facilities will not emerge under the umbrella so to speak of the Sports Authority. In other words, the establishment of the Sports Authority for the purposes of running the new facilities does not depend in any degree on the outcome of the negotiations with existing staff as to whether they and the old facilities join the Authority or not. Quite clear. Does the hon Lady not agree?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore, having heard the Chief Minister, can the Government confirm that there could be a possibility that once an agreement is reached, some of the existing staff in the existing facilities will be transferred to the new facilities if they agree to join the Sports Authority?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If there is agreement, and to the extent that there is agreement, all the facilities would be in the Authority and there would be no difference. That is the Government's preferred objective, but as we say, we do not force people into authorities, therefore that part of it depends on the outcome of those negotiations, whether they participate or not.

ORAL

**NO 963 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**EUROPA SPORTS GROUND**

Can the Minister for Sport confirm whether it is his intention to enter into negotiations with the MOD for the handover of the Europa Sports Ground to the Government which in turn would be handed over to the Gibraltar Cricket Association, something which his predecessor announced over three years ago would happen?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

No, it is no longer envisaged that MOD will transfer the Europa Sports Ground to Government.

**NO 964 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**SCHOOL OF TOURISM**

Can Government confirm that the two trainees from last year's School of Tourism who were to be merged with this year's intake, have done so?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

No Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 964 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state what has happened to these two trainees? Is there any trace of them?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

These two trainees will probably be integrated at the next intake. However, since the last intake in June 2003 there has not been any further intake this year. At the moment my Department is reviewing the current training that is provided by the Scheme, and the qualifications that are obtained by this Scheme, in order to put in place a new framework which will probably mean that the first intake will be in September this year.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So the Minister then is saying that this year there has not been any intake as such. No new ones nor the old.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes I have said that.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Point of order. I think we have a Speaker here, yourself. The Chief Minister is saying that I am repeating the question. Do I listen to him or do I listen to you?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He can do either. In either case, what I am saying is completely correct. The hon Member asks whether there has been an intake this year. The Minister gets up and says no there has not been an intake this year. So the hon Member gets up again to say 'ah, is the Minister saying that there has not been an intake this year'. Well, that is a repetition of the question which calls for a repetition of the answer in anybody's book.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does that mean that there has not been an intake this year and therefore the two trainees who were last year promised that they would be put into the intake this year will have to wait until next year to start the course?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I have already answered that question.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Thank you for the answer.

ORAL

**NO 965 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURIST BOARD – VOICE MAIL**

From what date onwards and in what circumstances is it the practice of the Tourist Board to have an answering machine or voicemail taking messages from callers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 966 of 2004.

**NO 966 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURIST BOARD – COMPLAINTS**

Can Government say whether any complaints have been received from persons trying to get through to the Tourist Board by telephone at the use of an answering machine or voice mail to take their messages?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

From 1998 onwards, until very recently, there was a voicemail attached to the main Tourist Board number. If all lines were engaged when a caller telephoned, the voicemail would automatically connect. A handful of complaints about this practice were received and it was decided that the voicemail would only trigger in after office hours and that there should be an engaged tone when lines are busy.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 966 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So the position at present is that the voicemail will only kick in after office hours, people who ring up will get an engaged tone and will have to call back later.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

At what point was this new practice introduced?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think this was introduced a few months ago.

**NO 967 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – PROMOTION AND CONFERENCES**

Can Government say how much of the £950,000, allocated to Tourism, Promotion and Conferences for the year 2003/2004 has been spent as at 31 March 2004, giving a breakdown of the sum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The total spend was £1,025,706, broken up as follows:-

|                           |                      |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| Literature                | £119,463.74          |
| Activity (Trade)          | £ 84,199.51          |
| Activity (Media)          | £ 86,642.77          |
| Promotional Material      | £ 4,435.37           |
| Advertising               | £448,564.52          |
| Trade Fairs               | £172,288.69          |
| Events                    | £ 90,366.79          |
| Website                   | £ 6,603.52           |
| Miscellaneous Expenditure | £ 13,141.27          |
| Total                     | <u>£1,025,706.18</u> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 967 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

To what does the Minister attribute the overspend in relation to the budget that had been allocated?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The overspend is in relation to the fact that there was an invoice for some of the Tercentenary London taxis which should have been paid from central vote and instructions were issued that this should be paid out of this vote. Therefore, the over expenditure, the invoice was approximately £70,000 to £75,000.



**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the taxi Tercentenary advertising campaign was introduced it was forecast that it would be paid from a central vote the Minister said, and now it is being paid by the tourist marketing vote. What was the reason for that change?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Most of the Tercentenary London taxi campaign was actually been paid from the central vote, this particular invoice was paid for from this vote and instructions were issued from the Chief Secretary's Office.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the six thousand odd pounds spent on the website, is that the website of the Tourist Board here or the London Office?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That was in respect of the website of the London Office.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The item on advertising, which according to the note that I scribbled down seems to be the highest single component in the breakdown of the marketing expenditure, does the Minister have the breakdown of those £148,000 and if not would he be able to supply me with one?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, I do not have the exact details here for him but I am able to send it to him if he so requests.

ORAL

**NO 968 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – LONDON BOAT SHOW**

What meetings with rally and event organisers did the Minister for Tourism hold during the London Boat Show this year, what was discussed and what were the results?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 969 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 969 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – LONDON BOAT SHOW**

How many journalists and from what media attended the press conference given by the Minister for Tourism at the London Boat Show in January?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I did not attend the London Boat Show in January 2004 and hence I did not meet rally or event organisers there or give a press conference at the exhibition.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 968 AND 969 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

It has been the practice in the past for the Minister to attend this event, why did he not attend it on this occasion?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It was my intention to attend the exhibition, however, it clashed with House of Assembly responsibilities and therefore I had to remain in Gibraltar.

**ORAL**

**NO 970 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – LONDON BOAT SHOW**

What was the cost of attending the London Boat Show between 8 and 19 January, how many persons made up the official Gibraltar delegation and what offices do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 971 and 1038 to 1043 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 971 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – FITUR**

What was the cost of attending FITUR this year, how many persons made up the official Gibraltar delegation and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 970 and 1038 to 1043 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 972 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – FITUR**

Can Government say whether Gibraltar was represented at FITUR this year together with the Campo Mancomunidad?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 973 and 974 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 973 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – FITUR**

Can Government list the savings or projected savings made, with a breakdown, by attending FITUR with the Campo de Gibraltar instead of alone?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 972 and 974 of 2004.

**NO 974 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – FITUR**

What did the joint tourist product marketed at the FITUR tourist fair in Madrid between Gibraltar and the Campo towns of the Mancomunidad consist of?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Gibraltar was not represented at FITUR this year together with the Mancomunidad del Campo de Gibraltar, nor was there a joint tourist product developed for FITUR or for any other purpose. Gibraltar and the Campo had separate stands as usual, and there were no savings because there was no joint initiative.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 973 AND 974 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Although Gibraltar did not attend it this year, is it the policy of the Government to find a way in which Gibraltar can attend together with the Mancomunidad in future events?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I held a meeting with the President and Vice-President of La Mancomunidad to explore possibilities, but let me say that it is my view that if we were to go down the route of doing any initiative with La Mancomunidad, that would be complimentary to what we already do and not as a substitute of what we do, because we in Gibraltar have a product to sell on our own right, whilst if we were to substitute that for a joint operation, we would lose out on what we have and we have a strong product to sell. So therefore, if we do anything with La Mancomunidad it would be complimentary to what we already do.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Whose initiative is it then, is this the initiative of the Government or the initiative of the Mancomunidad?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I cannot really square the responsibility for any possible initiative on either side, I think it is something that has been discussed in the past, officials have met on numerous occasions, nothing has really come out of this. We do not know as a result of the meeting that I held last Friday, whether something will come of this now. However, as I said, it would be complimentary to what we already do and not as a substitute to what we do at present.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to one of the questions which mentioned what projected saving there would be, I take it then that that is not really a consideration it is simply the extra facilities which may be able to market together rather than the actual cost of saving made by attending together.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think that is correct.

ORAL

**NO 975 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – BEACH LIFEGUARDS**

Can Government say how many persons have applied for the posts of beach lifeguard as advertised on 14 April 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 976 to 978 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 976 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – BEACH LIFEGUARDS**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality, showing Gibraltarians, of the persons who have applied for the posts of beach lifeguard as advertised on 14 April 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 975, 977 and 978 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 977 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – VISITOR INFORMATION PATROL OFFICERS**

Can Government say how many persons have applied for the posts of temporary part-time Visitor Information Patrol Officers as advertised on 14 April 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 975, 976 and 978 of 2004.

**NO 978 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – VISITOR INFORMATION PATROL OFFICERS**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality, showing Gibraltarians, of the persons who have applied for the posts of temporary part-time Visitor Information Patrol Officers as advertised on 14 April 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of 37 persons applied for 28 vacancies as lifeguards. Of the applicants 35 were Gibraltarian and two were British.

A total of 46 persons applied for 12 vacancies as Visitor Information Patrol Officers. Of the applicants 43 were Gibraltarian and three were British.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 975, AND 976 TO 978 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether these vacancies have now been filled in both these cases?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid I cannot confirm one way or the other but I am sure that they must be in the process of being done if they have not been done already.

ORAL

**NO 979 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – TOURIST SURVEY REPORT 2002**

Can Government say how the expenditure by tourist arrivals at hotels shown in Table 5 of the Tourist Survey Report 2002 has been calculated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 980 to 982 and 991 to 996 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 980 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – TOURIST SURVEY REPORT 2003**

Can Government say how the expenditure by tourist arrivals at hotels shown in Table 5 of the Tourist Survey Report 2003 has been calculated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 979, 981, 982 and 991 to 996 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 981 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – TOURIST EXPENDITURE – 2003**

Can Government explain how the amount of tourists expenditure for 2003 attributed to "other" visitors was calculated?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 979, 980, 982 and 991 to 996 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 982 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – TOURIST EXPENDITURE – 2002**

Can Government explain how the amount of tourist expenditure for 2002 attributed to "other" visitors was calculated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 979 to 981 and 991 to 996 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 983 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government say how many cruise ships cancelled calls to Gibraltar which were booked to take place in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 984 to 990 and 1012 to 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 984 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government list the names of the different cruise ships that cancelled calls to Gibraltar during 2003, showing the date the cancelled call was due to take place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 983, 985 to 990 and 1012 to 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 985 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government state what reasons were given by each respective cruise operator for the cancellation of booked cruise calls to Gibraltar in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 983, 984, 986 to 990 and 1012 to 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 986 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government say how many cruise ships have cancelled calls at Gibraltar which were booked to take place this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 983 to 985, 987 to 990 and 1012 to 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 987 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – CRUISE CALLS – 2004**

How many cruise calls are booked to take place during 2004 on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 983 to 986, 988 to 990 and 1012 to 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 988 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – CRUISE CALLS – 2004**

Can Government list the cruise calls expected at Gibraltar during 2004, showing the date of the call, name of the ship, the cruise lines and the local agent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 983 to 987, 989, 990 and 1012 to 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 989 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government list the names of the different cruise ships that cancelled calls to Gibraltar during 2004 to date, showing the date the cancelled call was due to take place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 983 to 988, 990 and 1012 to 1014 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 990 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government state what reasons were given by each respective cruise operator for the cancellation of booked cruise calls to Gibraltar this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 983 to 989 and 1012 to 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 991 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – EXCURSIONISTS FROM SPAIN**

Can Government say how much of expenditure by excursionists from Spain in 2002 was due to coach arrivals and the number of persons involved, and how much was due to the number of persons crossing the land frontier other than by coach, and the number of persons involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 979 to 982 and 992 to 996 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 992 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – EXCURSIONISTS FROM SPAIN**

Can Government say how much of the expenditure by excursionists from Spain in 2003 was due to coach arrivals and the number of persons involved, and how much was due to the number of persons crossing the land frontier other than by coach, and the number of persons involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 979 to 982, 991 and 993 to 996 to 2004.

ORAL

**NO 993 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – VISITOR EXPENDITURE**

Can Government say what was the average visitor expenditure per day on accommodation in 2002 in respect of the categories in Table 4 of the Tourist Survey Report for 2002, in respect of the categories in which the visitors stayed in Gibraltar and what was the average length of stay and the number of persons in each such category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 979 to 982, 991, 992 and 994 to 996 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 994 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – VISITOR EXPENDITURE**

Can Government say what was the average visitor expenditure per day on accommodation in 2003 in respect of the categories in Table 4 of the Tourist Survey Report for 2003, in respect of the categories in which the visitors stayed in Gibraltar and what was the average length of stay and the number of persons in each such category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 979 to 982, 991 to 993, 995 and 996 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 995 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – VISITORS IN TRANSIT**

Can Government say what was the figure for the number of visitors in transit shown in Table 5 of the Tourist Expenditure Survey Report for 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 979 to 982, 991 to 994 and 996 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 996 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – VISITORS IN TRANSIT**

Can Government say what was the figure for the number of visitors in transit shown in Table 5 of the Tourist Expenditure Survey Report for 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Question 996 of 2004**

**SCHEDULE**

**Q. 979, 980, 982, 981**

The method used to calculate tourist arrivals' expenditure at hotels and expenditure attributed to "other" visitors, as shown in table 5 of the Tourist Survey reports for 2002 and 2003, was made available to the Member opposite in response to Questions 207 and 209/2003.

**Q. 991, 992**

The expenditure by excursionists from Spain was as follows:

|                                 | <u>2002</u>  | <u>2003</u>  |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Excursionists arriving by coach | £ 11,992,000 | £ 11,535,000 |
| Other excursionists             | £132,534,000 | £155,884,000 |

The number of excursionists from Spain was as follows:

|                                 | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Excursionists arriving by coach | 411,664     | 381,186     |
| Other excursionists             | 6,390,279   | 6,503,285   |

**Q 993, 994**

Average visitor expenditure per day on accommodation in 2002 and 2003 was £60.00 per person per day, regardless of category of visitor.

The Average length of stay was:

| <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> |                                     |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3 days      | 3.1 days    | for arrivals from Morocco and Spain |
| 3.1 days    | 3 days      | for arrivals from UK                |

The number of persons in each category was:

|                       | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Arrivals from UK      | 31,578      | 39,088      |
| Arrivals from Morocco | 2,421       | 1,539       |
| Arrivals from Spain   | 25,418      | 21,116      |

**Q. 995, 996**

The number of visitors in transit was:

|      |   |        |
|------|---|--------|
| 2002 | - | 48,594 |
| 2003 | - | 61,663 |



**NO 997 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – NUMBER OF CRUISE PASSENGERS**

Can Government say what is the figure for arriving cruise passengers who actually disembarked from calling cruise ships on a monthly basis for each month of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Gibraltar Tourist Board does not keep a record of figures of disembarking passengers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 997 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The figures which are made available and which are published in relation to the cruise passengers calling at Gibraltar then are the actual cruise passengers on the ship, for the estimated capacity of the ship as opposed to the actual people who have disembarked. Is that the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the figures that we have and we publish are the figures that are being carried by the vessel when they call at Gibraltar. In fact passenger tax is based on that figure, whether they disembark or not is irrelevant.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So the ship will pay the tax on the number of passengers that it is carrying and not on the number of passengers that land?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does it follow then that the calculations in the Tourist Expenditure Report is also based on the survey of the people who land and then on the assumption that the people that have not landed would have spent as much if they had landed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe it has always been done based on the number of passengers that are actually on the vessel on arrival, whether they disembark or not is irrelevant.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The point is that then there is no way of knowing from the Tourist Expenditure Survey whether there is any change in the pattern of people coming ashore or not? The figure will always reflect as expenditure the questions put to the people that have been ashore and then multiplied.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Unless, and this is speculation, they have some sort of factor that they allow for people not disembarking. It may be that they have obtained information roughly about a percentage of passengers that tend not to disembark and multiply by the percentage that do. I am not saying that there is such a system, it is an interesting question and I think we should all know the answer to it. It may be that they do that.

ORAL

**NO 998 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government list the items that have been carried forward from the agenda of the old Tourism Advisory Council to the new one?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 999 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 999 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Tourism Advisory Council met since 26 September 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Since 26 September 2003, the Tourism Advisory Council has met on the following date: 19 February 2004

The Government do not wish to give a public account of internal discussions within the Tourism Advisory Council.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 998 AND 999 OF 2004.**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I suppose the Minister will be able to say whether in fact there were items on the agenda carried forward from one to the other?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There were not.

**ORAL**

**NO 1000 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – MINISTER’S OVERSEAS VISITS**

Can the Minister for Tourism give the dates when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business from 1 January 2004 to date, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I have been away as follows:-

26 January 2004 FITUR, Madrid

26 February to 3 March 2004 London for the UKGTA meeting, other tourism related meetings, the Stampex exhibition, the Tercentenary thanksgiving service and the MPs dinner.

ORAL

NO 1001 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – BARBARY APES**

Can Government say how many packs and how many apes inhabited the Upper Rock as at 31 March 2003, showing where each pack is usually located?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1002 of 2004.

**NO 1002 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – BARBARY APES**

Have any apes been killed in 2004 to date and if so how many and when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004, there were 209 apes, divided into 5 packs as follows:-

|                     |         |
|---------------------|---------|
| Middle Hill         | 65 apes |
| Philip II Arch      | 52 apes |
| Anglian Way         | 36 apes |
| Apes Den            | 34 apes |
| Farringdon Barracks | 22 apes |

Two apes have been killed in 2004: both were run over by taxis on 18 March 2004 and 12 April 2004. None have been culled in 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1001 AND 1002 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are there any plans to cull them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This issue is always under constant review.

**NO 1003 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PARSON'S LODGE**

Can Government say how many persons visited Parson's Lodge in 2003 and to date in 2004 on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

This site is operated by the Gibraltar Heritage Trust and not by the Government. The information requested should be sought from the Trust.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1003 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are Government not interested in keeping a record of how many visitors arrive at this site?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Obviously the Government are interested in keeping records of arrivals in our sites but this site, that is, Parson's Lodge, is operated by the Gibraltar Heritage Trust.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Trust not obtain a subsidy or some type of Government funding which allows them to assist them with the running of that particular site?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not think that there are any funds available to the Trust in respect of this.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, not in respect of this, there is no specific subsidy for this site but I think the Heritage Trust generally gets financial assistance from Government. I think they get a percentage of the museum takings. I think they get 5 per cent of the takings of the museum or some such quantity.

**ORAL**

**NO 1004 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – NEW AIRLINE**

Can Government say whether they have opened discussions with a new airline interested in flying to and from Gibraltar since the answer to Question No 359 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1005 of 2004.

**NO 1005 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – AIRLINES**

With how many of the four airlines that the Government were in discussion with in January do discussions continue?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Active discussions continue with three of the airlines. Discussions are on the back burner with the fourth airline, but they may resume. In addition, I have entered discussions with two new airlines.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1004 AND 1005 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether any of the three airlines with which discussions continue, or the two new airlines which he started discussions with, will open a route to Morocco or to Heathrow?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

As has been the case in previous times when questions like this have been raised, we do not feel that it is worthwhile commenting while negotiations are on-going.

ORAL

**NO 1006 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – SCHEDULED FLIGHTS**

How many flights a week were timetabled between Gibraltar and London Gatwick in June and January in the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1007 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1007 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – CANCELLED FLIGHTS**

How many flights between Gibraltar and London Gatwick have been cancelled on a monthly basis since November 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information sought in this question is too voluminous and I therefore hand to the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested.

## SCHEDULE

### Q1007

The information sought in respect of flights between Gibraltar and London Gatwick is not kept on a weekly basis, but on a monthly basis. The information provided is therefore for the months of January and June.

a) FLIGHTS PER MONTH TIMETABLED BETWEEN GIBRALTAR AND LONDON GATWICK

|         | <u>2000</u> | <u>2001</u> | <u>2002</u> | <u>2003</u> | <u>2004</u> |
|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| January | 50          | 45          | 16          | 53          | 40          |
| June    | 50          | 30          | 59          | 59          |             |

The following flights between Gibraltar and London Gatwick were cancelled:

|               |    |
|---------------|----|
| November 2003 | 8  |
| December 2003 | 6  |
| January 2004  | 23 |
| February 2004 | 19 |
| March 2004    | 6  |

ORAL

**NO 1008 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – HOTEL ARREARS**

What amounts are due and owing to Government by hotels broken down by item and in respect of which period these monies become due as at 31 March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1009 of 2004.

**NO 1009 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – HOTEL ASSISTANCE SCHEME**

Can Government say what amounts are due to Government in respect of loans under the Hotel Assistance Scheme, listing the hotels in question and the amounts repaid to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The amount owed by hotels in respect of historical arrears is £10,850, broken down as follows:

|                  |        |
|------------------|--------|
| Electricity      | £9,685 |
| Social Insurance | £1,165 |

The amount paid and remaining payable by hotels in respect of loans made under the Hotel Assistance Scheme per hotel is as follows:-

|                   |                        |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Bell Hotel Ltd    | £ 125,000 paid         |
|                   | £ 875,000 outstanding  |
| G & JB Hotels Ltd | £ 72,500 paid          |
|                   | £1,377,500 outstanding |
| Rock Hotel        | £ 178,224 paid         |
|                   | £1,247,566 outstanding |



**NO 1010 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – HOTELS – GRADING SCHEME**

When was the last inspection of hotels carried out in respect of their star grading, by whom, and with what results in respect of each hotel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The RAC carried out the last inspection of hotels under the grading scheme in June 2003, and the following grading was given to each hotel:-

|           |                                            |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------|
| 4 stars   | Caleta Hotel<br>Eliott Hotel<br>Rock Hotel |
| 1 star    | Continental Hotel                          |
| 1 diamond | Cannon Hotel                               |

The Bristol Hotel and the Queen's Hotel chose not to participate in the hotel grading scheme in 2003. Since writing the answer to this question, the Queen's Hotel has now opted to join the scheme and will then be subsequently inspected at the next round.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1010 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

This inspection was carried out by the RAC. They were not the firm that carried out the original inspection of hotels, is that right?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When was this changed and for what reason?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The change was carried out because previously this was done by a company called QAC, which ceased operation in the grading of hotels in the UK and Wales. The RAC was an internationally recognised assessor of hotel grades and we were extremely happy to have been able to get them to include Gibraltar in their grading system.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Who pays for the grading, the hotels or the Government?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Government paid for the grading.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the two hotels that chose not to participate, is it the Government's view that all hotels in Gibraltar should take part in this exercise or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes. However, the issue in respect of the Bristol and Queen's Hotel was that they do not have restaurant facility, so therefore under the RAC grading a hotel can only be graded with a star, be it whatever level of star it is, if it has restaurant facilities. So therefore they did not want to be classified under the diamond regime, which has happened to the Cannon Hotel for example. I believe the Queen's Hotel are now addressing this and therefore they want to join the scheme. It is obvious both from the Gibraltar Tourist Board and from the hotels themselves, that they wish to be part of the scheme because it is a selling and marketing tool for them to be able to sell their product internationally under a recognised band.

**NO 1011 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – VISIT BY MOROCCAN TOURISM MINISTER**

Can Government say if any date has been set for an official visit by the Moroccan Tourism Minister to Gibraltar, or by the Gibraltar Tourism Minister to Morocco?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No date has yet been set.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1011 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I think this issue first arose in FITUR, perhaps as much as a year ago, and since then I have been asking the question to see whether the meeting actually materialises. Is this something which is still on the cards and which may happen or have the Government of Morocco and the Government of Gibraltar decided not to pursue this avenue any more?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, there has been contact at official level between the Ministry of Tourism in Morocco and the Ministry of Tourism in Gibraltar. Tentative dates were actually agreed just before the Madrid bombing, and in the light of what had happened we decided that we would postpone the meeting until a later date.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Within what time scale is it envisaged that such a visit may now take place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We are currently waiting for the Ministry in Morocco to revert with some possible dates, but they have not done so.

ORAL

NO 1012 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government list the names of actual cruise ships that called at Gibraltar in 2002 on a monthly basis?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 983 to 990, 1013 and 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1013 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government list the names of the actual cruise ships that called at Gibraltar in 2003 on a monthly basis?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 983 to 990, 1012 and 1014 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1014 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – CRUISE SHIPS**

Can Government list the names of the actual cruise ships that called at Gibraltar in 2004 to date on a monthly basis?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information sought in this question is too voluminous to be read out in this House, I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested in the question.

Question 983 – 986, 989,990

14 cruise ships cancelled calls to Gibraltar which were booked to take place in 2003.

The cancelled calls were as follows:

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Vessels Name</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|
| 05/03/03    | Bordeaux            |
| 19/03/03    | Bordeaux            |
| 27/03/03    | Bordeaux            |
| 02/04/03    | Bordeaux            |
| 10/3/03     | Bordeaux            |
| 16/04/03    | Bordeaux            |
| 12/5/03     | Grand Princess      |
| 30/05/03    | Royal Princess      |
| 07/07/03    | Prisendam           |
| 12/09/03    | Princess Danae      |
| 17/09/03    | Ocean Monarch       |
| 23/10/03    | Funchal             |
| 28/10/03    | Constellation       |
| 01/11/03    | Oceania             |
| 02/11/03    | Funchal             |
| 05/11/03    | Marco Polo          |
| 09/11/03    | Andrea              |
| 19/11/03    | Adonia              |
| 20/11/03    | Bordeaux            |
| 20/11/03    | Funchal             |
| 27/11/03    | Funchal             |
| 01/12/08    | Costa Fortuna       |

To date two cruise ships have cancelled calls to Gibraltar this year. The cancelled calls are as follows:

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Name of Vessel</u> |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| 19/03/04    | Black Prince          |
| 27/03/04    | Black Prince          |
| 17/04/04    | Olympia Explorer      |
| 23/04/04    | Black Prince          |

No reasons were given for the cancellations by the cruise companies.

Question 987 and 988

Cruise calls expected at Gibraltar in 2004, from 1st May 2004, with date of call, name of ship, cruise line and local agent:

| <b>Date of Appt.</b> | <b>Vessel</b>    | <b>Company</b>            |           |
|----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| Thu 06 May 04        | Millenium        | Celebrity                 | S. Imossi |
| Fri 07 May 04        | Adonia           | P & O                     | Bland     |
| Sat 08 May 04        | Funchal          | Classic                   | Bland     |
|                      |                  | International             |           |
| Sat 08 May 04        | Thornson Spirit  | Thornson Cruises          | Bland     |
| Sun 09 May 04        | Saga Rose        | Saga                      | Inchcape  |
| Mon 10 May 04        | Astor            | Transocean                | Bland     |
| Mon 10 May 04        | Silver Wind      | Silversea                 | Bland     |
| Tue 11 May 04        | Ocean Majesty    | Page & Moy                | Inchcape  |
| Wed 12 May 04        | Royal Princess   | Princess                  | Bland     |
| Fri 14 May 04        | Astor            | Transocean                | Bland     |
| Fri 14 May 04        | Ocean Majesty    | Page & Moy                | Inchcape  |
| Fri 14 May 04        | Caronia          | Cunard                    | Bland     |
| Fri 14 May 04        | Sea Cloud II     | Sea Cloud                 | Bland     |
| Mon 17 May 04        | Crystal Symphony | Cystal                    | S. Imossi |
| Mon 17 May 04        | Galaxy           | Celebrity                 | S. Imossi |
| Tue 18 May 04        | Oriana           | P & O                     | Bland     |
| Tue 18 May 04        | Prinsendam       | Holland America           | Turner    |
| Wed 19 May 04        | Carousel         | My Travel                 | Maritime  |
| Wed 19 May 04        | Cystal Serenity  | Crystal                   | S. Imossi |
| Fri 21 May 04        | Black Watch      | Fred Olsen                | Inchcape  |
| Fri 21 May 04        | Kristina Regina  | Kristina Cruises          | Bland     |
| Sat 22 May 04        | Costa Marina     | Costa                     | L. Imossi |
| Sat 22 May 04        | Coronia          | Cunard                    | Bland     |
| Wed 26 May 04        | Oceana           | P & O                     | Bland     |
| Thu 27 May 04        | Queen Mary 2     | Cunard                    | Bland     |
| Fri 28 May 04        | Europa           | Hapag Lloyd               | Bland     |
| Fri 28 May 04        | Le Diamant       | Cie Des Iles Du<br>Ponant | Barwil    |
| Fri 28 May 04        | Marco Polo       | Orient                    | S. Imossi |

**28 CRUISE CALLS EXPECTED IN MAY**

|               |            |                  |        |
|---------------|------------|------------------|--------|
| Sun 06 Jun 04 | Aurora     | P & O            | Bland  |
| Mon 07 Jun 04 | Westerdam  | Holland America  | Turner |
| Thu 10 Jun 04 | Seadream I | Seadream Cruises | Bland  |



|               |                |                  |          |
|---------------|----------------|------------------|----------|
| Mon 14 Jun 04 | Oriana         | P & O            | Bland    |
| Tue 15 Jun 04 | Seadream I     | Seadream Cruises | Bland    |
| Wed 16 Jun 04 | Carousel       | MyTravel         | Maritima |
| Sat 19 Jun 04 | Thomson Spirit | Thomson Cruises  | Bland    |
| Tue 29 Jun 04 | Aurora         | P & O            | Bland    |
| Wed 30 Jun 04 | Carousel       | My Travel        | Maritima |

#### 10 CRUISE CALLS EXPECTED IN JUNE

|               |                   |                 |           |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Sat 03 Jul 04 | Caronia           | Cunard          | Bland     |
| Tue 06 Jul 04 | Adonia            | P & O           | Bland     |
| Wed 07 Jul 04 | Oceana            | P & O           | Bland     |
| Wed 14 Jul 04 | Carousel          | MyTravel        | Martima   |
| Fri 16 Jul 04 | Costa Romantica   | Costa           | L. Imossi |
| Wed 21 Jul 04 | Minerva II        | Swan Hellenic   | Bland     |
| Wed 21 Jul 04 | Monterey          | MSC             | Maritima  |
| Wed 21 Jul 04 | Adonia            | P & O           | Bland     |
| Tue 27 Jul 04 | Queen Elizabeth 2 | Cunard          | Bland     |
| Tue 27 Jul 04 | Oriana            | P & O           | Bland     |
| Wed 28 Jul 04 | The World         | Residensea      | Barwil    |
| Wed 28 Jul 04 | Carousel          | My Travel       | Maritima  |
| Sat 31 Jul 04 | Thomson Spirit    | Thomson Cruises | Bland     |

#### 13 CRUISE CALLS EXPECTED IN JULY

|               |                   |                 |           |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Sun 01 Aug 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope     | Inchcape  |
| Tue 03 Aug 04 | Queen Elizabeth 2 | Cunard          | Bland     |
| Wed 04 Aug 04 | Rotterdam         | Holland America | Turner    |
| Fri 06 Aug 04 | Costa Romantica   | Costa           | L. Imossi |
| Fri 06 Aug 04 | Queen Mary 2      | Cunard          | Bland     |
| Fri 06 Aug 04 | Royal Princess    | Princess        | Bland     |
| Sun 08 Aug 04 | Black Watch       | Fred Olsen      | Inchcape  |
| Mon 09 Aug 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope     | Inchcape  |
| Wed 11 Aug 04 | Aurora            | P & O           | Bland     |
| Wed 11 Aug 04 | Carousel          | MyTravel        | Maritima  |
| Mon 16 Aug 04 | Royal Princess    | Princess        | Bland     |
| Tue 17 Aug 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope     | Inchcape  |
| Wed 25 Aug 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope     | Inchcape  |
| Wed 25 Aug 04 | Carousel          | My Travel       | Maritima  |
| Thu 26 Aug 04 | Monterey          | MSC             | Maritima  |
| Thu 26 Aug 04 | Oceana            | P & O           | Bland     |
| Fri 27 Aug 04 | Caronia           | Cunard          | Bland     |
| Fri 27 Aug 04 | Oriana            | P & O           | Bland     |

## 18 CRUISE CALLS EXPECTED IN AUGUST

|               |                   |                          |           |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Wed 01 Sep 04 | Sea Cloud II      | Sea Cloud                | Bland     |
| Thu 02 Sep 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope              | Inchcape  |
| Sat 04 Sep 04 | Funchal           | Classic<br>International | Bland     |
| Mon 06 Sep 04 | Endeavour         | Noble Caledonia          | Turner    |
| Tue 07 Sep 04 | Galaxy            | Celebrity                | S. Imossi |
| Tue 07 Sep 04 | Queen Mary 2      | Cunard                   | Bland     |
| Wed 08 Sep 04 | Carousel          | My Travel                | Maritima  |
| Wed 08 Sep 04 | Oriana            | P & O                    | Bland     |
| Thu 09 Sep 04 | Sea Cloud II      | Sea Cloud                | Bland     |
| Thu 09 Sep 04 | Rotterdam         | Holland America          | Turner    |
| Fri 10 Sep 04 | Kristina Regina   | Kristina Cruises         | Bland     |
| Fri 10 Sep 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope              | Inchcape  |
| Fri 10 Sep 04 | Sea Cloud II      | Sea Cloud                | Bland     |
| Sat 11 Sep 04 | Royal Princess    | Princess                 | Bland     |
| Sat 11 Sep 04 | Thomson Spirit    | Thomson Cruises          | Bland     |
| Tue 14 Sep 04 | Paloma I          | Hansa<br>Kreuzfahrten    | Tarik     |
| Tue 14 Sep 04 | Queen Elizabeth 2 | Cunard                   | Bland     |
| Wed 15 Sep 04 | Funchal           | Classic<br>International | Bland     |
| Fri 17 Sep 04 | Saga Rose         | Saga                     | Inchcape  |
| Fri 17 Sep 04 | Costa Romantica   | Costa                    | L. Imossi |
| Fri 17 Sep 04 | Star Princess     | Princess                 | Bland     |
| Sat 18 Sep 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope              | Inchcape  |
| Sun 19 Sep 04 | Adonia            | P & O                    | Bland     |
| Sun 19 Sep 04 | Arion             | Classic<br>International | Bland     |
| Sun 19 Sep 04 | Noordam           | Holland America          | Turner    |
| Tue 21 Sep 04 | Prinsendam        | Holland America          | Turner    |
| Tue 21 Sep 04 | Queen Elizabeth 2 | Cunard                   | Bland     |
| Tue 21 Sep 04 | Marco Polo        | Orient                   | S. Imossi |
| Wed 22 Sep 04 | Carousel          | My Travel                | Maritima  |
| Fri 24 Sep 04 | Berlin            | Peter Deilmann           | Maritima  |
| Sun 26 Sep 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope              | Inchcape  |
| Mon 27 Sep 04 | Nautica           | TMR                      | S. Imossi |
| Mon 27 Sep 04 | Funchal           | Classic<br>International | Bland     |
| Wed 29 Sep 04 | Costa Europa      | Costa                    | L. Imossi |
| Wed 29 Sep 04 | Black Prince      | Fred Olsen               | Inchcape  |
| Wed 29 Sep 04 | Saga Pearl        | Saga                     | Inchcape  |

### 36 CALLS EXPECTED IN SEPTEMBER

|               |                   |                          |           |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Sun 03 Oct 04 | Oceana            | P & O                    | Bland     |
| Mon 04 Oct 04 | Van Gogh          | Travelscope              | Inchcape  |
| Mon 04 Oct 04 | Black Watch       | Fred Olsen               | Inchcape  |
| Wed 06 Oct 04 | Carousel          | MyTravel                 | Maritima  |
| Thu 07 Oct 04 | Costa Europa      | Costa                    | L. Imossi |
| Sat 09 Oct 04 | Funchal           | Classic<br>International | Bland     |
| Mon 11 Oct 04 | Oriana            | P & O                    | Bland     |
| Tue 12 Oct 04 | Black Prince      | Fred Olsen               | Inchcape  |
| Fri 15 Oct 04 | Costa Europa      | Costa                    | L. Imossi |
| Fri 15 Oct 04 | Saga Rose         | Saga                     | Inchcape  |
| Sun 17 Oct 04 | Caronia           | Cunard                   | Bland     |
| Sun 17 Oct 04 | Funchal           | Classic<br>International | Bland     |
| Sun 17 Oct 04 | Berlin            | Peter Deilmann           | Maritima  |
| Tue 19 Oct 04 | Oceana            | P & O                    | Bland     |
| Wed 20 Oct 04 | Club Med 2        | Club Med                 | Bland     |
| Wed 20 Oct 04 | Adonia            | P & O                    | Bland     |
| Wed 20 Oct 04 | Carousel          | MyTravel                 | Maritima  |
| Sat 23 Oct 04 | Costa Europa      | Costa                    | L. Imossi |
| Mon 25 Oct 04 | Queen Elizabeth 2 | Cunard                   | Bland     |
| Tue 26 Oct 04 | Funchal           | Classic<br>International | Bland     |
| Thu 28 Oct 04 | Queen Mary 2      | Cunard                   | Bland     |
| Thu 28 Oct 04 | Braemar           | Fred Olsen               | Inchcape  |
| Sat 30 Oct 04 | Seabourn Legend   | Seabourn                 | Bland     |
| Sat 30 Oct 04 | Thornson Spirit   | Thornson Cruises         | Bland     |
| Sun 31 Oct 04 | Costa Europa      | Costa                    | L. Imossi |

### 25 CALLS EXPECTED IN OCTOBER

|               |                   |                          |           |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Mon 01 Nov 04 | Crystal Serenity  | Crystal                  | S. Imossi |
| Mon 01 Nov 04 | Aurora            | P & O                    | Bland     |
| Thu 04 Nov 04 | Funchal           | Classic<br>International | Bland     |
| Fri 05 Nov 04 | Black Watch       | Fred Olsen               | Inchcape  |
| Sat 06 Nov 04 | Kristina Regina   | Kristina Cruises         | Bland     |
| Tue 09 Nov 04 | Millenium         | Celebrity                | S. Imossi |
| Tue 09 Nov 04 | Oriana            | P & O                    | Bland     |
| Thu 11 Nov 04 | Queen Elizabeth 2 | Cunard                   | Bland     |
| Thu 11 Nov 04 | Noordam           | Holland America          | Turner    |
| Mon 15 Nov 04 | Westerdam         | Holland America          | Turner    |

|               |                          |         |           |
|---------------|--------------------------|---------|-----------|
| Wed 17 Nov 04 | Splendour Of The<br>Seas | RCCI    | S. Imossi |
| Fri 26 Nov 04 | Costa Tropicale          | Costa   | L. Imossi |
| Tue 30 Nov 04 | Vistamar                 | Marline | Turner    |

**13 CALLS EXPECTED IN NOVEMBER**

|               |                        |                         |           |
|---------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Thu 02 Dec 04 | Black Prince           | Fred Olsen              | Inchcape  |
| Wed 08 Dec 04 | Costa<br>Mediterranea  | Costa                   | L. Imossi |
| Wed 08 Dec 04 | Delphin<br>Renaissance | Delphin Cruises         | Bland     |
| Sun 12 Dec 04 | Discovery              | Voyages of<br>Discovery | Bland     |
| Fri 24 Dec 04 | Van Gogh 2             | Club Cruises            | Inchcape  |
| Fri 24 Dec 04 | Van Gogh               | Travelscope             | Inchcape  |

**6 CALLS EXPECTED IN DECEMBER**

## Schedule

### Question 1012

#### Cruise calls in 2002, on a monthly basis:

January - None

| NAME OF CRUISE SHIP | MONTH |
|---------------------|-------|
| Costa Victoria      | Feb   |
| Black Watch         | Mar   |
| Paloma              | Mar   |
| Berlin              | Mar   |
| Costa Tropicale     | Mar   |
| Black Watch         | Apr   |
| Sun Bay             | Apr   |
| Norwegian Dream     | Apr   |
| Victoria            | Apr   |
| Black Prince        | Apr   |
| Silver Cloud        | Apr   |
| Paloma              | Apr   |
| Black Prince        | Apr   |
| Funchal             | Apr   |
| Sea Cloud II        | Apr   |
| Noordam             | Apr   |
| The Topaz           | Apr   |
| Oriana              | Apr   |
| C Columbus          | Apr   |
| Black Watch         | May   |
| Carousel            | May   |
| Aurora              | May   |
| Saga Rose           | May   |
| Astor               | May   |
| Astoria             | May   |
| Golden Princess     | May   |
| Aurora              | May   |
| Kristina Regina     | May   |
| Monterey            | May   |
| Sea Cloud II        | May   |
| Caronia             | May   |
| Ocean Majesty       | May   |
| Black Watch         | May   |
| Oriana              | May   |
| Noordam             | May   |
| Arcadia             | May   |

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Braemar            | June |
| Silver Shadow      | June |
| Queen Elizabeth II | June |
| Aurora             | June |
| Black Prince       | June |
| Arcadia            | June |
| Monterey           | June |
| Oriana             | July |
| Van Gogh           | July |
| Odysseus           | July |
| Van Gogh           | July |
| Odysseus           | July |
| Aurora             | July |
| Victoria           | July |
| Odysseus           | July |
| Van Gogh           | July |
| Caronia            | July |
| Monterey           | July |
| Arcadia            | July |
| Odysseus           | July |
| Van Gogh           | Aug  |
| Oriana             | Aug  |
| Odysseus           | Aug  |
| Van Gogh           | Aug  |
| Odysseus           | Aug  |
| Van Gogh           | Aug  |
| Aurora             | Aug  |
| Crystal Symphony   | Aug  |
| Oriana             | Aug  |
| Odysseus           | Aug  |
| Funchal            | Aug  |
| Monterey           | Aug  |
| Caronia            | Aug  |
| Can Gogh           | Aug  |
| Odysseus           | Aug  |
| Princess Danae     | Aug  |
| Sea Cloud II       | Aug  |
| Caronia            | Sep  |
| Van Gogh           | Sep  |
| Odysseus           | Sep  |
| Braemar            | Sep  |
| Funchal            | Sep  |
| Van Gogh           | Sep  |
| Odysseus           | Sep  |
| Arcadia            | Sep  |
| Noordam            | Sep  |

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Paloma                | Sep |
| Victoria              | Sep |
| Arcadia               | Sep |
| Ocean Majesty         | Sep |
| Odysseus              | Sep |
| Van Gogh              | Sep |
| Kristina Regina       | Sep |
| Maxim Gorky           | Sep |
| Kristina Regina       | Sep |
| Song of Flower        | Sep |
| Black Prince          | Sep |
| Black Watch           | Sep |
| Sundream              | Sep |
| Odysseus              | Sep |
| Costa Marina          | Sep |
| Van Gogh              | Sep |
| Ocean Majesty         | Sep |
| Costa Romantica       | Oct |
| Odysseus              | Oct |
| Caronia               | Oct |
| Van Gogh              | Oct |
| Black Prince          | Oct |
| Monterey              | Oct |
| Sundream              | Oct |
| Odysseus              | Oct |
| Costa Romantica       | Oct |
| Aurora                | Oct |
| Marco Polo            | Oct |
| Oriana                | Oct |
| Arcadia               | Oct |
| Odysseus              | Oct |
| Noordam               | Oct |
| Costa Allegra         | Oct |
| Costa Romantica       | Oct |
| Black Watch           | Oct |
| Caronia               | Oct |
| Noordam               | Oct |
| Victoria              | Oct |
| Costa Romantica       | Oct |
| The Topaz             | Oct |
| Van Gogh              | Oct |
| Constellation         | Oct |
| Crystal Symphony      | Oct |
| Caronia               | Oct |
| Eleftherios Venizelos | Oct |
| Carousel              | Oct |

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Kristina Regina  | Nov |
| Van Gogh         | Nov |
| Kristina Regina  | Nov |
| Aurora           | Nov |
| Pacific Princess | Nov |
| Princess Danae   | Nov |
| Maxim Gorky      | Nov |
| Oriana           | Nov |
| Caronia          | Nov |
| Van Gogh         | Nov |
| Aurora           | Nov |
| Van Gogh         | Nov |
| Noordam          | Nov |
| Van Gogh         | Nov |
| Black Watch      | Dec |
| Vistamar         | Dec |
| Astor            | Dec |
| Costa Europa     | Dec |
| Black Prince     | Dec |
| Black Watch      | Dec |
| Black Prince     | Dec |

Question 1013

Cruise calls in 2003, on a monthly basis:

January – None  
February - None

| <u>Name of Cruise</u> | <u>Month</u> |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Black Prince          | Mar          |
| Black Prince          | Mar          |
| Kristina Regina       | Mar          |
| Seabourn Pride        | Apr          |
| Black Watch           | Apr          |
| Oriana                | Apr          |
| Black Watch           | Apr          |
| Olympia Voyager       | Apr          |
| Noordam               | Apr          |
| Carousel              | Apr          |
| Adriana               | May          |
| Discovery             | May          |
| Ocean Village         | May          |
| Caronia               | May          |
| Albatros              | May          |



|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| Sea Cloud II       | May  |
| Black Prince       | May  |
| Royal Princess     | May  |
| Oceana             | May  |
| Millenium          | May  |
| Kristina Regina    | May  |
| Ocean Majesty      | May  |
| Black Watch        | May  |
| Oriana             | May  |
| Astoria            | May  |
| Silver Whisper     | May  |
| Aurora             | May  |
| Sea Cloud II       | May  |
| Costa Marina       | May  |
| Black Watch        | May  |
| Caronia            | May  |
| World Renaissance  | May  |
| Costa Allegra      | May  |
| Triton             | May  |
| World Renaissance  | May  |
| Costa Marina       | May  |
| Caronia            | May  |
| Noordam            | June |
| Adonia             | June |
| World Renaissance  | June |
| Monterey           | June |
| World Renaissance  | June |
| Sundream           | June |
| Oceana             | June |
| World Renaissance  | June |
| Costa Mediterranea | June |
| Black Prince       | June |
| World Renaissance  | June |
| Wind Surf          | June |
| Adonia             | July |
| World Renaissance  | July |
| Van Gogh           | July |
| Aurora             | July |
| Oriana             | July |
| World Renaissance  | July |
| Van Gogh           | July |
| World Renaissance  | July |
| Oriana             | July |
| Oceana             | July |
| Van Gogh           | July |
| World Renaissance  | July |

|                   |      |
|-------------------|------|
| Monterey          | July |
| Caronia           | July |
| Crystal Serenity  | July |
| World Renaissance | July |
| Van Gogh          | July |
| QE II             | July |
| World Renaissance | Aug  |
| Van Gogh          | Aug  |
| Adonia            | Aug  |
| World Renaissance | Aug  |
| Aurora            | Aug  |
| Oriana            | Aug  |
| Van Gogh          | Aug  |
| Aurora            | Aug  |
| World Renaissance | Aug  |
| Silver Cloud      | Aug  |
| Princess Danae    | Aug  |
| Van Gogh          | Aug  |
| World Renaissance | Aug  |
| Sea Cloud II      | Sep  |
| Van Gogh          | Sep  |
| World Renaissance | Sep  |
| Princess Danae    | Sep  |
| Golden Princess   | Sep  |
| Van Gogh          | Sep  |
| World Renaissance | Sep  |
| Oceana            | Sep  |
| Caronia           | Sep  |
| Funchal           | Sep  |
| Kristina Regina   | Sep  |
| Arion             | Sep  |
| QE2               | Sep  |
| Van Gogh          | Sep  |
| Discovery         | Sep  |
| World Renaissance | Sep  |
| Noordam           | Sep  |
| Paloma I          | Sep  |
| Adonia            | Sep  |
| Black Prince      | Sep  |
| Sundream          | Sep  |
| Oriana            | Sep  |
| World Renaissance | Sep  |
| Van Gogh          | Sep  |
| Ocena Majesty     | Sep  |
| Funchal           | Sep  |
| Royal Princess    | Sep  |

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Costa Romantica       | Oct |
| Monterey              | Oct |
| World Renaissance     | Oct |
| Deutschland           | Oct |
| Black Princess        | Oct |
| Ocean Princess        | Oct |
| Silver Cloud          | Oct |
| Adonia                | Oct |
| Oceana                | Oct |
| World Renaissance     | Oct |
| Costa Romantica       | Oct |
| Royal Princess        | Oct |
| Oosterdam             | Oct |
| Aurora                | Oct |
| Oosterdam             | Oct |
| Royal Princess        | Oct |
| Costa Romantica       | Oct |
| Sundream              | Oct |
| Oceana                | Oct |
| Black Watch           | Oct |
| Marco Polo            | Oct |
| Rhapsody              | Oct |
| C.Columbus            | Oct |
| Millenium             | Oct |
| Costa Romantica       | Oct |
| Carousel              | Oct |
| Kristina Regina       | Oct |
| Regatta               | Nov |
| Kristina Regina       | Nov |
| Sea Cloud             | Nov |
| Aurora                | Nov |
| Splendour of the Seas | Nov |
| Costa Romantica       | Nov |
| Marco Polo            | Nov |
| Adonia                | Nov |
| Astor                 | Nov |
| Black Watch           | Nov |
| Mona Lisa             | Nov |
| Maxim Gorkiy          | Nov |
| Van Gogh              | Nov |
| Oosterdam             | Nov |
| Marco Polo            | Nov |
| Black Prince          | Nov |
| Aurora                | Nov |
| Noordam               | Nov |
| Island Escape         | Nov |

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Caronia         | Nov |
| Discovery       | Nov |
| Van Gogh        | Nov |
| Melody          | Nov |
| Vistamar        | Nov |
| Costa Fortuna   | Nov |
| Royal Princess  | Dec |
| Discovery       | Dec |
| Costa Tropicale | Dec |
| Thomson Spirit  | Dec |
| Black Prince    | Dec |
| Van Gogh        | Dec |
| Costa Europa    | Dec |
| Msc Lirica      | Dec |

Question 1014

Cruise calls in 2004, on a monthly basis:

February - None

| <u>Name of Cruise</u> | <u>Month</u> |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Costa Europa          | Jan          |
| Black Prince          | Jan          |
| Astoria               | Mar          |
| Adriana               | Mar          |
| Caronia               | Mar          |
| Norwegian Dream       | Apr          |
| Clipper Adventurer    | Apr          |
| Kristina Regina       | Apr          |
| Braemar               | Apr          |
| Astoria               | Apr          |
| Seabourn Pride        | Apr          |
| Aurora                | Apr          |
| Paloma 1              | Apr          |
| Funchal               | Apr          |
| Astoria               | Apr          |
| Nautica               | Apr          |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 983 TO 990 AND 1012 TO 1014 OF 2004**

### **HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the cancellation of calls at Gibraltar by cruise ships this year, obviously since the answer to the question was prepared I assume the latest developments in relation to the three calls that have not taken place, in which one I understand was a booked call, can the confirm to the House the reasons for the cancellation of these last three calls that were due to take place, and confirm what action the Government are taking to pursue the matter? Certainly Opposition Members take a very serious view of developments in relation to reports that have appeared indicating that the Spanish Foreign Ministry have once again taken the view that calls from Gibraltar to a Spanish port is something that they want to target.

### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government take an equally serious view and wish to avoid making statements that will exacerbate the matter at a time when we understand Spain is trying to work hard to remedy the matter, and we are just abiding time for a day or two, the priority has got to be to restore the status quo ante which is that this has always been Spain's position but that under the previous government it had waived it. In other words it was not implementing it. The underlying position is not new, it has always been Spain's position but the previous government chose not to implement it. We understand that in the interregnum in change of governments and a new minister has not yet taken possession, a new No. 2 has not yet taken possession, that there is an officer at that particular port who is unilaterally decided to implement the policy. Now, we understand that that situation is being resolved and that we hope that by the end of this week the situation will have been normalised. If it does not happen, it will be an extremely serious development which will bring in its wake, I think, great ramifications and consequences in other policy areas, but we believe that there has been no conscious decision by the Spanish Foreign Ministry to activate the implementation of their policy, and the truth is that it has not happened in other ports in Spain where there have been ships in the same period of time. For example, as nearby as Malaga ships have come. So we understand that there is an element of frolic of own of a person in the Barcelona port and that the Spanish administration is dealing with it. We think it is preferable to give them that opportunity to deal with it than to come out making inflammatory remarks that may make it harder for them to deal with it, but of course we cannot keep that position indefinitely or even for very long.

### **HON J J BOSSANO:**

The last time it happened it was resolved as a result of the intervention of the UK Foreign Office or what?

### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The last time yes, there was some local contact and there was some UK contact and it was resolved. The position of the Partido Popular element is that this is not a policy which although they were not willing to abandon it on paper, that they were not

implementing. It would be grossly ironical if the socialist government reversed that concessionary position, as they see it, and have an even tougher policy, so we tend to think that the information that we are getting that this is not a formal government decision, we see the logic. It would not be logical for the PSOE to be even more aggressive than the PP on this issue. That is why we have been persuaded to bite our tongue and to pursue a public profile on this which facilitates a resolution in the interests of Gibraltar rather than exacerbate it.

**NO 1015 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – MARINA OCCUPANCY**

Can Government say whether Marina operators have now supplied them with Marina occupancy figures for 2001, 2002 and 2003 which they promised to forward to the Opposition?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1015 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I should point out that since this Question was Tabled the Minister has already sent me the figures,

ORAL

NO 1016 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – ST MICHAEL'S CAVE**

How much did the company that installed the sound and light system at St Michael's Cave charge the Government for training members of the Electricity Authority to carry out the maintenance?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1017 of 2004.



**NO 1017 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – ST MICHAEL'S CAVE**

Has an annual fee been agreed with the Electricity Authority for the maintenance of the sound and light system at St Michael's Cave and if so what is it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There was no charge for the training, but the £585 accommodation costs of the trainers was met. No annual maintenance fee has as yet been agreed with the Electricity Authority.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1016 AND 1017 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So who is carrying out the maintenance at present?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The Electricity Authority.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

They are doing it on the basis of some agreement that might happen in the future which will result in them receiving any money?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**NO 1018 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – GDC EMPLOYEES**

Can Government say how many employees of the Gibraltar Development Corporation are employed in tourism as at 31 March 2004, with a breakdown showing specific area of employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

A total of 73 Gibraltar Development Corporation employees are employed in tourism as at 31 March 2004 as follows:

|                                        |            |
|----------------------------------------|------------|
| Management                             | 8 persons  |
| Marketing                              | 4 persons  |
| Administration, Accounts and Reception | 4 persons  |
| Terminals                              | 7 persons  |
| Information Officers                   | 8 persons  |
| Upper Rock                             | 37 persons |
| Ape keepers                            | 2 persons  |
| Messenger                              | 1 person   |
| Madrid Office                          | 2 persons  |

**NO 1019 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from January 2004 inclusive:

- (a) by charging coaches that use the coach park;
- (b) in admission fees to the Upper Rock;
- (c) in entrance fees to the Gibraltar Museum;
- (d) in entrance fees to the Moorish Castle;
- (e) in entrance fees to St Michael's Cave;
- (f) in entrance fees to Parson's Lodge;
- (g) in entrance fees to the Siege Tunnels?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There is no separate admission fee for the Moorish Castle, St Michael's Cave or the Upper Galleries. Parson's Lodge is not a Gibraltar Government tourist site. It is operated by the Gibraltar Heritage Trust, to whom the question of admission fees should be addressed.

The revenue from admission charges to the Museum per month, was as follows:

|               |        |
|---------------|--------|
| January 2004  | £1,343 |
| February 2004 | £2,129 |
| March 2004    | £2,711 |

The revenue from admission fees to the Upper Rock per month, was as follows:

|               |          |
|---------------|----------|
| January 2004  | £ 80,171 |
| February 2004 | £100,050 |
| March 2004    | £151,228 |

Coach Park fees per month were as follows:

|               |        |
|---------------|--------|
| January 2004  | £4,520 |
| February 2004 | £5,549 |
| March 2004    | £8,831 |

**ORAL**

**NO 1020 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews with persons who said that they had stayed at a hotel have been carried out since December 2003 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1021 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1021 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews have been carried out with persons who said that they had not stayed at a hotel since December 2003 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information sought in this question is handed over to the hon Gentleman in a schedule giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question 1021 of 2004**

Q 1021

**PERSONS WHO STAYED AT HOTELS:  
INTERVIEWS CARRIED OUT SINCE DECEMBER 2003**

|               | Total Interviews | Persons who stayed at Hotel | Place of Interview |          |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------|
|               |                  |                             | Airport            | Frontier |
| December 2003 | 1392             | 2                           | -                  | 2        |
| January 2004  | 1682             | 16                          | 11                 | 5        |
| February 2004 | 1715             | 6                           | 1                  | 5        |

The information in respect of March 2004 is not yet available.

Q 1020

**PERSONS WHO DID NOT STAY AT HOTELS:  
INTERVIEWS CARRIED OUT SINCE DECEMBER 2003**

|               | Total Interviews | Place of Interview |          |        |            |
|---------------|------------------|--------------------|----------|--------|------------|
|               |                  | Airport            | Frontier | Marina | Coach Park |
| December 2003 | 1390             | -                  | 1349     | 41     | -          |
| January 2004  | 1666             | 17                 | 1520     | 10     | 119        |
| February 2004 | 1709             | 5                  | 1571     | 12     | 121        |

The information in respect of March 2004 is not yet available.

**NO 1022 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say of the number of persons who have been interviewed since December 2003 inclusive, who said that they had not stayed at a hotel, how many were interviewed at the airport, how many were interviewed at the land frontier, and how many were interviewed elsewhere, and in each case what was the average length of stay in hotels?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The statistical information requested was given in reply to Question No. 1021. The questionnaire asks about the average length of stay in hotels. The answer is zero, given that the question refers to persons who did not stay in hotels.

**NO 1023 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – COUNTERFEIT GOODS**

Can Government say whether they intend to legislate against the importation into and sale of counterfeit goods in Gibraltar, and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes, but Government are not in a position to say when. Legislation will be published when Government are ready to do so. This is not imminent. It is a complex issue that requires consultation. In the meantime, and as the hon Member should be aware, there is already some law on this issue, which has recently been used successfully in court.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1023 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether this process of consultation to which he refers, presumably with the Chamber of Commerce and the Federation of Small Businesses and any other interested party, has already commenced?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No.



ORAL

**NO 1024 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – POWER CHIPS PLC**

Has any more contact taken place between the Government and Power Chips PLC with a view to setting up a manufacturing facility in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1024 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister tell the House then at what stage the original enquiry is, whether that is being pursued or not, or is simply static?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think there was, I hope that the hon Member will not seek to hold me too much to this answer, I think there was one or possibly two meetings with officials at a relatively junior level. I do not think it got beyond that.

ORAL

NO 1025 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TRADE – BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government list the topics that were discussed at the first meeting of the Business Advisory Council?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1026 and 1027 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1026 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government say what are the opportunities that will be explored by the Business Advisory Council to see how the business environment can be improved to create additional sustainable jobs in the economy?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1025 and 1027 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1027 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TRADE – BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government list the issues that are of importance to small and medium size enterprises in Gibraltar, and to commerce in general, on which the advice of the Business Advisory Council will be of assistance to the Government?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The advice of the Business Advisory Council will be of assistance to the Government in all issues of importance to business in Gibraltar.

The Government will not list the topics discussed at the first or any meeting of the Council. The Council is an on-going advisory body to the Government.

I would expect the Council to explore all opportunities available to business to improve the business environment.

ORAL

**NO 1028 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TQS**

Can Government state what payments have been made to TQS since 1996 and what services have been provided by this company in respect of such payments?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1029 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1029 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TQS**

Can Government state what payments have been made to TQS since 1996 and what services have been provided by this company in respect of these payments?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought in this question is too voluminous to read out in the House, and therefore I hand over to the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested in the question.

## SCHEDULE

### Q1029

To date a grand total of £648,541.00 has been paid to TQS for services provided. the following is a breakdown of amounts paid.

|                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1997 – 1998        | £4,287.19          |
| 1998 – 1999        | £24,929.00         |
| 1999 – 2000        | £142,027.02        |
| 2000 – 2001        | £102,429.18        |
| 2001 – 2002        | £10,017.89         |
| 2002 – 2003        | £129,331.29        |
| 2003 – 2004        | £233,519.43        |
| 2004 – 2005        | £2,000.00          |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>£648,541.00</b> |

The services that TQS have provided are as follows:

- a. TQS assisted in making all Government software programs Millennium compatible. This software was in-house and written in RPG2 computer language. The Departments involved were Income Tax department, Licensing department and the Wages section (Treasury).
- b. TQS have re-written the Income tax system.
- c. TQS are currently involved with the writing and implementation of the DSS systems.
- d. New payroll systems for Salaries, Pensions, Wages and GHA.
- e. Arrears.
- f. Supply of equipment and software.

To date a grand total of £648,541.00 has been paid to TQS for services provided. The following is a breakdown of amounts paid.

|                    |                    |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1997 -1998         | £4,287.19          |
| 1998 -1999         | £24,929.00         |
| 1999 - 2000        | £142,027.02        |
| 2000 - 2001        | £102,429.18        |
| 2001 - 2002        | £10,017.89         |
| 2002 - 2003        | £129,331.29        |
| 2003 - 2004        | £233,519.43        |
| 2004 - 2005        | £2,000.00          |
| <b>Grand Total</b> | <b>£648,541.00</b> |

The services that TQS have provided are as follows:

- a. TQS assisted in making all Government software programs Millennium compatible. This software was in-house and written in RPG2 computer language. The Departments involved were Income Tax department, Licensing department and the Wages section (Treasury).
- b. TQS have re-written the Income tax system.
- c. TQS are currently involved with the writing and implementation of the DSS systems.
- d. New payroll systems for Salaries, Pensions, Wages and GHA.
- e. Arrears.
- f. Supply of equipment and software.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1028 TO 1029 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government say whether this company was selected originally by the work that needed to be done being put out to tender?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid that I will be unable to confirm one way or the other what the hon Member is asking. However, I can tell him that this company has been doing work for the Government on an on-going computerisation programme now for a number of years, but if the hon Member wishes I will try and find the information out and inform him accordingly.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am aware that they have been doing this for a number of years because he has just given me a list of the amount they have been paid every year, which comes to a total of £650,000. So we are talking about big sums of money for writing programmes. In fact, is the company still contracted to do more work for the Government, because we have got 2004/2005 which we have not yet voted down?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe that this company does actually have some maintenance contracts with departments like the Income Tax and Department of Social Security. So therefore it does have an on-going maintenance commitment to the Government.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The maintenance of what, the hardware?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is the company involved in networking the Government's computer systems and developing the Government's computer programme, for which there is an annual vote, as the hon Member has just mentioned, in the Improvement and Development Fund Public Administration Head. This is one of the companies, I think it is the main company involved in the delivery of that. I think it is mainly software systems but it may also include hardware too.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The fact that payments are made to this company is not identified in the Estimates that we vote, but there is a sum of £2,000 intended to be voted presumably in the forthcoming Estimates of Expenditure for this year, because it says in the amounts paid 2004/2005 which has not happened yet, unless they have been paid £2,000 in April this year. Is that what it is?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is what that means but of course the vote, as he knows from the book that he has is higher than that on computers generally for the Government computer system development. I just do not want to give the hon Member the impression that that is the only amount that this company is going to be used for this financial year.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It just so happens that the Principal Auditor every year predicts that something is going to be happening as a result of the work done by this company, except that in the subsequent Audit Report it says the same thing. So whatever it is they have been promising to deliver does not seem to have happened yet and they have been at it now for a considerable number of years.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I think that there has been a delay due to technical reasons which I think is the issue the Principal Auditor refers to in relation to the wages and salaries programme. Now all this is run by the IT Department but I do know that there has been delay in part and failure, in the sense that part of the work done was not effective in that area of computerisation, of Government function.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In note 8 to the reply to the original question it says that the software was in-house and written in RPG 2. Is that just with regard to the Millennium compatibility or does the RPG 2 used as a computer language apply to the whole answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would need notice of the question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is RPG 2 a computer language in which the staff of the Computer Department is trained?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would need notice of that question too.

**ORAL**

**NO 1030 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – IMPORT DUTY**

How much import duty has been collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from January 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1031 to 1034 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1031 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TRADE – IMPORT DUTY**

What was the amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since January 2004 inclusive?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1030 and 1032 to 1034 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1032 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – GOODS VEHICLES**

What was the value and number of goods vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since November 2003 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1030, 1031, 1033 and 1034 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1033 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES**

What was the value and number of private motor vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since November 2003 inclusive

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1030 to 1032 and 1034 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1034 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TRADE – COMPUTERS IMPORTED**

What was the value of computers imported into Gibraltar since December 2003 inclusive on a monthly basis?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS

The information sought in this question is too voluminous to read out in this House, and I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested.

Q. 1034

VALUE OF COMPUTERS IMPORTED SINCE DECEMBER 2003

|               | Value of Computers<br>(£) |
|---------------|---------------------------|
| December 2003 | 417,514                   |
| January 2004  | 707,699                   |
| February 2004 | 1,024,196                 |

The figures for March 2004 are not yet available.



Answer to Q1034 of 2004

**Q 1030**

The amount of import duty collected from persons entering Gibraltar via the Land Frontier since January 2004 is as follows:

|               |            |
|---------------|------------|
| January 2004  | £10,754.36 |
| February 2004 | £10,806.77 |
| March 2004    | £14,172.21 |

**Q 1031**

|               |            |
|---------------|------------|
| January 2004  | £32,437.20 |
| February 2004 | £26,674.03 |
| March 2004    | £42,995.43 |

**Q 1032**

VALUE AND NUMBER OF GOODS VEHICLES IMPORTED SINCE NOVEMBER 2003

|               | Goods vehicles imported by: |                        |                  |                        |
|---------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
|               | Individuals                 |                        | Licensed Dealers |                        |
|               | Number                      | Value<br>(£ thousands) | Number           | Value<br>(£ thousands) |
| November 2003 | 2                           | 1                      | 3                | 27                     |
| December 2003 | -                           | -                      | 10               | 81                     |
| January 2004  | 1                           | -                      | 13               | 55                     |
| February 2004 | 2                           | 2                      | 4                | 15                     |

The figures for March 2004 are not yet available.

**Q. 1033**

VALUE AND NUMBER OF PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES IMPORTED SINCE NOVEMBER 2003

|               | Private Motor Vehicles imported by: |                        |                  |                       |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|               | Individuals                         |                        | Licensed Dealers |                       |
|               | Number                              | Value<br>(£ thousands) | Number           | Value<br>(£ millions) |
| November 2003 | 24                                  | 61.0                   | 459              | 6.0                   |
| December 2003 | 21                                  | 66.0                   | 132              | 1.6                   |
| January 2004  | 23                                  | 65.5                   | 648              | 8.2                   |
| February 2004 | 11                                  | 37.0                   | 515              | 7.4                   |

The figures for March 2004 are not yet available.

ORAL

**NO 1035 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties who have applied for EU funding since the last Question Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purposes for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1036 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1036 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties who have applied for Gibraltar Government funding since the last Question Time in this house, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purpose for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought in this question is handed over to the hon Member in a schedule giving the information requested.

**SCHEDULE**

(a) **EU Funding**

Nine applications for EU funding have been received since the last question time in House. Six applications were for ERDF funding under 2000-2006 Objective 2 Programme and three were for ESF funding under the 2000-2006 Objective 3 Programme.

**ERDF Projects**

| <b>Sponsor</b>             | <b>Status</b>          | <b>ERDF</b> | <b>GOG</b> | <b>Purpose of Grant</b>                                                            |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| USURF                      | Approved               | £3,085.50   | £3,085.50  | Premises, hardware<br>Marketing                                                    |
| Family Research            | Approved               | £ 191.00    | £ 191.00   | Purchase of Computer<br>Equipment                                                  |
| Oil Pollution<br>Equipment | Under<br>consideration | £4,470.00   | £4,470.00  | Purchase of Oil Spillage<br>Equipment                                              |
| Vanessa<br>Hairdresser     | Approved               | £1,083.00   | £1,083.00  | Fitting-out works<br>Purchase of equipment                                         |
| Urban Dance                | Under<br>consideration | £1,478.00   | £1,478.00  | Fitting out work<br>Purchase audio system                                          |
| Roots                      | Approved               | £4,995.00   | £4,975.00  | Building Works. Purchase<br>of equipment, payment of<br>Import Duty & Advertising. |

**ESF FUNDING**

|                             |                         |               |                         |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Focus 5504                  | ESF -                   | £40,725 (45%) | Wage Subsidy<br>Schemes |
|                             | GOG -                   | £49,775 (55%) |                         |
|                             |                         | -----         |                         |
|                             |                         | £90,500       |                         |
| Venia 2003                  | ESF -                   | £18,450 (45%) |                         |
|                             | GOG -                   | £22,550 (55%) |                         |
|                             |                         | -----         |                         |
|                             |                         | £41,000       |                         |
| Developing Line<br>Managers | ESF -                   | £70,488 (45%) |                         |
|                             | GOG -                   | £54,828 (35%) |                         |
|                             | Private<br>Contribution | £31,329 (20%) |                         |
|                             |                         | -----         |                         |
|                             |                         | £156,645      |                         |

(b) **Gibraltar Government Funding**

| Total Grant/Loan             | Sponsor                           | Purpose of Grant                                         | Status                 |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| £30,000 Loan                 | Everleigh Ltd                     | Purchase of furniture and equipment .<br>Advertising     | Approved               |
| £3,058 Grant<br>£5,500 Loan  | Dataworks Ltd                     | Purchase of equipment.<br>Working Capital                | Approved               |
| £12,164 Loan                 | Car Clinic Ltd                    | Purchase of equipment.<br>Fitting-out costs.             | Approved               |
| £15,676 Loan                 | James Molinary Ltd                | Fitting-out premises.                                    | Not proceeded with     |
| £10,000 Loan                 | Veramar Real Estate               | Working capital.                                         | Approved               |
| £5,000 Loan                  | Flymed Ltd                        | Feasibility Study.                                       | Approved               |
| £7,960 Grant<br>£10,000 Loan | Paperdash Ltd                     | Fitting-out costs.<br>Purchase of furniture and vehicles | Approved               |
| £7,000 Loan                  | Cotton Leisure Ltd                | Purchase of equipment.                                   | Approved               |
| £60,000 Grant                | Grand Parade<br>Feasibility Study | Geological<br>Survey/Topographical Survey                | Approved               |
| £2,000 Loan<br>£4,000 Grant  | They Went to War                  | Publication of book.                                     | Approved               |
| £23,500                      | Oil Pollution<br>Equipment        | Purchase of Equipment                                    | Under<br>consideration |
| £3,950                       | Urban Dance                       | Purchase of audio system                                 | Under<br>consideration |

**NO 1037 OF 2004****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****EU OBJECTIVE 2 PROJECTS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the expenditure met from the EU Objective 2 projects grant of £1,775,532.32 shown in the audited accounts of the Improvement and Development Fund for the financial year 2001/2002?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought in this question is handed over to the hon Member in a schedule giving the information requested.

**Objective 2 Projects**

| <b>Project(s)</b>                               | <b>£</b>            |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Business Advisory Unit                          | 62,321.11           |
| Technical Assistance 1997/1999                  | 22,586.72           |
| North Mole Industrial Park                      | 1,024,338.63        |
| Dolphin Discovery                               | 1,768.63            |
| Technical Assistance 2000/2006                  | 20,274.27           |
| Construction of a Joinery Workshop              | 24,947.09           |
| Moorish Castle Feasibility Study                | 18,685.00           |
| Gibraltar in Europe Business Development Scheme | 4,358.19            |
| Improvement to Construction Training Centre     | 4,900.00            |
| Amco (Gib) Ltd                                  | 7,784.35            |
| Small Grant Scheme 2000/2006                    | 9,674.34            |
| Laundry Service                                 | 1,687.28            |
| Film Team                                       | 20,421.50           |
| Rock Photos Ltd                                 | 1,405.51            |
| Charles G Trico                                 | 31,380.64           |
| <b>Total</b>                                    | <b>1,256,533.26</b> |

ORAL

NO 1038 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – CONFEX**

What was the cost to Government, with a breakdown, of attending CONFEX in February this year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 970, 971 and 1039 to 1043 of 2004

ORAL

NO 1039 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – CONFEX**

How many persons made up the official delegation to CONFEX and what posts do they hold?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 970, 971 and 1038 and 1040 to 1043 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1040 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – SEA TRADE**

What was the cost to Government, with a breakdown, of attending the Sea Trade in Miami in March?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 970, 971, 1038, 1039 and 1041 to 1043 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1041 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – SEA TRADE**

How many persons made up the Gibraltar Government delegation to Sea Trade in Miami and what posts do they hold?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 970, 971, 1038 to 1040, 1042 and 1043 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1042 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – STAMPEX**

How many persons made up the Gibraltar Government delegation to Stampex and what posts do they hold?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 970, 971, 1038 to 1041 and 1043 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1043 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – STAMPEX**

What was the cost to Government, with a breakdown, of attending the Stampex Exhibition in March?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information sought in this question is too voluminous to be read out in this House, therefore I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested.

## SCHEDULE

### Q1043 of 2004

#### **Q971 FITUR**

(a) Persons making up the delegation:

|                        |                                      |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Hon J J Holliday       | MTIC                                 |
| Peter Canessa          | CE, GTB                              |
| Marcello Sanguinetti   | Sales & Marketing Manager            |
| Dylan Ferrar           | Sales Co-Ordinator                   |
| Marie Gloria Macedo    | Marketing Co-Ordinator               |
| Kim Falzun             | Miss Gibraltar                       |
| Denise Devincenzi      | Madrid Office Administrator          |
| Gillaine de los Santos | Madrid office Marketing Co-Ordinator |

(b) Costs of the exhibition: £44,038

#### **Q970 London Boat Show**

(a) Persons making up the delegation:

|                |                             |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Peter Canessa  | CE, GTB                     |
| Albert Poggio  | Director, London Office     |
| Orlando Yeats  | Information Officer, London |
| Joanna Neish   | Information Officer, London |
| Ian Leyde      | UK Sales Manager            |
| Tracey Poggio  | Red Leaf Associates         |
| Jenny Franklin | Information Officer, London |

(b) Costs of the exhibition: £30,986

#### **Q1038 and 1039 CONFEX**

(a) Persons making up the delegation:

|                  |                              |
|------------------|------------------------------|
| Hon J J Holliday | MTIC                         |
| Peter Canessa    | CE, GTB                      |
| Ian Leyde        | UK Sales Manager             |
| Orlando Yeats    | Information Officers, London |
| Joanna Neish     | Information Officers, London |
| Tracey Poggio    | GTB PR Consultant            |

(b) Breakdown of costs of the exhibition:

|                |           |
|----------------|-----------|
| Stand          | £8,940.79 |
| Equipment hire | £ 124.55  |
|                | -----     |
|                | £9,065.34 |

#### **Q1040 and 1041 SEA TRADE, MIAMI**

(a) Persons making up the delegation:

|               |                         |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| Albert Poggio | Director, London Office |
| Tony Davis    | CE, Port Authority      |
| Peter Canessa | CE, GTB                 |
| N Guerrero    | Product Manager, GTB    |

(b) Breakdown of costs of the exhibitions:

|                        | £                 |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| Stand                  | 12,067.07         |
| Flights                | 7,383.80          |
| Hotel                  | 1,101.75          |
| Taxis                  | 142.08            |
| Delivery of literature | 115.05            |
| Subsistence            | 1,199.61          |
| Conference persons     | 66.86             |
|                        | -----             |
|                        | <b>£22,673.22</b> |
|                        | -----             |

**Q1042 STAMPEX**

(a) Persons making up the delegation:

|                  |                             |
|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Richard Garcia   | CE, MTIC                    |
| Anne Montegriffo | Information Officer, London |

(b) Breakdown of costs of the exhibition:

|                                                               |                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Flight                                                        | £180.00          |
| Subsistence                                                   | £256.08          |
| Hotel                                                         | £430.00          |
| Expenses in mounting exhibition and<br>delivery of literature | £104.25          |
| Travel expenses                                               | £ 34.20          |
|                                                               | -----            |
|                                                               | <b>£1,004.53</b> |
|                                                               | -----            |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 970, 971, 1038 TO 1041 AND 1043 OF  
2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I recall correctly, this is in relation to the Seatrade in Miami. In the past there used to be three persons making up the Gibraltar delegation, this time there are four. Is there any specific reason as to why that is the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, apart from the fact that for example, Mr Albert Poggio goes not just representing Gibraltar but he actually does functions within Medcruise where there are several meetings and things. Tony Davies is the one that basically attends the conference that is held in Miami, where issues in relation to the industry are discussed and then two other people, Peter Canessa and Nicky Guerrero both man the stand from the early hours of the morning to late at night, during the duration of the conference.

ORAL

NO 1044 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – CONFERENCES SPONSORED**

Can Government list the conferences that they have assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored since January 2004 inclusive, showing the dates of the conferences in question?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

There have been none.



**NO 1045 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – UNFAIR COMPETITION**

What measures do Government intend to take to curb unfair competition against established local traders?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The question does not identify the unfair competition to which the hon Member believes local traders are subject to and from whom.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1045 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The annual reports and the public comments of both the Chamber and the Federation of Small Businesses refer to this unfair competition which they feel they are having from cross-frontier tradesmen, and that is obviously what I am referring to given that the issue has been topical and has been raised in the media.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think that the hon Member should ask the Federation and the Chamber for details of this.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

No, the question refers to what action the Government intend to take, not the Chamber.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government know that there are tradesmen coming through the border. It is not the Government's intention to do anything specific about them. The Government's policy for what we call unfair competition, this is why it depends on whose terminology one is borrowing, different parties use the phrase 'unfair competition' to

describe different things. The Government's approach to unfair competition is not to allow Spanish businesses facilities in Gibraltar which Gibraltar businesses are not allowed in Spain. For example, in the port, there is a regime applicable for who can go to do work in a port in Spain, there is paperwork that one needs, we do not think that our port should therefore be more liberally run so that Spanish companies can do work in our port but our companies cannot reciprocate in the Algeciras port. That is what we mean by unfair competition. There are areas where the Government are working in relation to the haulage industry, where our system is so much more liberal than the neighbouring market system that our market is in effect open to them but theirs is not open to us. That is what the Government mean by unfair competition and in those areas, there is not a sort of one cure for all, the requirements of each area need to be separately looked at and sort of a tailor-made solution found. Amongst the areas that the Government are working on, as far as I am aware, is not included the fact that tradesmen come across the border to do their trades. That is very difficult to police. If the Chamber and the Federation of Small Businesses have specific proposals about abuses of that and how those might be addressed, I am not saying the Government would not look at them but this is not something that the Government themselves are working on as a matter of policy initiative.

**NO 1046 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**UPPER ROCK – ROAD MAINTENANCE**

Can Government state what is the position regarding road maintenance on the Upper Rock generally, including Signal Hill?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The roads on the Upper Rock are checked periodically and appropriate maintenance work is carried out whenever it is necessary on the main roads. Certain other roads such as Signal Hill Road are not in the ordinary course open to vehicular traffic. If there is a problem identified on such roads it receives a low priority in terms of repairs.

**NO 1047 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**UPPER ROCK – CLEANING OF SLOPES**

Has the contract award for the cleaning of the slopes of the Upper Rock now been extended beyond the original five months?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1047 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So can the Minister say who is cleaning the Upper Rock slopes at present when they need to be cleaned?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The previous contractor terminated at the end of March and we were waiting to see the sort of budget that would be available for Upper Rock maintenance in order to decide what sort of contract we can enter and what its intensity can be.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has the Minister now been able to review that position and establish what the nature of the contracts will be?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, but the Product Manager of the Gibraltar Tourist Board I know is now actively pursuing this and I believe I already have some proposals on my desk for me to consider.

**NO 1048 OF 2004****THE HON L A RANDALL****UPPER ROCK – NATURE RESERVE**

Can Government state what is the level of arrears due as at 31st December 2003 by concessionaires in respect of admission fees to the Upper Rock Nature Reserve?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought in this question is too voluminous to be read out in this House, and therefore I hand the hon Member a table giving the information requested in the question.

**SCHEDULE****ARREARS IN RESPECT OF UPPER ROCK ADMISSIONS AS AT 31<sup>ST</sup> DECEMBER 2003**

| <b>DEBTOR</b>                          | <b>AMOUNT OWED</b> |
|----------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Smith Imossi & Co Ltd                  | £6,048.00          |
| Inchcape Shipping Ltd                  | £3,967.00          |
| Hercules Millennium Travel             | £285,014.00        |
| Persian Rose                           | £46,821.00         |
| Calypso Tours Limited                  | £96,594.00         |
| M H Bland Ltd                          | £86,466.00         |
| M H Bland Ltd (Royalty)                | £13,139.50         |
| M H Bland Ltd (Royalty Sites)          | £34,714.00         |
| M H Bland Ltd (Tour Operators Royalty) | £4,266.50          |
| Bland Ltd                              | £41,544.00         |
| George Bamby                           | £19.20             |
| Gibraltar Taxi Association             | £268.00            |
| <b>Total</b>                           | <b>£618,861.20</b> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1048 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In his report for 2001/2002 the Auditor expressed concern that the two worse cases owed circa £300,000. It appears from the figures provided that there has been no improvement on this level of arrears. The arrears for the two worst is something in the region of £380,000 now.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There is one particular operator which has not improved its situation. That is correct. However, the matter is being tackled and will hopefully be solved soon.

ORAL

**NO 1049 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PORT – BUNKERING**

Can Government say how many companies are currently licenced to carry out bunkering and are any of them exempt or qualifying companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1050 of 2004.

**NO 1050 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING**

Have any new applications for a bunkering licence been made during 2004 and have any new licences been issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

**Answer to Question No. 1049 of 2004**

Five Companies are licensed bunker operators. Of these, one is an exempt company.

**Answer to Question No. 1050 of 2004**

No new applications for bunkering licences have been made during 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1049 AND 1050 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it that the other four are not qualifying companies, is that correct?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the other four find it commercially viable to be on the normal tax regime, there would not appear to be a need as an incentive to give people exempt company status then.



ORAL

NO 1051 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT – BUNKERING**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar this year to date on a monthly basis for bunkering and how many tonnes of bunker fuel were sold each month?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1068 of 2004.

**NO 1052 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SHIP ARRESTS**

How much revenue did Government receive, with a breakdown, as a result of the arrest in Gibraltar earlier this year of a number of Festival cruise ships?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The amount collected was £36,058 as follows:-

|          |                  |         |
|----------|------------------|---------|
| Bolero   | Tonnage Dues     | £ 1,920 |
|          | Berthing Charges | £18,464 |
| Azur     | Tonnage Dues     | £ 1,640 |
|          | Berthing Charges | £13,464 |
| Flamenco | Tonnage Dues     | £ 570   |
|          | Berthing Charges | none    |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1052 OF 2004**

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can we just clarify to make sure that we are not at cross purposes with the question and the answer. I do not know if these ships were sold by the Admiralty Marshal like the other ones, he will have seen from the answer that it will not include the commission the Government's share of the port poundage. I do not know if they have been sold yet, they have been sold. I do not know if the Government have collected their share or not but in either case it is not included in the answer he has been given. So this has been answered as if it were port revenue rather than Government revenue.

ORAL

**NO 1053 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – DREDGING OF WESTERN ARM**

How many tenderers bid for the dredging works at the Western Arm of the Port that will be needed in order to accommodate the Queen Mary II, listing the amount bid by each and showing which sum was bid by the successful tenderer?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1054 of 2004.

**NO 1054 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – DREDGING OF WESTERN ARM**

Can Government say whether the dredging at the Western Arm of the Port that will be needed to accommodate the Queen Mary II is now complete?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The dredging at the Western Arm is not complete. Indeed it has not begun. The Government do not publish information such as the question seeks in relation to tenders, until a tender has been awarded.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1053 TO 1054 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If the dredging is not complete, where does that leave the call by the Queen Mary which I understand is due to take place fairly soon?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We are in contact at the moment with Cunard looking at possible options that are open to us, which include the anchoring in the Bay and the tendering of passengers through the port, the actual berthing along the South Mole and actually the possibility of just a technical call into Gibraltar without any disembarking.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that the tender was advertised at the beginning of January and that we are now in May, can the Minister say why there has been such a delay in this?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not a question of delay, the costs of those works are substantially in excess of £1 million. The Queen Mary II has been built and acquired by its owners for trans-Atlantic trade. In its trans-Atlantic trade it will not be coming anywhere near Gibraltar.

It is coming to the Mediterranean once, as a one off thing in connection I believe with the Olympic Games or something. The number of visits scheduled to Gibraltar, I understand, are two or three and to boot half day visits. In future years, it is likely that she will not visit at all or if she did it will be once and the Government are considering whether the economic activity that would flow from that degree of use by the Queen Mary II of the Port of Gibraltar, justifies incurring an expenditure of I think nearly £1.3 million, is the cost of the works. A lot of technical issues involved and frankly, we have decided not to proceed with it. This would be a long-term developmental thing. The Queen Mary II can either not come, can come and not come alongside or can come in alongside at the South Mole where there is depth for her there we understand. Frankly, we do not think that it is worth spending in a rush, with the Government prioritising their capital investment programmes we do not think it is worth spending £1.3 million to facilitate two half-day visits by the Queen Mary II.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I assume that the reason why they do not want to use the South Mole is because there is no cruise liner terminal in that area. Were Cunard as the ship owners or the operators given the impression that the ship would be docking in Gibraltar, because I understand it has been included in all the relevant literature and is part of the cruise itinerary. If they were under that impression then where does this leave us with one of the major cruise operators? We are already having enough problems with Spain in order to shoot ourselves in the foot at the same time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That decision by Cunard, or that publicity or that assumption by Cunard was not based on any Government promise to dredge or to dredge by time. It was based on their assumption that the existing facility could take them. Now, the existing facility cannot take them, it is up to them whether they wish to make use of such of Gibraltar's facilities as can take them, the South Mole, anchoring as they do for example when all these cruise ships go to Monaco. They do not come alongside, passengers get tendered ashore. That is their choice but frankly, our view is that there are more urgent things for Government to spend £1.3 million on than two half-day visits in the foreseeable future by the Queen Mary II. In an ideal world of course, it may be future port development may include this project but given that the demand for this is really just this one ship, which is not for the Mediterranean route anyway, it is not going to be a regular client of Gibraltar in its cruising itinerary, it is certainly not a priority for the Government.

ORAL

NO 1055 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOURISM – CRUISE LINER TERMINAL**

Can Government say whether and when there has been rainwater penetration at the Cruise Liner Terminal?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

There was rainwater penetration problem which began three years ago, and that has now been rectified.

ORAL

NO 1056 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government list the topics that were discussed at the first meeting of the Port Advisory Council?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Government do not consider it appropriate to do so.

**NO 1057 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**TRANSFER OF BOATS TO COALING ISLAND**

Can the Government now confirm when they can expect to transfer the boats at Western Beach to the area of Coaling Island, something they promised to do four years ago?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government did not promise to transfer the boats four years ago. The Government promised four years ago to transfer the boats when it became possible to obtain the transfer of the site from MOD.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1057 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When do the Government expect the site to be transferred to the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, as the hon Lady will have read in the newspapers, the excellent land transfer deal that we have recently signed with the MOD includes, by way of ratification in this respect, because that element of it had already been agreed in principle, the transfer of the Coaling Island Basin in exchange for a relocation of the yellow and black units, MSG units to Gun Wharf. That is at an advanced stage, the re-provision works have been designed and I think have either gone out or about to go out to tender, or are being costed by JBS, the work is about to begin.



**NO 1058 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PORT DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state whether the outstanding grievances with the employees of the Port Department have now been resolved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Government are not aware of the outstanding grievances to which the hon Member may be referring. Government are in discussions with Port Department staff about their possible transfer to a statutory Port Authority.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1058 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Those were the grievances I referred to.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not a grievance. If the hon Member meant to ask how the negotiation is going for the Port Authority, it would be the same answer that the hon Lady got in respect of the Sports Authority except that these are more advanced. There have been meetings about this, it is just that the negotiations have not concluded.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Perhaps one should ask the people working at the Port Department whether they consider them to be grievances or not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member can ask whoever he likes and if he simply adopts the language of other people and adopts them as his own, then the problem is his not ours. It is not a grievance. These guys do not have a right to join a Port Authority just as we do not have a right to demand that they join an Authority. It is a negotiation, it is not a

grievance. Nobody can have a grievance, it would be quite unusual for somebody to have a grievance about not being allowed to leave Government Service. That would be a turn out for the books, I suppose it is possible. So it is not a grievance, there are negotiations in which each side has aspirations and red lines and, as in all negotiations, there is a tension within the negotiation as to which side achieves, how many and to what extent. That is not a grievance, it is just a normal cut and thrust of a negotiating process.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say whether the grievance that there was about the use of a security company has been resolved, because that was a grievance?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, it has been resolved in the sense that the Government's position has been accepted. It was never actually a grievance, this was not a service that the Government had ever provided in the Port. There was no privatisation of an existing service. The Government made it perfectly clear that they were never willing to entertain the provision of those services from directly employed labour and I am sure that the staff would have preferred it, one knows Unions always like staff to be directly engaged by the Government. I am sure they would have preferred it otherwise but it is no longer a live issue.

ORAL

NO 1059 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT DEPARTMENT**

Can Government say whether the vacancy or vacancies for the post of Seaman/Mechanic in the Port Department advertised on 5 March have now been filled?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1060 and 1061 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1060 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT DEPARTMENT**

How many persons applied for the post of Seaman/Mechanic in the Port Department advertised on 5 March and how many vacancies were there?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1059 and 1061 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1061 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT DEPARTMENT**

Can Government say of those who applied for the post of Seaman/Mechanic in the Port Department how many were from within the Government service, how many were unemployed and how many were already employed elsewhere?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The single vacancy in question has not yet been filled. There were six applicants for the post. One applicant is in Government service, the other five are employed elsewhere. No unemployed person applied for this job.

**NO 1062 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**COMPUTER HACKING**

Can Government say at what stage is the production of computer misuse legislation to outlaw hacking of computers in or from Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I am not aware that such legislation is at any stage of production.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1062 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

During the debate on the Data Protection legislation that we had in this House, I remember the Chief Minister mentioning that this was something that was in the pipeline. This is why the question was tabled. Can the Minister then clarify that remark?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The fact that it is in the pipeline does not mean that it is at any stage of production.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Perhaps as my hon Colleague has said, it depends on the length of the pipeline, but surely we understand that this is something the Government intend to do. It is the something the Opposition take a very serious view of this. We think that it is part of the package of data protection, indeed it is a requirement of some of the directives that we have already implemented in this House in relation to electronic commerce and electronic signatures, that there should be anti-hacking computer misuse protection laws in place as well. So can the Government commit themselves to introduce this legislation, and can the Minister please find out at what stage this is?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I assume that this will be forthcoming. However, what I can assure the hon Gentleman is that the drafting of this legislation has not yet begun.

ORAL

NO 1063 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**INTERNET SERVICES**

Can Government say how many internet connections there were in Gibraltar as at 31 March 2004, indicating how many were dial-up and how many ADSL?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1064 of 2004.



**NO 1064 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INTERNET SERVICES**

Have Government urged Gibtelecom to make its telephone services like ADSL and internet more competitive and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Figures provided by the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority show that the total number of internet connections as at 31 March 2004 was 6017 broken down as follows: 5028 were dial-up and 989 ADSL. The Government constantly encourages Gibtelecom to lower its charges as much as possible, consistent with its reasonable commercial interests. I do not know what the hon Member means by "more competitive". Gibtelecom ADSL and internet services are competitive in the local market.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1063 TO 1064 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I will clarify what I mean by being competitive. In relation to for example, an examination that I remember conducting of the price of the same service in similar territories the size of Gibraltar, I remember looking at the Channel Islands, the price of the same service there was much cheaper. So while they may be competitive in the local market in which they have a near monopolistic share, they are certainly not competitive compared to other parts of Europe. Does the Minister not agree?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Chairman of Gibtelecom, sitting a few chairs away, share that view?

**HON F VINET:**

As the hon Member will know it is not Government practice to comment on matters relating to Gibtelecom as a company. I can however say that the price structure of ADSL services has been reviewed and an announcement will be made very shortly.

**NO 1065 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS SECTOR**

Can Government state the date on which they now propose to transpose into Gibraltar law the new EU Regulatory framework for the electronic communications sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

As I said in reply to Question No. 291 of 2004, work on the transposition of the new regulatory package is at a very advanced stage and is expected to be completed in the first half of this year. There has been a slight delay in the finalisation of the drafts, but the Government still intend to implement the directives this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1065 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I take it that they will now be transposed by the end of June 2004.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I have already answered that question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has the Minister said that it is still expected to happen in the first half of the year? I thought he said it had been delayed.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

What I have said is that work on the transposition of the new regulatory package is at an advanced stage and expected to be completed in the first half of the year. Then I said that the Government still intend to implement the directive this year.

**NO 1066 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**e-EUROPE 2005**

Can Government state whether they have now filed with the European Commission their intentions regarding the switchover from analogue to digital TV as part of Action Plan eEurope 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1066 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

When do Government plan to do this, seeing that the date for the filing was end of 2003?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The GRA will shortly be drawing up a paper for Ministers, on options for the change over from analogue to digital broadcasting. The GRA is responsible for the management of the radio frequency spectrum, so therefore this should happen shortly.

**NO 1067 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**REFERENCE INTERCONNECT OFFER 'RIO'**

Can Government state whether the reference interconnect offer ('RIO') was revised in January 2004, and if not, when do they expect RIO to be revised by?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Under the provisions of the Telecommunications (Interconnection) Regulations 2001, it is the duty of the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority to ensure that a Reference Interconnect Offer 'RIO' is provided by certain telecommunications operators and it is to the GRA that the operators are answerable. The information requested should be sought from the GRA.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1067 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it that the Government do not know what the answer is?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

As I have said in the answer, the information should be requested and sought from the GRA.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, I have asked in the supplementary is it that the Minister does not know or that he does not want to tell us? Which of the two?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I do not know.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Government are aware that the reason for the question is that they actually stated in their last report that it would be done by this date. That is why we are asking whether it has happened. In the last report from the Regulator, it said this would be revised in January 2004. We would like to know if it has happened?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know what any of this is all about, it is all technical, beyond me but, as can be seen in another question the Government are particularly keen not to be drawn one issue at a time into accounting in this House for the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority. If the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority as a concept is going to work, given the directives in which it is involved that require independence from the Government as a matter of legal requirement, it is vital that the GRA, which in fact is not an agency controlled by the Government, should not be seen to be because the Government accounts for its business in the House. Now, of course, if it is a matter of legislation that is another matter. I do not know if this requires legislation to introduce it or not but if it is a regulatory matter we would much prefer that the hon Members deal directly with the Regulator about it. That way signalling that the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority is not an arm of Government so to speak.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Certainly, we will pursue that avenue that has been suggested by the Government, but the only thing is, are the Government not conscious of the fact that this is not something that the Regulator has to do, this is something that Gibtel has to do and submit to the Regulator. So what the Regulator was saying was by January 2004 Gibtel has to produce a Reference Interconnect Offer. We can ask the Regulator whether he has received it but obviously we can also ask the Chairman of Gibtel whether he has actually sent it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the question is formulated in that way I think the answer is that an extension has been given to the company to send. I mean, answering as the company not as the Regulator, an extension has been given I understand until September.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the answer is, to the original question, that it was not revised and that the company requested an extension and obtained it. Is that the correct answer to the original question?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Following discussions with Gibtel the GRA accepted the accounting separation report which was based on historical costs, but instructed the company to prepare a new report based on current cost to reflect costs more accurately and therefore they have been given until September 2004 to re-submit that.

ORAL

NO 1068 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT – SHIP CALLS**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar this year to date on a monthly basis for:

- (a) repair;
- (b) cargo?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information sought by the hon Member is sensitive and I am happy to give this to him on a confidential and private basis, but not for the record.

**SCHEDULE**

**Q1051 and Q1068**

**VESSELS CALLING AT GIBRALTAR, JANUARY – MARCH 2004**

|               | <b>Purpose of Call</b> |              |                |
|---------------|------------------------|--------------|----------------|
|               | <b>Repairs</b>         | <b>Cargo</b> | <b>Bunkers</b> |
| January 2004  | 9                      | 7            | 415            |
| February 2004 | 5                      | 8            | 388            |
| March 2004    | 11                     | 10           | 433            |

**VOLUME OF BUNKERS SOLD**

| <b><u>Months</u></b> | <b><u>Tonnes</u></b> |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| January 2004         | 294,293              |
| February 2004        | 289,750              |
| March 2004           | 306,283              |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1068 OF 2004**

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If I could just add to that, the hon Member may have noticed moves by neighbouring ports and Algeciras especially taking a very keen interest in volumes and number of ships movements, Government are very happy for the hon Member to know the information but we just do not see why we should publish it in a way which helps people who do not have Gibraltar's interests at heart.

ORAL

NO 1069 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY WEBSITE**

What was the cost of translating parts of the Tercentenary website into Spanish and who carried out the translation?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

No part of the Tercentenary website has been translated into Spanish.

ORAL

**NO 1070 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY COMMITTEE**

How often and on what dates has the Tercentenary Committee met since it was set up?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

On nine occasions as follows:

9<sup>th</sup> January 2003  
31<sup>st</sup> January 2003  
14<sup>th</sup> February 2003  
6<sup>th</sup> March 2003  
20<sup>th</sup> March 2003  
15<sup>th</sup> April 2003  
5<sup>th</sup> May 2003  
19<sup>th</sup> May 2003  
2<sup>nd</sup> June 2003

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1070 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has the Tercentenary Committee met in 2004?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister explain why the Tercentenary Committee has not met on the year of the tercentenary?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, the purpose and objective of the Tercentenary Committee when it was set up in January 2003 was to advise Government on the sort of activities that would be put into the programme during the year 2004. The purpose of this was to receive input from a number of sectors, be it in the area of culture, sports, et cetera and once the advice of this main committee had been obtained and a draft programme put in place, the purpose of the main Tercentenary Committee was no longer of need. There have been sub-committees that were set up as a result of this Tercentenary Committee, and these have continued to meet and have been on-going during all this time and in fact continue to meet to monitor the different areas and activities that are going to be held during the year.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Have the events or recommendations which were drawn up as a result of this Committee been changed since the Committee was dissolved?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There have been changes in terms of detail but not in terms of substance.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does that mean that the calendar or the programme of events, for example today will be the same as at the beginning of the year?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, it will not have been the same because as I said, in the terms of the detail of it there have been changes and in fact there will continue to be changes as the programme evolves. The fact is that an event may be concluded as being something that we wish to proceed with but then there may have been changes in the actual detail or in terms of dates, and terms of events, venues et cetera. That is the whole purpose of having the website which is updated constantly, in order to have the members of the public fully informed as to what is the latest information on events as the programme progresses.

ORAL

NO 1071 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY COMMITTEE**

How many companies has the Tercentenary Committee written to requesting donations or sponsorship and with what result?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1072 of 2004.

**NO 1072 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY COMMITTEE**

Can Government say for what purpose or specific events are the donations or sponsorship requested by the Tercentenary Committee required?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Tercentenary Committee has not written to anybody requesting sponsorship. This has been done verbally. The sponsorship is not being allocated to specific events. All sponsorship received will be used to complement the Government's investment in the year's celebration events.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1071 AND 1072 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There are, I understand, letters that have been written requesting funding for the tercentenary. They may not have been written by the Committee because the Committee has been dissolved. Who were the letters written by and in what capacity were they signed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, a sub-committee of the main committee was formed to look after sponsorship, and that comprised of some officials and two of the original main committee members. I know that they were tasked with the responsibility of trying to seek sponsorship from a number of firms and there may have been an element of information being sent as to what sort of events they could aspire to in terms of advertising and value for money in terms of advertising in return for their sponsorship money, but there was not any official letter that was sent out to companies seeking their support.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In terms of the results of those requests for funding, how was the business community that was targeted responding?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We have had 15 positive replies for main sponsorship of the events.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In terms of actual amounts of money do we know what the sum is?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

These companies were asked for £25,000 to become a main sponsor and 14 of these agreed to that, because initially we started offering two levels of sponsorship, main sponsorship and minor sponsorship. We have had 14 main sponsors and one minor sponsor.

**NO 1073 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

On what date are the Rolling Stones scheduled to play in Gibraltar as part of the Tercentenary celebrations and at what cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Rolling Stones are not scheduled to play in Gibraltar.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1073 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Were they ever approached or considered in this capacity?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, not that I am aware of.



ORAL

**NO 1074 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What "Super Stars" are being considered or have been booked for the Tercentenary Super Star Event at the Victoria Stadium on 17-19 December this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1075 to 1082 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1075 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

Can Government list the "superstar artiste" or artistes who have been considered for the Tercentenary Rock Concert giving reasons why each of them can or cannot perform in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1074 and 1076 to 1082 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1076 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

Can Government list the "superstar artiste" or artistes who have been considered for the Tercentenary Rock Concert showing the fees asked for by each in order to perform in Gibraltar?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1074, 1075 and 1077 to 1082 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1077 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What is the projected/budgeted cost, with a breakdown, of the Tercentenary Rock Concert?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1074 to 1076 and 1078 to 1082 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1078 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

Can Government give the date when the Tercentenary Rock Concert will take place and who will be the star attraction?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1074 to 1077 and 1079 to 1082 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1079 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What is the projected cost, with a breakdown, of the Tercentenary Classical Concert?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1074 to 1078 and 1080 to 1082 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1080 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

Can Government confirm the date, time and venue of the Tercentenary Classical Concert?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1074 to 1079, 1081 and 1082 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1081 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What will be the venue, date and time of the Exhibition of Ecclesiastical Treasures planned as part of the Tercentenary celebrations?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1074 to 1080 and 1082 of 2004.



**NO 1082 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

Can Government confirm the date time and venue of the Tercentenary Local Talent Variety Show?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No "super stars" have been booked for the December event as this is a local event for Gibraltarian sportsmen and women. It is not appropriate to publish information about Artistes' that have been considered. Negotiations are presently under way for a concert by a particular artiste, and that artiste will be made public when and if it materialises. As a decision has not yet been taken on the superstar artiste, the issue of not being able to perform in Gibraltar does not arise.

There is no definite projected cost of the Tercentenary Rock Concert or the Classical Concert as this will depend on the fees charged by the artiste chosen. The choice of date for the Tercentenary Rock Concert, the classical Concert and the local talent variety show have yet to be finally decided. The identity of the star attraction for the Rock Concert cannot be revealed until negotiations are complete, as this may prejudice the discussions.

The venue, date and time of the exhibition of Ecclesiastical Treasures is under discussion with representatives of the various religious denominations who have expressed an interest in participating in this event.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1074 TO 1082 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Minister not consider that given that we are already five months into the tercentenary year, many of these issues should have been sewn up much earlier, in relation to dates of exhibitions, artistes who are going to be performing, the budgets for classical concerts, the Rock Concert, the star who will be in the Rock Concert, practically the answer to every question has been that negotiations are under way or that no decision has been taken. Should this all have not been sewn up much earlier?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

An announcement will shortly be made in respect of all these.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I asked the question in relation to obviously the tourist aspect, if there are going to be charter flights or coaches or tour operators, we will need time to organise these things, hotels will need notice. Surely it makes sense to sort these things out with a considerable amount of time so that it can be properly marketed and advertised and attract more visitors to Gibraltar, which is the object of the exercise. Does the Minister not agree?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The purpose of these events are not for tourists. Our main interest in this is obviously the local community.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I recall correctly, was there not some type of a statement made that we were expecting so many visitors to Gibraltar in the tercentenary year that we may even have to bring in two cruise ships to cope with the numbers? While I accept that primarily this is an event for the people of Gibraltar to participate in and to enjoy, given what we are celebrating, surely it would make sense to have a tourism or a marketing aspect at the same time, whereby it would attract people to come here to stay in our hotels, eat in our restaurants and spend money in our shops. For that to happen people need to have dates, times, venues and plenty of notice of what is going to go on. That is certainly not the case at the moment. I looked at the website of the tercentenary and on many of these major events for example, like the Rock Concert or like the Variety Show, the Classical Concert, all it says is 'to be confirmed', the venue, the time to be confirmed and even the artiste to be confirmed. I think it is totally unacceptable that at this stage in the tercentenary year, we should still be waiting for these things to be announced. Do the Government not agree?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not really. There are different sorts of events for different sorts of audiences. When the Government put that agenda on the website, it was made perfectly clear that it was an incremental agenda. In other words, as the agenda developed, information would be put on the website and the principal purpose of putting on the website was for local purposes. In other words, clubs and organisations that wanted to themselves organise events, would have some idea of what dates were available and what dates were vacant or taken so that people would have an idea of how the calendar was filling up during the year's worth of events of many different kinds. There is a great deal of interest that has been shown in visiting Gibraltar in relation to the principal military tercentenary event, which is the granting of the Freedom of the City to the Royal Navy. For the rest of events, certainly as far as the Government are concerned, the cultural events are for the benefit of the local community. Obviously people will come, they are very welcome but we are not staging a concert for the entertainment principally of visitors. We are staging cultural events to celebrate the

tercentenary principally as a local community celebration. Now, it is true that the fact that it is Gibraltar Tercentenary Year, does provide a prop generally for the tourism flavour of the year so to speak in terms of tourism marketing, and that different types of potential visitor to Gibraltar have an interest in different types of events, and if they are interested in coming to Gibraltar because it is Tercentenary Year and their interest is prodded by that, then they will pick the time of the year when there are events of the sort that they want. The main one in terms of foreign visitors will be the military connection and retired people and all that, is the 4<sup>th</sup> August event and indeed that is that week, that 10 day period is the principal part of the year for us locally here as well, but the organisation of a major musical event is intended as a local thing, not as a tourist attraction. Principally, obviously if it has the effect of attracting visitors too, fine.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I understand what the Chief Minister has said but I certainly do think that the fact that these events for example, if there is a super star coming to have a rock concert in Gibraltar it is something which is capable of attracting a far wider audience than purely people in Gibraltar themselves, who are the primary beneficiaries of the events and on whose behalf the money will be spent, but I certainly think the marketing aspect of the Tercentenary, given what the Government have said, is totally inadequate. I know they have studied this, for example, if they want taxis et cetera, the new logo, the tercentenary logo, which indicates that there is some kind of intention to advertise the tercentenary for tourism marketing purposes, but at present I think it would be in everybody's interest that things are announced as quickly as possible so everybody knows, both locally and people who may be interested in coming from abroad, that they know what is going on, who will be coming and when they will be performing and the sooner that happens the best it will be from a marketing point of view.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think there is a difference of focus and approach here. Certainly from the Government's point of view the fact that it is Gibraltar's Tercentenary is something which is valuable that people abroad should know. It is not just an important event in our history in terms of chronology of time, it is also a very useful political prop in terms of our general political campaigning. It is another issue around which Gibraltar's supporters can focus, tercentenary year. Certainly there has been no shortage of publicity for the fact that it is Gibraltar's tercentenary year and that event has received plenty of publicity, as the hon Member has said, it is a focal point of the taxis et cetera and the books being issued and widely circulated, cufflinks and all sorts of things, simply to highlight the fact that it is the tercentenary year. Now, the hon Member appears to be extending that principle to the actual plethora of events that take place, everything from individual sporting associations organising special tercentenary events, all the way through some of the more political events, to the cultural events to the military events. The hon Member appears to be taking the view that each of those events is also for the purposes of attracting visitors to Gibraltar, and of course they may or may not attract people to Gibraltar but from the Government's point of view, the focus of events as opposed to the fact that it is the tercentenary year, is an internal commemoration of an important landmark in our history, the passage of 300 years of time in this community and their formation. Therefore it is principally for local enjoyment, for local celebration and for local consumption, which is not to say that to the extent that it is also capable of being

used to attract visitors, then that is an additional benefit but the hon Member seems to be focusing the events directly as if they were a marketing tool. The events as such, all the various celebratory events, they themselves are not marketing tools. The marketing tool is the fact that it is Gibraltar's tercentenary but the events themselves, obviously except for the ones that we held in London, are very much for local celebration. That is why they are spread throughout the community at almost every level of activity. So, I hear what the hon Member says about what he thinks of the marketing job but I think his assessment may be based on the fact that he seems to be using these events for a slightly different purpose to the one that the Government are actually using them for. Having said all of that, there is an event, the Freedom of the City, that has attracted a lot of interest, obviously from retired people from the Navy and people that have served in Gibraltar in the past, and we are expecting quite a lot of visitors around that time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just say that the Chief Minister rightly says that this is principally a celebration for the people of Gibraltar and it is right that that should be so, although I of course share my hon Friend's views that we can use this more effectively as an international marketing tool, but the fact that these events are seen by the Government principally as events for the people of Gibraltar does not exonerate the Government, surely, from planning these events properly and with time, and that decisions should already have been made about who the artistes are, when events are going to be held, so that Gibraltarians also can plan their own calendar of events and agenda around the events that are going to take place in Gibraltar. I think that the most important point to take, that is my first point, the second point is this. Sometimes we tell things in this House, both in the sessions in which I have been a Member of this House and in earlier sessions, which are either specifically giving us statements to one effect or designed to give us an impression in one particular direction, which then turn out to be completely different. In fact I was this morning greatly surprised to read in the Gibraltar Magazine for example, that the Hon Mr Holliday seems to have told a journalist that the dredging works in respect of the Queen Mary II had already began, and he is quoted as saying that. Whilst in this House we were yesterday told something completely different. So I think that there are two points to be made and I wonder whether the Chief Minister would care to comment on them. First, that even though these plans are for essentially a Gibraltarian audience and market, that does not exonerate the Government from effective and careful planning of those events. Secondly, that the Government should be circumspect about what they say in this House and ensure that they do not mislead the House or parties outside the House, of what the Government's plans are.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not intend to address the second part of the hon Member's question which I think is entirely inopportune. First of all the hon Member assumes that the journalist is correctly reported. Secondly he brings to this House journalistic reports as if they were facts, and on the basis of it actually uses the words misleading this House. Well, I do not intend to engage the hon Member in a debate on that issue. Suffice it to say that in my opinion it is important for both sides of the House to always be true to the facts when they are addressing this House. Frankly in my view, if we were to run a league table of who infringes that rule more frequently, I suggest quite strongly that the hon Members would top it with flying colours. As to the first part of his question, which is an entirely appropriate issue for the hon Member to press the

Government on, of course he is right except that we do not agree with the underlying premise of his question, which is that we think that these things are being effectively and opportunely organised. The fact that the hon Members who of course, as they criticise each and everything that the Government do, whether it is the new buses, or whether it is the hospital, or whether it is the Theatre Royal, or as they criticise each and everything that the Government do, as far as the hon Members are concerned the Government do everything badly and wrong and absolutely nothing well. Of course it seems to be their political strategy to actually undermine and criticise everything that the Government do, never acknowledging that anything is done even half well. I take this remark in the same context. I take note of the fact that the hon Member thinks that the Government have not opportunely and effectively organised the events in relation to the tercentenary, and I assert the contrary. Therefore that is where the matters lie. The fact that the hon Members assert things does not make them facts or correct, in fact almost always they are not.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just rise in relation to those three issues that the Chief Minister has identified as evidence of the fact that we tend to criticise the Government at every turn hoping to see the Government fail. I think that that really is quite unfair. The Opposition are here to do a job and are doing it as best they can. I think we are doing an effective job but let me take those three examples. First of all the hospital. The Chief Minister promised the people of Gibraltar a new hospital by 2003. The people of Gibraltar did not have a new hospital by 2003. The Chief Minister promised the people of Gibraltar a bus service which Gibraltar deserved. Of course Gibraltar needed a new bus service and of course the Opposition will hope to see the bus service that has been provided flourish, despite the fact that we have to put that bus service under the microscope and ensure that Government expenditure has been incurred properly. That is what we are here for, that is why the Western parliamentary democracy has an Opposition for. In relation to the Theatre, the Chief Minister himself yesterday half admitted the mistake. Come on.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, if the hon Member wants a mini debate, a re-run of the last General Election campaign, I am game. I know of no practice of honest, western parliamentary democracy that in order to hold the Government to account, which is of course the Opposition's function, for example on the buses, that it is legitimate or even acceptable for the Opposition to invent facts, mis-state facts, fail to research facts, mis-read documents and mis-represent them on television, and then on the back of their factual, legal mis-statements, to launch a criticism of the buses. He may think that that is holding the Government to account, and he may think that that is doing a very good job, and he may think that that is the role of oppositions in western parliamentary democracies. I accept that it is the role of opposition in western parliamentary democracies to hold the Government factually to account on the basis of correct facts. Then on correct facts one can make whatever judgement one likes. That is a different matter. Once one deals with truths, one can then think it is a good thing, a bad thing, that the Government have done it well, that the Government have done it badly, that they could have done it better or that they should not have done it so badly. The question of assessment and judgement of the Government's performance is one thing. To base that assessment on fabricated facts by the hon Members for the purposes of them doing what they subsequently describe as being their democratic role, in my opinion is wholly legitimate, and that is what the hon

Members have done for example with the buses. They were too heavy, they were too long, they were too short, they were too thin, Government had not done any research, we had not done any research for the buses, we had not done any research for the Theatre Royal. Apparently we had not done any research for the new hospital because we had forgotten that patients had to be fed in hospital, and how can a Government design a new hospital without making allowance for people eating. This is the entire approach, everything is reduced to a simplistic analysis based on a foundation stone of fabricated facts and assessments which they first lay in order to then provide themselves with a prop with which to criticise the Government. This is systematically so, issue by issue. Look, it is entirely a matter of political judgement for them, he obviously thinks that they are doing a very good job and they are doing it effectively and of course, ultimately the electorate will tell. I do not know if they would regard it as pertinent for me to offer some advice but if I were doing the same thing, my fear would be that people would regard my criticisms as being so systematic, so unobjective and so politically self-serving that eventually my fear would be that I might lose credibility, and when I do criticise something rightly with justification because the Government genuinely have got it wrong, people are just not going to believe it. That would be my concern, but it is also part of western democratic principles that every political party conducts its fortunes and conducts its affairs as they think they are most likely to bring electoral success and so be it. As for the Theatre Royal, the Government have made no such admission of the sort that the hon Member has suggested that we got it wrong. We think the hon Members have got it entirely wrong. The fact that the Government are suggesting that it is re-assessing their priorities for capital expenditure projects, should not be misinterpreted by the hon Members as meaning that the Government have decided to abandon doing the Theatre Royal. It is simply that we are stopping, and it is not just in relation to leisure activities, it is a question of whether we want to do the Theatre Royal before we do for example the Leisure Centre, or whether we want to do the Theatre Royal before we do other projects that are also in Gibraltar's interests. It is a re-assessment of priorities of order of doing things, not necessarily the hon Members have rushed to assume something different. It is all very well for the hon Members to now pretend that the Government again did not do their homework. I was amused to catch part of what the Hon Mr Linares said. The only thing that was missing by way of prop was a builder's helmet. I notice that he positioned himself carefully outside the Theatre Royal. The hon Member may wish to lead public opinion again on a false premise to think that the Government have not done reports, that the Government have not done their homework, but the hon Member must surely know that amongst all the reports, as well as all the reports that the Government did, the Hon Mr Linares appears to be anxious that the words 'two' get into Hansard. I am therefore perfectly content so that I can move on, to ask Hansard to record that as I was speaking Mr Linares was anxious that the words 'two reports' should appear on the record, and I am delighted that that should be so. So if he is now satisfied that his views are properly recorded, I perhaps can move on.

It is all very well for the hon Members now to pretend that the Theatre Royal project has sort of crept out of the woodwork. It is almost as if something that the Government decided over breakfast, no planning, no homework, over breakfast, wrong place, no reports, bad this, everything bad, but the hon Member cannot overlook the facts as they occurred. I am assuming he is interested in adding to his factual knowledge and that he has some interest in what I am saying to him here today. The hon Member cannot surely have forgotten, and if he has forgotten then I think people are entitled to know the factual basis, or the non-factual basis upon which he makes the remarks. If he has not forgotten then I think people should know the basis upon which he makes the remark, namely, a misrepresenting basis. He must know that not only was there a long consultation process with members of the

public and users and people involved, a long consultation process with almost every conceivable user group, before this decision was made, but that indeed before the decision was made the plans for the Theatre Royal and the project as it was envisaged, was exhibited to the public and it was publicised as being exhibited to the public in the John Mackintosh Hall for a week. I do not remember anybody else, but let alone him, saying at the time 'it is too big, too small, wrong place, right place, it should not be here, it should be there'. So first of all he pretends that there has been no preparation when there has been detailed, excruciating research and preparation. He forgets the fact that there has been a full public consultation period in which he chose not to participate, or he chose not to react to the information then put into the public domain, and then he thinks he can stand up in this House with any credibility in May 2004 and pretend that this is something that the Government have pulled out of their sleeves in the last 48 hours. It is just typical of the basis upon which the hon Members choose to make their political attacks. Well, we are now going to go to the trouble of putting in the public domain, so that they can understand, not just the facts about the Theatre Royal but so that they can understand the credibility of the hon Member's statement, we shall remind people of all these facts so that they can really do what he asked them to do yesterday on television, which is to make up their own minds. The Government are always happy for people to make up their own minds, and on the last three occasions when the people have been asked to make up their own minds, he knows what the result has been, but I insist that people make up their minds on the basis of fact. Events as they have happened, not events that I spin and distort in order to create a convenient political backdrop for my self-serving political interests that is the difference between him and me, and it is also going to become clear in relation to the Theatre Royal.

So, in concluding the debate that the Hon Mr Picardo invited us to have on these issues, the Government genuinely welcome being held to account by the hon Members. That is why we put at their disposal unprecedented amounts of information. Not just unprecedented by reference to Gibraltar's parliamentary history, but unprecedented amounts of detailed information as for example is contained in the answers to these nine hundred odd questions, unprecedented even in respect of western parliamentary conventions as he describes. There is no parliament in the world in which the information for example that is published by the Government annually or quarterly in an official way, we then give in addition, broken down, in the way the Opposition wants it in respect of the months and time periods that the Government want. There is no parliament in the world where that takes place. So we are very happy to give all the information that the Opposition wants, save on the rare occasion that we say that there is some good reason, which we also then try to explain to the hon Members what it is, precisely because we welcome being held to account by them. Of course there is a difference between being held to account in the parliamentary context and the political cut and thrust between two opposing political parties, where the difference between the former and the latter very often is that the actual fact and truth gets second stage because the principal objective is not information, the principal objective is to do down ones political opponent, and therefore the presentation of fact as a matter of objective takes a second plane.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I just have to ask the Chief Minister exactly what part of that answer was designed to reply to my suggestion that members of his Government had to be very careful about what they said in this House, because it is a feature of western parliamentary democracies that there is great care taken by Ministers about what they say in the House of Parliament to which they may be elected. I have also, I think, to illustrate

that by Mr Holliday's own behaviour yesterday when at one stage he was telling us that he did not know an answer, and when pressed slightly further he then went on to read us those magical notes that Ministers seem to have just below the written answers that we get, which in fact contained the complete answer to what he was being pressed on at the time. As to the number of questions that are asked in this House in relation to statistical issues, on which the Chief Minister has addressed us, I would ask him this: 'in what other western parliamentary democracy are statistics published so late by the Government? Sometimes three or four years later, that Oppositions have to rely on asking question in the House in order to elicit information that would otherwise be publicly available?' Finally, what I have to ask the Chief Minister is, 'what facts is it alleged to have been invented by the Opposition?'. All the Opposition did, and I am sure that the hon Gentleman who has responsibility for these matters gets to this in time in relation to these questions, was ask Government to explain the weight of the buses set out in the manual. We did not invent that weight, all we did was put that in the public domain and ask the Government to comment on whether or not these buses were too heavy. That was not an invention and to suggest the opposite is really just evidence of the way that the hon Gentleman conducts his political campaigns in and out of this House, which is simply to say when a fact is not convenient to me it is a fact which is invented, and I have in my gift from St Peter's chair what the real facts are. As for our criticism being so systematic and so self-serving, I would ask the Chief Minister this, 'does he not accept that in fact his political project is slowly falling apart systematically', and all we are doing is pointing that out. Far from being self-serving, it is bad for the whole of Gibraltar when Government's business goes wrong. We are only here to say 'be careful this might happen', but we do not rejoice when things go wrong for Government. It would be wrong for any Gibraltarian to rejoice when things go wrong for its own Government.

#### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, another of the hon Member's devices is to say things and then when they are caught out, pretend that they did not say it and that it is the person pointing it out that has got it wrong. Look, if the hon Member really believes, with sincerity and integrity, that when his Colleague Mr Randall appeared on television to denigrate the buses on the basis that they were too heavy, he said 'oh look, here is a clause in the manual, I do not quite understand what it is. Please could the Government explain to me what this means. Does this mean that the buses are too heavy? Does it mean that the buses are not, because I do not really understand'. This is the impression he is now trying to give. He is now trying to suggest that in the Government's attack on the weight of the buses, that they did not misrepresent the fact that they were somehow innocently, as the sort of tame lambs that they think they like to misrepresent when they want to project themselves as the victims of this terribly ogre and aggressive Government, when they want to paint themselves as innocent lamb-like victims, they simply distort their own initial assault. The Hon Mr Randall appeared on television asserting as a fact that he had caught the Government. 'See these buses are too heavy. See, here I have obtained through my own sleuth work, a copy of the users manual and it says here, 18 tons, because these buses are too heavy and every time they cross the bridge, the bridge will fall down because they have got a 10 ton limit and here it says quite clearly that they are 18 tons'. It transpires that he was not looking at the weight of the buses at all, he was looking at the weight capacity of the axles of the bus. He still says it is not correct. He is still therefore asserting that he is correct, it is incredible. It is absolutely incredible. So far from the situation being what the Hon Mr Picardo says that they were just asking for clarification, talk about being inconsistent in the House and changing the story, not three minutes ago the Hon Mr Picardo has said that all that they were doing was not inventing facts on the



buses, just seeking clarification. Three minutes later, from a sedentary position, the perpetrator of the invention and the fabrication, asserts, re-asserts the allegation that the buses are too heavy, so who is inventing the facts? It is not the Government that invent facts, the hon Members are constantly, as a matter of political system, inventing and distorting facts for the purposes of them launching a political campaign on the Government.

Now, I am sorry that the hon Member thinks that the Government take too long to publish statistics. I can tell him that they are published much more quickly, infinitely more quickly, nearly twice more quickly than the GSLP used to publish them when they were in office. So, however difficult he finds it to be an Opposition Member, let me tell him by his measure of tardiness or promptness of publishing statistics, his job is at least twice as easy as ours, because in the case of statistics that there was no obligation to publish, the Opposition Members did not even publish unemployment statistics. Where there was a statutory duty to publish statistics, it always used to take much, much longer. He may not be aware of this because of course, he only joined the House at the recent election, but the flow of publication of statistics is infinitely more timely than it used to be, and it is true that the Abstract of Statistics was not published for a couple of years whilst the Statistics Office was doing it, but the Abstract in respect of most of the statistics simply puts together information most of which is already otherwise published. If one takes the Tourist Survey, the Employment Survey, all the surveys that we lay in this House, the unemployment statistics which are now published quarterly, this is an infinite improvement on the situation that we inherited. Mr Holliday did not fail to give this House information that he had simply because he only gave it when he was pressed. Again, a distortion of the events as they happened by the hon Member. What the Minister said was that he was not aware what the RIO was. He never said that he did not know what the current position was about delays and that, this arose in a supplementary and when the issue arose in a supplementary he gave it. What we were saying to the hon Members, I certainly did not know what RIO is, that we are not accountable in this House for the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority, and it is important that we should not be held accountable in this House for the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority, because under Statute it needs to be independent of the Government. It will not work as a mechanism if by the way that we deal with its affairs and information and become accountable for it, other supervening authorities in the EU think that this is just an extension of Government. Then the hon Member re-formulated his question, the Leader of the Opposition, by asking us the question as if it were directed at the company, and that is when the information was given about the extension having been given until September and things like that. There was no revelations in supplementaries of facts which the hon Member had said he did not know about in the first place. It is true that facts were given in supplementary but they were not facts which had been withheld or asked for in the principal question, that is the position as that happened.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is not correct, what he has just said. Will the Chief Minister not agree that the original question was about something which should have happened in January 2004? The answer was that we should ask the Regulator and then we said, 'Is the Chief Minister telling us to ask the Regulator because he does not want to tell us the information, or because he has not got the information?'. The answer was 'because we do not have the information'. Then I said 'how can you not have it, if the person that has to do the action is not the Regulator but the Government-owned company?' When I asked that we were then told, which could have been given in the original

answer to the original question, which was 'the Regulator has not received that information because the company has asked for a delay and he has granted it'. So that was the information required in the original question and that was eventually given, but I mean it is not a big thing but that is factually what has taken place.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well if it is not a big thing we can move on, but we do not accept that that is factual. I understand that that is his assessment and analysis of how it happened factually, it is not the events as they actually happened. If the hon Member does not want to make it a big deal we can move on, but the question asked 'have they been revised and if not when do they expect the RIO to be revised by?'. The information that was given was that the Regulator has given an extension, but the facts had they been revised and if not when do they expect to be revised by, is not information that we know. We know when the extension has been given till but when the company intends to issue its revise, I do not know unless the Hon Mr Vinet might know as Chairman. As to not having addressed his point about Ministers having to be careful about what they say in this House, I did address that. I said that of course Ministers have to be careful and Ministers are careful, but that they have to be careful as well, and we think that we are much more careful than them. Does he not remember an answer to that effect?

Finally, as to the Government's political project "falling apart", he wishes, he wishes. The problem with Opposition Members is that they actually believe their own propaganda. The hon Members lose the third general election on the trot to a Government that is the first Government in history to win three general elections with all eight of its members in the first eight slots of the ballot, and with more than 50 per cent of the vote in each successive election, and within two months of that the hon Members are pretending that the Government's political projects are falling apart. The hon Members can delude, of course as Harold Wilson used to say, 'a week is a long time in politics' and between now and the next general election much can happen politically to both sides let me say, but the suggestion on almost the morning after the general election when they were saying 'well, never mind we have lost. We have not actually managed to increase our share of the vote, it is still languishing at the 40 per cent that we have had but never mind because now we have decided to inject enthusiasm into ourselves and to begin to look like a party in waiting'. It is such a tiresome inconvenience that the electorate should have just beaten us in the election. This is terrible that we should now be made to wait another four years when it was quite obvious that the logical thing is that we should have won this time round. They can hype themselves up and hyperventilate politically as much as they like. It is terribly dangerous of them to actually believe it. In four year's time this Government, as all previous Governments before it, will be judged on its record. We were elected on a manifesto, four years from now the electorate will look at our performance in Government, they will decide whether they like it or not, they will take a long hard look, at least I hope they take a long hard look, at the Opposition Members and their track record, and they will say now what is it going to be. Is it going to be a change of Government or not? That is how these things normally work in a democracy, but I have to say that I have never come across a situation where a party that loses the election is immediately, lands on its feet proclaiming almost victory, because the Government's margin of victory had crashed too 11 per cent. This is terrible, the Government's political project is falling apart because its margin of victory was only 11 per cent, when their share of the popular vote was 30 per cent. They had made no progress in 8 years of opposition. With eight years of political erosion, which is always suffered by parties in Government, the hon Members were

not the political beneficiary of a single percentage vote, and their analysis of their political position nevertheless, based presumably on the fact that they saw off the Labour Party, that is the only element of good news as far as I can tell for them. Apparently their political panacea is measured in the fact that they prevented the Labour Party from winning a seat on the House. On the basis of that somewhat limited achievement, they base their statements that the Government's political project is falling apart, systematically. Well, the problem with the hon Member is that he is falling victim of what I have been trying to explain to them. They actually think that they have succeeded in establishing that the bus service is terrible. They think that the tactic is to throw enough mud. They throw mud at every issue. In the hope that enough of it has stuck, in the hope that enough of it sticks to tarnish everything that the Government do. Then they think that they succeed. They actually believe that the bus service, never mind that the Women Association have written to the Government praising, forget all those objective assessments, they actually persuade themselves that on the spurious basis of a factual misrepresentation of the fact that the Government have not done their homework, never mind the fact that a bus was bought last year to do the runs and the trials and to be tested on the roads and to establish what needed to be amended and what roads needed to be widened and whether the bus was suitable, they forget all that and assert the fact that the Government did not do their homework. On the basis of invented facts about the weight of the bus, they throw mud and they actually think they have succeeded because presumably the bus service is another one of the political projects which have fallen apart, presumably, since it is the only major policy initiative that has come on stream since the electorate returned us by a margin of 11 per cent, since that is the only major policy initiative that has come on stream since then, I can only assume that his statement that the Government's political project is falling apart, must be a reference to the bus service. They actually believe themselves when they think that they have succeeded in converting the bus project into something politically negative for the Government. The problem with the hon Members is that they do not distinguish between propaganda that they have themselves launched, and reality which they must not lose sight of. They are different things. One just has to look at this little pamphlet called *The Key*, that the Opposition Members publish, to see the lies and the diatribe and the inventions to which the people of Gibraltar are systematically fed by the hon Members' attempt to con the electorate into thinking that the Government are bad and they are good. They feed the people of Gibraltar an intense diet of lies, lies and more lies through the letterbox, because of course the reason why they feed it through the letterbox is that they fear that the lies that they have systematically been fed in the New People, that does not get far enough, because as it has lost all credibility, presumably nobody buys it any more. So now the same lies that were published in the New People are reduced into a little pamphlet and shoved into peoples houses. Well, they are still lies and this is the problem. I am perfectly happy if the hon Member's definition of political project systematically falling apart is what the Government are going to deliver to the people of Gibraltar during the next three and a half years, then let me say that the political falling apart, as he calls it, is not going to be any good to the Opposition Members political prospects.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Yes, that was the end but because there was an allegation against the Hon Mr Randall, that he invented a lie, I give him permission if he wishes, to make a statement. He tried to before.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Thank you very much. What I asserted is what is in the document that I obtained, when I made my intervention. I can tell the Chief Minister that I have never been and am not, unlike others, in the habit of distorting the facts.

ORAL

**NO 1083 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INDUSTRIAL PARKS**

Can Government list the criteria used, or to be used, in determining the allocation of vacant units in the industrial parks advertised in the tender notice of 30 March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The criteria to be used in determining the allocation of industrial units will be based on the proposed use, the creation of employment opportunities, premium offer and whether applicants are existing businesses or new businesses.

ORAL

**NO 1084 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LATHBURY BARRACKS**

Can Government say on what date and for what reason the units at numbers 1, 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27, and 28 Lathbury Barracks industrial park became vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1085 to 1088 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1085 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPA BUSINESS CENTRE**

Can Government say on what date and for what reason the unit at number F10A Europa Business Centre became vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1084 and 1086 to 1088 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1086 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**12 GOVERNOR'S COTTAGE CAMP**

Can Government say on what date and for what reason the unit at number 12 Governor's Cottage Camp became vacant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1084, 1085, 1087 and 1088 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1087 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**NEW HARBOURS**

Can Government say on what date and for what reason the units at numbers 73, 74, 90, 91, 98 and 102 Harbour's Walk, New Harbours became vacant?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1084 to 1086 and 1088 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1088 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**NEW HARBOURS**

Can Government say on what date and for what reason the units at number 44B and 61 Harbours Deck, New Harbours became vacant?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information sought in this question is being handed over to the hon Gentleman in a schedule with the information that he has requested.

## **SCHEDULE**

### **Q1088**

Units 1, 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 28 Lathbury Barracks have been vacant since completion of construction.

Unit F10A at the Europa Business Centre was not vacant on 30 April 2004.

Unit 12 Governor's Cottage Camp became vacant in January 2004, when the tenant was successful in tendering for a unit at the Lathbury Barracks Industrial Park.

Unit 73 and 74 Harbours Walk became vacant in April 2003, as a result of the repossession of the units due to arrears of rent and service charges.

Unit 90 Harbours Walk became vacant in January 2000. The Unit was surrendered by the tenant and has since been used as a Government store.

Unit 91 Harbours Walk became vacant in January 2003. The unit was surrendered by the tenant.

Unit 98 Harbors Walk became vacant in November 2003. The Unit was surrendered by the tenant.

Unit 102 Harbours Walk became vacant in August 2003, as a result of the repossession of the unit due to arrears of rent and service charges.

Unit 44B Harbours Deck became vacant in November 2003. It was repossessed as a result of arrears of rent and service charges.

Unit 61 Habours Deck became vacant in May 2003. It was repossessed as a result of arrears of rent and service charges.

ORAL

NO 1089 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**LATHBURY BARRACKS**

How many tenders have been submitted in respect of unit numbers 1, 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 28 at Lathbury Barracks industrial park?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1092, 1095, 1098 and 1101 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1090 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LATHBURY BARRACKS**

Can Government say how much was bid by each tenderer in respect of Unit numbers 1, 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 28 at Lathbury Barracks industrial park, indicating which bid was successful?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1093, 1096, 1099 and 1102 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1091 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LATHBURY BARRACKS**

Of the tenders submitted by interested parties in respect of units 1, 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 28 at Lathbury Barracks industrial park can Government say how many were submitted by parties already established elsewhere in Gibraltar, and how many were submitted by new parties wishing to set up a business?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1094, 1097, 1100 and 1103 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1092 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**NEW HARBOURS**

How many tenders have been submitted in respect of unit numbers 44B and 61 at Harbours Deck, New Harbours?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1089, 1095, 1098 and 1101 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1093 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**NEW HARBOURS**

Can Government say how much was bid by each tenderer in respect of unit numbers 44B and 61 at Harbour's Deck, New Harbours, indicating which bid was successful?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1090, 1096, 1099 and 1102 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 1094 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NEW HARBOURS**

Of the tenders submitted by interested parties in respect of units 44B and 61 at Harbour's Deck, New Harbours, can Government say how many were submitted by firms already established elsewhere in Gibraltar, and how many were submitted by new firms?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1091, 1097, 1100 and 1103 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1095 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**NEW HARBOURS**

How many tenders have been submitted in respect of unit numbers 73, 74, 90, 91, 98 and 102 at Harbours Walk, New Harbours?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1089, 1092, 1098 and 1101 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1096 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**NEW HARBOURS**

Can Government say how much was bid by each tenderer in respect of Unit numbers 73, 74, 90, 91, 98 and 102 at Harbour's Walk, New Harbours, indicating which bid was successful?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1090, 1093, 1099 and 1102 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1097 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NEW HARBOURS**

Of the tenders submitted by interested parties in respect of units 73, 74, 90, 91, 98 and 102 at Harbour's Walk, New Harbours, can Government say how many were submitted by parties already established elsewhere in Gibraltar, and how many were submitted by new parties wishing to set up a business?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1091, 1094, 1100 and 1103 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1098 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EUROPA BUSINESS CENTRE**

How many tenders have been submitted in respect of unit number F10A at Europa Business Centre?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1089, 1092, 1095 and 1101 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1099 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPA BUSINESS CENTRE**

Can Government say how much was bid by each tenderer in respect of unit number F10A at Europa Business Centre indicating which bid was successful?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1090, 1093, 1096 and 1102 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1100 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPA BUSINESS CENTRE**

Of the tenders submitted by interested parties in respect of unit F10A at Europa Business Centre can Government say how many were submitted by parties already established elsewhere in Gibraltar, and how many were submitted by new parties wishing to set up a business?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1091, 1094, 1097 and 1103 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1101 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GOVERNOR'S COTTAGE CAMP**

How many tenders have been submitted in respect of unit number 12 at Governor's Cottage Camp?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The number of tenders for the relevant units at the various industrial parks was as follows:

|                         |            |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Lathbury Barracks       | 33 tenders |
| Europa Business Centre  | 1 tender   |
| Governor's Cottage Camp | 11 tenders |
| Harbours Walk           | 4 tenders  |
| Harbours Deck           | 20 tenders |



ORAL

**NO 1102 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GOVERNOR'S COTTAGE CAMP**

Can Government say how much was bid by each tenderer in respect of unit number 12 at Governor's Cottage Camp indicating which bid was successful?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Tenders closed on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2004, and the tender submissions are presently being analysed and collated. It is not possible to provide the information sought until after the tenders have been adjudicated.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1090, 1093, 1096, 1099 AND 1102 OF  
2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Will the Minister undertake to provide the information at that stage, or do I need to table the questions again?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Once the tenders have been adjudicated I have no problem in supplying the information.

ORAL

**NO 1103 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GOVERNOR'S COTTAGE CAMP**

Of the tenders submitted by interested parties in respect of unit 12 at Governor's Cottage Camp can Government say how many were submitted by parties already established elsewhere in Gibraltar, and how many were submitted by new parties wishing to set up a business?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought in this question is too voluminous to be read out in this House, nor would the hon Member be able to note the information given for the purposes of formulating supplementaries if it were read out. I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested.

## SCHEDULE

### **Q1091**

28 tenders were submitted by firms already established in Gibraltar and 5 by parties wishing to set up a business.

### **Q1094**

16 tenders were submitted by firms already established in Gibraltar and 4 by new firms.

### **Q097**

4 tenders were submitted by firms already established in Gibraltar, none by new businesses.

### **Q1100**

Only one tender was submitted by a party already set up in Gibraltar.

### **Q1103**

4 tenders were submitted by firms already established in Gibraltar and 7 by parties wishing to set up a business.

ORAL

**NO 1104 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LATHBURY BARRACKS – SUNSET CLOSE**

Can Government say how much has been received for the lease of the area of the Sunset Close project near Lathbury Barracks?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1105 to 1107 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1105 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOWN RANGE BARRACKS**

Can Government say how much has been received for the lease of the area of the Town Range Barracks project?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1104, 1106 and 1107 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1106 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADMIRAL'S PLACE**

Can Government say how much has been received for the lease of the area of the Old Naval Hospital project (Admiral's Place)?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1104, 1105 and 1107 of 2004.

**NO 1107 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**THE CLIFTONS**

Can Government say how much has been received for the lease of the area of the Naval Hospital project (The Clifton's)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The premium paid was as follows:-

|                     |            |
|---------------------|------------|
| Sunset Close        | £ 333,000  |
| Town Range Barracks | £ 381,000  |
| Admiral's Place     | £1,386,000 |
| The Cliftons        | none       |

In the case of The Cliftons, this development was an exchange for land at Gun Wharf which the developers already held as part of the Queensway Quay development.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1104 TO 1107 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is that the land which is being given back to the MOD?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, as part of the deal which was several months ago with the MOD to relocate the tugs to Gun Wharf so that the small boat owners could come into Coaling Island, there was a mismatch of numbers of metres of berthing, in other words the berthing provided by the Gun Wharf arm is much less than the berthing provided on the inside of the Coaling Island arm. Gun Wharf is shorter than Coaling Island and the deal was done on the basis that the MOD would get back the berth on the outside of Gun Wharf, which was owned by Queensway Quay or whoever had by then bought Queensway Quay, the current owner. They also had certain development rights over part of the island itself and those development rights and the Wharf were exchanged,

I think it was still with Taylor Woodrow, were exchanged for the plot of land where The Cliftons is now being built.



ORAL

NO 1108 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ROCK HOTEL – PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say who will conduct the environmental impact assessment into the proposed development of 76 apartments to the rear of the Rock Hotel?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1109 and 1110 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1109 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CASEMATES – FUNICULAR TO ROCK GUN**

Has an environmental impact assessment been submitted in respect of the application by 21st Century Rock Ltd to provide a funicular installation from Casemates to Rock Gun?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1108 and 1110 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1110 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SIR HERBERT MILES ROAD – PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

Has an environmental impact assessment been submitted in respect of the proposed development of 65 residential units and car parking at Sir Herbert Miles Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No environmental impact assessment has been submitted in respect of either 21<sup>st</sup> Century Rock proposal or the Sir Herbert Miles Road development.

The Government are not aware of who will conduct the environmental impact assessment for the project at the rear of the Rock Hotel.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1108 TO 1110 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the case then in relation to the Rock Hotel project that no assessment has been submitted either, otherwise the Government would know who has conducted it, is that correct?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

ORAL

NO 1111 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

When do Government expect the Development Plan to be ready?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

It is hoped that a draft plan will be published in late 2004.

ORAL

NO 1112 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 6 January 2004 and on what dates?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The four meetings of the Development and Planning Commission since 6 January 2004 were held on:

18 February 2004  
17 March 2004  
07 April 2004  
22 April 2004

ORAL

NO 1113 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**BOTH WORLDS**

Are Government now in a position to say at what stage is the application for planning permission to construct two additional houses at the northern end of Both Worlds?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1114 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1114 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MARINA BAY – PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

At what stage is consideration by Development and Planning Commission of the application by Marina Bay Complex Ltd to construct a multi-storey car park/commercial development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The application from Marina Bay Complex Limited was received on 18 February 2004, and it is being processed. No Outline Planning permission has been given as yet for this project.

With regard to the project at the north end of Both Worlds, Outline Planning permission was granted on 31 March 2004.

ORAL

NO 1115 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**CATALAN BAY**

Can Government say whether the tender in respect of Phases 2 and 3 for the upgrading and beautification of Catalan Bay has now been awarded, and if so to whom and for how much, listing the amounts bid by the unsuccessful tenderers?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

It has not been awarded as yet.



ORAL

NO 1116 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**CASEMATES DEVELOPMENT**

When are the empty units in the Casemates development going out to tender, and since what date has each unit been empty?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1117 and 1118 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1117 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**CASEMATES DEVELOPMENT**

How many units within the Casemates development have been sold by the original successful tenderer to a third party, and which units are they?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1116 and 1118 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1118 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**CASEMATES DEVELOPMENT**

How many units in the Casemates development, the arcade inside or the old Health Centre building were empty as at 31 March 2004 and for what reason?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

There are no empty units in the Casemates development, so they cannot be put out to tender.

No units have as yet been assigned by the original successful tenderer to a third party, although the following three units are in the process of being assigned:

Casemates Barracks  
Watergate House

Units 6B and 6D  
Unit 2/2

ORAL

NO 1119 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**OCEAN VILLAGE**

How many representations have been received following the application for planning permission by Ocean Village (Gibraltar) Ltd to construct a "premier international health spa with glass exterior restaurant" over water next to pier A?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The period for public consultation expired on 29 April 2004, and at the time that this reply was prepared no representations had been received.

**ORAL**

**NO 1120 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SHEPPARD'S MARINA**

Were any inspections and recommendations made by Government Health and Safety inspectors in relation to the demolition of the Sheppard's Marina building to make way for the Ocean Village project, if so when and what were they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1121 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1121 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SHEPPARD'S MARINA**

On what date were Government made aware of the discovery of asbestos at the old Sheppard's Marina building in Glacis Road which is being demolished to make way for the Ocean Village project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Two site visits were carried out on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2004 and 25<sup>th</sup> March 2004. The Inspectorate asked for a method statement for the proposed works, a risk assessment and a notification of the project on the correct forms. The Inspectorate pointed out on 4<sup>th</sup> February that the roof was made of asbestos and that it had to be removed by a competent asbestos removal contractor. The Inspectorate was aware that, in common with many other buildings of its age, the building in question contained corrugated asbestos sheets.

ORAL

NO 1122 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SHEPPARD'S MARINA**

Can Government state whether there has been a change of use in respect of the land previously utilised to provide repairs to visiting yachts at the Sheppard's Marina, and if so, whether change of use was granted, to whom and when?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1123 of 2004.

**NO 1123 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**OCEAN VILLAGE**

Can Government state whether any Government land was sold in connection with the development known as Ocean Village?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No Government land was sold in connection with the Ocean Village development.

A change of use was agreed in respect of the land in question in August 2003 with the developers of the Ocean Village.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1122 AND 1123 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the change of use, was the leaseholder required to make any payment to the Government for obtaining the change of use?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

A premium was negotiated in respect of the change of use and the extension of the lease from 99 to 150 years.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say how much had to be paid for this?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The sum of £225,000.



**NO 1124 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**OLD GUARD HOUSE**

Can Government say whether restoration and refurbishment works at the Old Guard House in John Mackintosh Square have now commenced, and if not when are they programmed to start?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

It is evident to the naked eye that restoration and refurbishment works on the Old Guard House have not yet commenced. Government hope to commence those works this financial year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1124 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Will this be put out to tender in the normal way?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The decision has not yet been made but it is not the only model available. It could be added as an extension into the Piazza project, this is just a possibility I am not suggesting to him that it is the preferred possibility. Sometimes when JBS does work it is not put out to tender, JBS being the Government's own construction company. So if it were to be decided that they should do it, it then would not go out to tender, but if it were not through either of those models then it would go out to tender. In other words, it would not be given out to a new contractor without going out to tender.

ORAL

NO 1125 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PIAZZA PROJECT**

Can Government give the cost to date of the Piazza project, showing the cost of the underground toilets?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 1126 of 2004.

**NO 1126 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PIAZZA PROJECT**

How much is payable by the contractor to the Government if the Piazza project overruns its target completion date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The cost to date of the project is £1,500,209.

The cost to date of the toilet block is £131,992.

The amount payable in Liquidated Damages to the Government should the Contractor fail to complete by the Contract Completion Date is as follows:

|                         |                    |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Whole of the Works      | £5,000.00 per week |
| Piazza Grill South Unit | £2,000.00 per week |
| Piazza Grill North Unit | £2,000.00 per week |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1125 AND 1126 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister confirm that the project is behind schedule?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes it is behind schedule, I believe by a few weeks.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether the underground toilets contain access points for the disabled or for ladies with prams, or for the elderly or others who will have difficulty in going down steps?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, there is a separate toilet for the disabled, presumably made available to mothers with prams as well, above ground so the block that one now sees under construction in block stones, that contains a hut which is partly a street level toilet for the disabled but is also the housing for a staircase that goes down to the main toilet for those of us that can go up and down stairs.

**NO 1127 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LAND RECLAMATION WITHIN THE HARBOUR**

What conclusions have been drawn by the report on land reclamation within the harbour which has been submitted to the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The options with regard to land reclamation within the harbour are presently being studied by Government, and it would be premature to debate the issue until decisions are taken.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1127 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible for the Minister to say what area of the harbour the report looks at?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The area in question is the area in front of the Royal Gibraltar Yacht Club and Calpe Rowing Club and Rooke, all that area in front.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When, in fact, have they received this report, how long have they had it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The date of the report dates back to 22 April 2003.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is that still what is being looked at now or has anything been added subsequently because of any changes in the area?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, there have not been any changes because the report took into account the possibility of the release of MOD land et cetera so therefore that is why the different options that were reported in the report.

**NO 1128 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**RELOCATION OF MOD FACILITIES**

Can Government state when was the last financial year in which expenditure was incurred to relocate MOD facilities and how much was the expenditure and which were the facilities relocated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No specific record of this is readily available. LPS, however, recollects that Navy Ground No 2 and the Special Boat Squadron facilities were re-provided by the Government in 1989/90 at Coaling Island. A recreational block was also re-provided by the Government at Chilton Court around the same time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1128 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the intended move, in fact it did not really happen, because the plot of land there was retained by the Government, is that not the case? The answer that is given about the relocation of the football ground.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Special Boat Squadron Headquarters on the reclamation next to the north of Coaling Island, that was a re-provision for the same facilities that there were on the site that became the West Side reclamation. They had it there near the Montagu Basin and that facility was re-provided by the Government to the Coaling Island site as part of the vacation of what was then known as USSC, and that facility is still there and is one of the things now offered to us if we re-provide them again into Gun Wharf. There was the finger jetty and the headquarters ashore, a two storey building with mess rooms and things of that sort.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Was that done by the Government or by the developers of West Side?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

My understanding is that it was done by his government at the time. In fact I distinctly remember the Hon Michael Feetham giving us an explanation of that in the House at the time.



**NO 1129 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CHANGE OF USE OF LEASE**

Can Government state whether it is Government policy to charge a premium where change of use is required in respect of a lease in order to proceed with a development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes, if it represents added value to the leaseholder.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1129 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the case of the development of the Servants Quarters in the grounds of the Rock Hotel, did that involve a change of use or was it not required because it already had a residential use?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, there is added value to the developer from changing it from the servants quarters to a residential, so therefore there is a premium involved.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is that something which has already been negotiated and agreed or is it still under?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes it has been negotiated, agreed and paid, the only thing is I am not quite sure of the actual sum involved but it has been agreed and settled.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In that case was there just the change of use or was there also a lengthening of the existing lease?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I would need notice of that particular question but am happy to make it available if required.

**NO 1130 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SALE OF LAND**

Can Government state which was the most recent sale of land for development giving the financial year, location of the land, the price per square metre and total revenue obtained?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The most recent sale of land for development was the area known as Little Genoa.

The sale was completed on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2002 and the price paid was £438,950 representing a rate of £260 per square metre of land.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1130 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it the case then that the land in the recent housing development in the area of Safeways was going to have been sold prior to this date?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It depends whether the hon Member is talking to the southwest of Safeways or to the east of Safeways.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I mean the one that is going up now.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Euro Plaza. That site was actually sold by the hon Member and not by us. That site was part of the original lease of the original developers of Europort. It was Plot A as it was then called and they simply sold it. The Government have not been involved in that transaction.

ORAL

**NO 1131 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL**

Has any decision been taken on the appeals before the Development Appeals Tribunal that were pending or awaiting comments in answer to Questions 296-298 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1132 of 2004.

**NO 1132 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT APPEALS TRIBUNAL**

Can Government say if any new appeals have been lodged before the Development Appeals Tribunal since September 2003, and, if so, list the appeals showing the date they were lodged and the issue at stake?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Since the answer to Question Nos. 296-298 of 2004, one new appeal has been received against refusal to grant permission for the construction of a water heater cabinet.

The Tribunal met on Thursday 25 March 2004 and again on 2 April 2004 to consider two of the appeals listed in answer to Question No. 298 of 2004. In one case the Tribunal accepted the appeal and in the other the Tribunal deferred its final decision pending receipt of further and better particulars from the parties.

**NO 1133 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SALE OF GOVERNMENT HOUSING**

Can Government say what formula it intends to apply to determine affordability in respect of the sale of Government housing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is difficult to give the hon Member a much fuller answer than to say that affordability is a subjective thing. It depends on the income and financial means of the purchaser. Government intend to sell the houses that they build at cost. They cannot be more "affordable than that", but of course, some people may still not be able to afford it. The Government have already given a public outline of their intended variant of the current 50/50 scheme.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1133 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

With all due respect to the Chief Minister, if he starts off by saying that what is affordable depends on how much money one has got, however reasonable it may be to sell something at no profit it may still not be affordable if the cost happens to be too high.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course that is the very essence of the answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, but if the Government are promising affordable houses, they must have a notional figure in their heads of what they think is affordable in today's level of wages presumably.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, and the answer to that is in the last sentence of my answer. The Government have already given a public outline of their intended variant of the current 50/50 scheme, which as the hon Member will remember, is based on the need not to buy 50 per cent but to buy that share for which one can get a mortgage on at 3.5 times salary. In other words, whatever percentage that buys. People will buy the percentage that they can afford. That was the variant. I cannot afford the cost of the product and I cannot alter the cost of the product except to make no profit on it and not to charge financing costs and not to charge land value costs. I cannot alter the fact that different buyers have different levels of income but I can develop a 50/50 scheme which would no longer be 50/50. A home ownership scheme which unlike the previous one, allows affordability to people who cannot afford 50 per cent. Before one could either afford 50 per cent or one could not afford to take part in the scheme. Our variant of the home ownership scheme allows people to access the level of ownership that they can afford under the formula that the Government have already explained publicly. Therefore, it seems to me that the Government have done as much as they possibly can to make this as accessible to as many people, regardless of and taking into account the subjective element of affordability.

**ORAL**

**NO 1134 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government provide the indicative percentage increase in and the value of each estate in the 50/50 sale offer in respect of the offer made in 2002 and in respect of the offer made in 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member seeks is on the schedule attached.



|                           | 2002 % increase<br>on Original Value | 2004 % increase<br>on Original Value | 2004 % increase on<br>2002 % increase |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Sir William Jackson Grove | 34%                                  | 67%                                  | 24.63%                                |
| Harbour Views             | 66%                                  | 113%                                 | 28.31%                                |
| Montagu Crescent          | 116%                                 | 135%                                 | 8.80%                                 |
| Montagu Gardens 1 & 2     | 173%                                 | 226%                                 | 19.41%                                |
| Montagu Gardens 3         | 51%                                  | 95%                                  | 29.14%                                |
| Brympton                  | 105%                                 | 125%                                 | 9.76%                                 |
| Westview Park             | 108%                                 | 117%                                 | 4.33%                                 |

Government's share value in each Estate

|                           | 2002                  | 2004                  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Sir William Jackson Grove | £2,533,018.07         | £3,156,900.42         |
| Harbour Views             | £6,465,322.77         | £8,295,655.65         |
| Montagu Crescent          | £3,705,287.56         | £4,031,352.86         |
| Montagu Gardens 1 & 2     | £5,688,784.21         | £6,792,977.23         |
| Montagu Gardens 3         | £1,770,159.07         | £2,285,983.42         |
| Brympton                  | £930,489.79           | £1,021,305.59         |
| Westview Park             | £1,771,440.67         | £1,848,144.05         |
|                           | <u>£22,864,502.14</u> | <u>£27,432,319.22</u> |

The 2002 value of Government's share in these properties is based on Government's share in the properties as at 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1134 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer provides the increase on the original value in 2004. I take it that is the offer in 2003 which is what the question asks.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure that it does, nor am I sure that the question is that clear in asking that. I believe that the table that the hon Member has tells him what was the increase in 2002, in other words in calendar 2002 and then in calendar 2004.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but the question does not ask anything about calendar 2002. It says, '*in respect of the offer made in 2002*', and the offer made in 2002 was an offer to sell the houses at 4 per cent increase over the original value. Is that the information that is provided?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not think that that is how the person that has answered this question has understood it at all. I think that these are percentage increases in value, percentage and quantum increases in the value of the Government's real estate so to speak. I think that is how the question has been understood and answered.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it has nothing to do with the offer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think it is a valuation of the offer. I think it is a valuation of the estate but I will find out. My reading of the information given is that his question has been understood as asking for a valuation of the Government's estate rather than a quantum valuation of the offer as such.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the value of the estate then in 2002 and 2004 based on the 7 per cent per annum?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think so, it is probably based on market values but I am uncited on that. I will have to get clarification of the whole basis of this answer for him. I do not think his question has been answered. I think he has had a lot of information but not the one that he asked.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

At least I would like to understand what the information that I have been given is. I would like to know how those percentages have been arrived at in respect of 2002, since I cannot relate it to the information that has been given previously. In respect of the information in the lower part of the table that has been provided, where there is a footnote saying the 2002 value of the Government shares in this property is based on the Government shares in the property as at 2004. I take it that means subsequent to the sale that took place as a result of the offer made in 2002, is that the correct interpretation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is my interpretation of it.

-----  
-

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The percentages 2002/2004 are the same and the values 2002/2004 are the same, except that this one has got 22p more than this one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We will have to clear this up later but can the hon Member make clear why he believes that that is not the information that the question seeks?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not that I am asking whether this is the information the question seeks, it is just that the answer that this information supplies is not consistent with the information he has supplied.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that is the next question, that is the one about the 50/50 scheme. What the hon Member has just said refers to the breakdown between 50 per cent of market value or 4 per cent of annual uplift.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of how many were sold under one and how many were sold under the other. That is the next one, but in respect of this one where I have asked him to give the indicative percentage increase and the value which they state in the offer made in 2002, and in the offer made in 2003, the percentage mark-up of market value in 2002 that he gave me in 2002 was based on the 7 per cent per annum. How come Montagu Gardens have gone up by 173 per cent and William Jackson Grove has gone up by 34 per cent? When he told me market value meant 7 per cent per annum..... *[Interruption]* yes, I am afraid that is what he said then, I have got the

answer here. I asked him whether market value was the amount that was actually raised in transactions. What he answered was, I will quote. This is Question No. 655 of 2002 and I said 'have Government obtained valuation advice on transactions to arrive at the current market value?'. The reply that I got was that since the purchase would be restricted to 7 per cent per annum, and any money that they pay for fixtures and fittings is not taken into account, market value means 7 per cent per annum because that is what is legally permissible. He actually told me that the values he was giving me was 7 per cent multiplied by the number of years.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, but that is market value in a wholly different context. That is market value in relation to what people could sell their houses for. This is market value in the context of the offer made by the Government to sell their share, and it is not the same thing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept that it is not the same thing but it was the same question and it is not the same answer, that is the whole point. The question that I was asking was, if the offer for sale that was made then is 50 per cent of market value, 50 per cent of the prices that are being paid for these houses in the market. The Chief Minister said no, it is not. Market value in the offer for sale means 50 per cent of nine years at 7 per cent per annum. That is what he said, it is in the Hansard of Answers to Questions answered by him in 2002.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member must be mis-reading or misquoting that because it is one or the other it cannot be both. If the offer is 50 per cent of market value or cost price plus a certain number of percentage uplift per annum, it is nonsensical to say that for the purposes of that equation, market value is the percentage that they can mark up, they would both be the same. The whole essence of the offer was.... The Government have never charged 7 per cent. Seven per cent is what they can charge when they sell to third parties. The Government have never offered to sell at 7 per cent. The Government have offered to sell on one year it was at 4 per cent and I think the other year it was more. Four and five per cent. The whole essence of the Government's offer was that it was being offered more "cheaply" than the Government were entitled under the lease. Government could have said 'well I will charge 7 per cent like everybody else does'. The Government's offer was that we were willing to sell for less than the 7 per cent per annum up rate.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When I asked in one of my supplementaries specifically, is the £80 million (which was the result that he had given me) of the market value, the result of the value in the books of the company that owned the property or the result of valuation advice. His reply was 'it is a result of what the hon Member asked for in his question which was market value'. The market value means, because of the conditions attached to the trust deed, the market value actually means cost plus 7 per cent per year. Therefore, how is it that market value which is cost plus 7 per cent per year, represents an

increase of 116 per cent in Montagu Crescent and 34 per cent in William Jackson Grove?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is comparing apples with pears. Not only is he comparing apples with pears but he is completely misapplying an answer to a completely different question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, it is exactly the same question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not exactly the same question. At the time, he was asking what the Government's shares in these estates were worth, and in saying what is the Government's share of all these flats were, he said are they being valued at 7 per cent up rates or at market value, and he got an answer for that purpose. Then along come the Government and say 'I am going to offer my shares for sale', on what basis? On the basis either of 50 per cent of the market value, meaning 50 per cent of what the properties are worth on the open market, or at the original cost up rated, ignoring market value, at the original cost up rated by 4 per cent in the first offer and 5 per cent in the subsequent offer, and people could choose. This question relates to the latter of the two exercises. In other words the Government's offer, not the question that he asked back then. In the context of the Government's offer it is nonsensical for the hon Member to think that the phrase 'market value' means a figure arrived at by reference to an annual percentage up rate because that is nonsensical. The whole basis of the offer is that there is a choice either open market value or original cost, increased per annum of ownership by 4 per cent. So the hon Member is comparing apples with pears and he is completely misquoting and misapplying my answer to a wholly different question, in a wholly different context to this question in this context which relies specifically to can the Government provide the indicative percentage increase in and the value of each estate in the 50/50 sale offer, in respect of the offer made. Not what is the Government's share of the flats worth. He is asking for the information in respect of the offer made, and in respect of the offer made it is either 50 per cent of market value, or, that is the offer made.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think that when the Chief Minister becomes less excited, if he cares to go back and read the explanations he gave me, he will find that I am not misquoting him or misreading. I just happened to pick part of what was several pages of exchanges and throughout he keeps on saying that it is not based on open market values, it is based on the fact that the trust deed will not allow the houses to be sold for more than 7 per cent. If the houses were sold in that nine year period for more than 7 per cent, it is because of people asking for fixtures and fittings. So when the Government said it is either 50 per cent of the market value or 4 per cent instead of 7, as the following answer will clearly show, to the next question, what he was telling us then was that in fact 4 per cent would invariably be less than 50 per cent of the annual uplift of 7 per cent per annum. That is what he said then. He can get all

worked up about it but look, I am not criticising him or anything. All I am doing is to try and make sense of the answer he has given me today and the answer he gave me the last time I asked about the sale of these houses.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. It is not a question of excitement. It is not a question of comparing like with like. The hon Member is completely and utterly misinterpreting what he is reading there, and he is misquoting it and he is misapplying his own misquotations. The information in relation to 7 per cent can only apply to transactions between third parties. If he asks me at a given point in time what is the Government's share of the houses worth, and I said to him the share of the houses are worth what they can be sold for. At the moment that is a 7 per cent per annum uplift. Then along comes the Government later and makes an offer on a different basis. Now he comes and asks me questions not related to the basis of his first question in 2002, but related to the different basis upon which the Government made subsequently an offer. The information provided therefore relates to the offer and not to the general generic question of 2002 about how these things were valued and whether it was on a 7 per cent or on an open value basis. I do not need to re-read Hansard. I can tell the hon Member just from the bits that he has quoted from it. It is not a question of criticism, this is statistical information, it is not open to political criticism. The facts are what they are. I do not feel criticised by it, and even if he were criticising me for it, that is not the issue. The hon Member is perfectly free to criticise me, he has spent quite a lot of time doing it. The point is that he should not stand up in this House and assert that the Chief Minister is giving him answers inconsistent with answers given to him previously, relying on the fact that he happens to have the Hansard in front of him and I do not, and expect to get away with it. On this occasion he has not got away with it because just by the limited amount he has read from it, his error is clear. That is the reason why I am engaging him on this, not because there is any underlying criticism, but because he is just asserting that there is an inconsistency of an answer and the answer is that there is no inconsistency of an answer. What there is, is a comparison of apples and pears by him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

First of all I have not got the whole of the Hansard here, I have just got some bits that I brought in as background to this question, but I will return to this subject when I have got the information in order to put the record straight in the House on a point of clarification, when the time comes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What is the number?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

There are several questions involved. Since the Chief Minister has the practice of saying 'I will answer this question with 20 others', all I have done is pick one out of the 20, but it affects 665, 647, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654 of 2002. Now, in all that long list and in all the supplementaries, there were a number of exchanges when he gave me that explanation.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Next time he raises it with me in the House, I will be armed with Hansard too.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not armed with all of it, this is what I am telling him. In any case, I know that when I am able to demonstrate to him that this is in fact what took place, he will not feel criticised because he will then blame whoever it was that prepared the answer for him.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Does the hon Member think that I prepare the answers to these questions?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, but if the Chief Minister thinks that I have made a mistake then he gets very worked up about it and defends it very virulently. If he goes on the defensive because he thinks I may be right, then he says it must be the Civil Servant that got the figures wrong that I have just read.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No this is not about figures.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes it is, about whether the valuations has been based on 7 per cent or on an open market percentage.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No this difference is not about that distinction.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

See, he is still not understanding the explanations that he has had from me. This issue is not about whether it was produced on the basis of 7 per cent or open market value back then, the answer to 2002. The issue now is about whether the answers given in answer to that question, howsoever they were calculated, are comparable to the information being given now in answer to what is a different question here, in 1134, that is the issue between us. Therefore, I will not on this occasion, since he

says I always have recourse to it, on this occasion it will not be open to me to have recourse to that device, if that is what he thinks it is, because that is not the issue on which I will seek to defend myself when we debate this issue on the next occasion. Debate it we will. Believe me, debate it we will.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just say that I predict that when we have this discussion again and I am able to demonstrate to the Chief Minister that I am not misinterpreting it, he will blame the Civil Servants.



**NO 1135 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government say in respect of 50/50 sales other than Westside 1 Phase 2, whether it was found necessary to apply the alternative method of charging the 50 per cent market value as lower than 4 per cent add on increase on the original cost and if so, can Government identify the estate and the number of housing units out of total sales in each estate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Apart from 18 of the 57 flats sold in Montagu Gardens Phase 1, which were sold using the 4 per cent uplift per annum formula, all other properties were sold at 50 per cent of market value.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1135 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am astonished. That is in direct conflict with the answer I got the last time. Is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I have to say that I was surprised by this answer. I have asked for it to be re-checked and the answer has been left in front of me the same. My understanding is that it had been the other way around. In other words, the 4 per cent had been the norm. I am just trying to work out from the information that I have been provided here for any possible supplementaries, whether I can just work out, I am told that sales using 4 per cent in Montagu Gardens Phase 1 was 18 units and that the alternative is 57 units. No it does not give me a clue as to whether this answer is erroneous or the previous one, but I agree with the hon Member because I had the same reaction when I read this and I asked for this to be checked, and I am assuming, perhaps wrongly, that because no one has come back to me saying 'yes *Chief Minister, you were right, we made a mistake*' it may be that they were not expecting me to have to answer this question this morning, given that the whole thing has been advanced and when I get back to the office at lunchtime all will be revealed. It might be that because I was not scheduled to start answering my

questions until much later or possibly even on Thursday. So I will have to come back on that, I agree that at first sight the answers had the same effect on him that they had on me and I would just like to come back to him to see whether this piece of paper that I still have in front of me, represents the result of having been checked or of not yet having been checked.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact, do the Government recall that in the answer given to Westside 1 Phase 2, which is why I am excluding it from this, I think I was told, speaking from memory but we can check the Hansard, that only two out of 180 had been sold at 50 per cent and that is why my question excluded that particular group of units because that answer had already been given. So perhaps if that answer was wrong, could the Government correct it?

-----  
**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I give him this answer, I have not had an opportunity to review it myself, it has just been given to me, but it does seem to make more sense than the previous one. Under the 2002 50/50 discount scheme, the computations of 39 out of the 57 sales in Phase 1 were lower when computed on the market value basis. A total of 39 out of 57 in the case of the Montagu Gardens Phase 1. Under the 2004 50/50 discount scheme, the computations were all lower when computed on the uplift per annum basis. Presumably because the market values had risen in those two years and changed the equation for the rest of them. Which of the two methods of computation was lower, depended on whether original completions took place in 1992 or 1993, thereby explaining the marginal differences between both bases of computation. Of course not all the houses in the estate were completed in the same year originally, and as it is 4 per cent per annum, the multiplier is different as it alters the equation. In respect of Montagu Gardens Phase 2, under the 2002 scheme offer, the offer price on all but two sales, and this information is the one that he had carved out of the question because I think that he had it already, the offer price on all but two sales in the phase was lower on the uplift per annum basis. Under the 2004 50/50 offer, the computations were lower when computed on the uplift per annum basis in all cases. Now, in addition to that I hand the hon Member a schedule, of which unfortunately again a spare copy has not been made for me, so in case he has supplementaries I would not have it in front of me.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, while I am waiting for that, in fact if the Chief Minister remembers, when I asked about the two systems originally when he brought the proposal to the House originally and we asked questions about it, I said to the hon Member that as I had understood it in all cases it was expected that the 4 per cent per annum would be the more effective formula for the tenant to buy. In fact, it was because he had already told me that the market value was limited to 7 per cent per annum. What I said to him then in relation to this particular question was that in fact, if the higher price is going to be the 7 per cent per annum, then it must follow that the 4 per cent per annum will be better for everybody in every case. His reply was, everything that the hon Member has said is correct, but that in the case of Westside 1 Phase 3, the

provision for open market value and 50 per cent had been put because even applying the 4 per cent since they had started off from a higher base, the 4 per cent might be more than the open market value. That is what he told me, and he said that I had identified correctly that the provision of open market value had been there only for that purpose. I can go back and dig it all out if he wants. Therefore, he confirmed in supplementaries to Question No. 417 of 2003, put by the Hon Dr Valarino, that indeed it was only in the case of Westside 1 Phase 3 that the 50 per cent of open market value had been applied as he had predicted originally. In a subsequent answer he said that there had been two instances of Westside 1 Phase 2 which had in fact resulted in the 50 per cent of open market value out of 180. Since the formula was intended to apply universally and really the other one was an exception, as he explained it originally, because these houses had started at such a high price that the Government thought that even if they offered them a 4 per cent per annum uplift, it would not be such a bargain because they could not possibly have gone up by so much in the period of time. Then the questions that we were asking generally indicated that in most other cases, as predicted, it was the 4 per cent that was available. That is why I was surprised by the answer which seemed to be indicating the very opposite and particularly, the inconsistency in the values, because if we are talking about the answer that he has given me to the previous question, and we are saying well in Montagu Gardens 1 and 2 the price of the houses is 226 per cent of what they were when they were bought, and the Government are going to charge either 50 per cent of 226 or 4 per cent per annum, I would have thought that the more the increase in value the more the 4 per cent is likely to be the cheaper element. The very explanation that was given for the 50 per cent of the market value was because the 50 per cent of market value would prove to be below 4 per cent per annum, and that that was going to be in the place where the market value had gone up least, because it started off from being very high already.

**MR SPEAKER:**

What is the question, the supplementary?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The supplementary is, in the light of the explanation that he has just provided, and the figures he has provided, is it in fact the case that the answers that he gave previously, which was in the first answer that he gave us was that nobody had bought at 50 per cent of market value except the last phase, Phase 3, where the prices had started higher. Subsequently, in a subsequent answer they told us that there had been two out of 180 in Phase 2 that somehow, I did not quite understand why there should be two that were different from the other 178, but there were two where the market price was such that 50 per cent of the market price was less than 4 per cent per annum. Now we are being told that it is much higher than that, that it was 39 out of 57 in Phase 1.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I have got to insist, what was your specific question?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My question is in the light of the answer I have been given today, am I to take it then that the information provided about the prices which these houses were sold in the previous answer is not the correct information.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not willing to compare the information provided today with the information provided in answer to the other questions until I have had an opportunity to do a detailed comparative test myself. I am certainly not willing to do it on the basis of the hon Member's skimpy summary of what he says. So what I will do, is that I will take cognisance of his last supplementary and I will respond to him by other means. I will write to him to explain, but certainly it would appear, this much is true, that after that question was answered, more purchases had been completed on the market value basis than was anticipated at the time by either him or me. Now, there has got to be a reason for this. It could be the variable, the years passed from completion, I will get to the bottom of it. First of all I will do the comparison of the answers to see if there is an inconsistency and if there is an inconsistency, which he appears to be clear that there is and there may be, I will find out when I do the comparison myself, I will write to him to give him an explanation why the facts now look different. Can the hon Member just remind me what the questions are?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, there were the original questions in 2002 which were 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 649 and 647 and then there were supplementaries in answers to question 417 of 2003, and there may be others because this was raised on a number of occasions. I can tell him on the 2003 occasion, when I was asking precisely as to which units triggered off the 50 per cent of the market value, he cited the following example. In respect of Westside 1 Phase 3, all interested purchasers are under 50 per cent of market formula, just to give him an idea why. Using the 4 per cent per annum annual increase would give a price of 36 per cent over cost, and using 50 per cent of the market value formula gives a figure of 25.5 per cent over cost. Therefore, the market value figure has been used in Westside 1 Phase 3. The Chief Minister will recall that the reason for that was basically the explanation that he has given. He can see from the schedule that many of the sales in Westside 1 Phase 3 have all been under the 50 per cent formula. So everything that I have quoted there, it is not that I calculated something and it has turned out to be different, it is that I calculated it based on the explanation that he gave me which he has been confirming until today. The results of today would indicate that those explanations were not accurate and therefore, all I want is to be sure which of the two is accurate.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Or that the answer to this question is still not right.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I cannot judge, that is the honest truth.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well that is the clarification that I will write to him on, promptly.

2002 50:50 DISCOUNT SCHEME

Q1135/2004

| Estate                    | Average yr of completion | % Mkt value increase in 2002 | Revised Offer                             |      | No. of years from original purchase | Revised Offer                       |      | Applicable method                   |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|
|                           |                          |                              | 50% of market value as % of original cost | A    |                                     | 4% multiplier as % of original cost | B    |                                     |
| Sir William Jackson Grove | 1994                     | 34%                          | 67%                                       | 67%  | 8                                   | 132%                                | 67%  | Market value method                 |
| Harbour Views             | 1992                     | 66%                          | 83%                                       | 83%  | 10                                  | 140%                                | 83%  | Market value method                 |
| Montagu Crescent          | 1998                     | 116%                         | 108%                                      | 108% | 4                                   | 116%                                | 108% | Market value method                 |
| Montagu Gardens I         | 1992                     | 173%                         | 137%                                      | 137% | 10                                  | 140%                                | 137% | Market value method                 |
| Montagu Gardens II        | 1993                     | 173%                         | 137%                                      | 137% | 9                                   | 136%                                | 136% | Marginal difference between methods |
| Montagu Gardens III       | 1993                     | 51%                          | 76%                                       | 76%  | 9                                   | 136%                                | 76%  | Market value method                 |
| Brympton                  | 1993                     | 105%                         | 103%                                      | 103% | 9                                   | 136%                                | 103% | Market value method                 |
| Westview Park             | 1998                     | 108%                         | 104%                                      | 104% | 4                                   | 116%                                | 104% | Market value method                 |

\* 4% per annum x number of years from original completion to 2002

2004 50:50 DISCOUNT SCHEME

| Estate                    | Average yr of completion | % Mkt value increase in 2002 | Revised Offer                             |      | No. of years from original purchase | Revised Offer                       |      | Applicable method                   |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|
|                           |                          |                              | 50% of market value as % of original cost | A    |                                     | 5% multiplier as % of original cost | B    |                                     |
| Sir William Jackson Grove | 1994                     | 67%                          | 84%                                       | 84%  | 10                                  | 150%                                | 84%  | Market value method                 |
| Harbour Views             | 1992                     | 113%                         | 107%                                      | 107% | 12                                  | 160%                                | 107% | Market value method                 |
| Montagu Crescent          | 1998                     | 135%                         | 118%                                      | 118% | 6                                   | 130%                                | 118% | Market value method                 |
| Montagu Gardens I         | 1992                     | 226%                         | 163%                                      | 163% | 12                                  | 160%                                | 160% | Marginal difference between methods |
| Montagu Gardens II        | 1993                     | 226%                         | 163%                                      | 163% | 11                                  | 155%                                | 155% | 5% uplift method                    |
| Montagu Gardens III       | 1993                     | 95%                          | 98%                                       | 98%  | 11                                  | 155%                                | 98%  | Market value method                 |
| Brympton                  | 1993                     | 125%                         | 113%                                      | 113% | 11                                  | 155%                                | 113% | Market value method                 |
| Westview Park             | 1998                     | 117%                         | 109%                                      | 109% | 6                                   | 130%                                | 109% | Market value method                 |

\* 5% per annum x number of years from original completion to 2004

ORAL

NO 1136 OF 2004

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government state what has been the response to the current offer for sales of Government 50 per cent share of the co-ownership homes with a 5 per cent uplift, giving the same breakdown as was given in answer to Question No 417 of 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

I set out the very detailed information that he seeks in the schedule which I hand to him.

| Total Letters Sent        | Total sum of Replies Received "Yes" |                        | Total sum of Replies Received "No" |                       | Total sum of No replies Received Yet |                         | Total sum of Government Share |                |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
|                           | Government Share                    | Replies Received "Yes" | Government Share                   | Replies Received "No" | Government Share                     | No replies Received Yet |                               |                |
| Brympton                  | 36                                  | £1,021,305.59          | 6                                  | £154,423.13           | 2                                    | £51,840.00              | 28                            | £815,042.46    |
| Harbour Views             | 401                                 | £8,295,655.65          | 22                                 | £437,358.25           | 51                                   | £1,046,090.68           | 328                           | £6,812,206.72  |
| Montagu Crescent          | 152                                 | £4,031,352.86          | 8                                  | £192,698.94           | 10                                   | £262,174.36             | 134                           | £3,576,479.56  |
| Montagu Gardens           | 309                                 | £9,078,960.65          | 12                                 | £358,375.63           | 29                                   | £829,124.47             | 268                           | £7,891,460.55  |
| Sir William Jackson Grove | 165                                 | £3,156,900.42          | 6                                  | £97,633.21            | 13                                   | £240,943.43             | 146                           | £2,818,323.78  |
| Westview Park             | 82                                  | £1,848,144.05          | 9                                  | £190,560.81           | 8                                    | £181,570.32             | 65                            | £1,476,012.92  |
|                           | 1,145                               | £27,432,319.22         | 63                                 | £1,431,049.97         | 113                                  | £2,611,743.26           | 969                           | £23,389,525.99 |



**NO 1137 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government say whether any further sales of Government 50 per cent share of the co-ownership homes have taken place as a result of the late application for the 4 per cent uplift offer for sale since the answer to Question No 417 of 2003, and if so, provide the table of such transactions to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A further three applications were processed after the answer to Question 417 of 2003 as follows:

|                 |   |                   |
|-----------------|---|-------------------|
| Harbour Views   | 2 | £34,745.88        |
| Montagu Gardens | 1 | <u>£30,272.24</u> |
|                 |   | £65,018.12        |
|                 |   | =====             |

ORAL

NO 1138 OF 2004

THE HON C A BRUZON

**LANDLORDS AND TENANTS ORDINANCE**

Can Government confirm that they will be in a position to publish legislative proposals to reform the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance by the end of June 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

It is Government's present hope and working assumption that the legislation will be published and legislated before the end of this year.

ORAL

NO 1139 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TRANSFER OF MOD LAND**

What land and properties have been identified in the negotiations between the Government and the MOD that MOD could transfer to the Government of Gibraltar?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1140 to 1144 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1140 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**CHILTON COURT**

Can Government state how many housing units will become available with vacant possession on the transfer from MOD of Chilton Court and give a breakdown of the room composition of these units?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1139 and 1141 to 1144 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1141 OF 2004

THE HON C A BRUZON

**CHILTON COURT**

Is it Government policy that the housing units that become available on the transfer of Chilton Court from MOD will be allocated for rental to persons on the waiting list?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1139, 1140 and 1142 to 1144 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1142 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**ROSIA COURT**

Can Government confirm that the MOD proposes to transfer Rosia Court and can it state how many housing units are involved, their composition and whether it will be available for rental to persons on the waiting list?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1139 to 1141, 1143 and 1144 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1143 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**RELOCATION OF MOD FACILITIES**

Can Government state what relocation costs it expects to have to meet in the current financial year in connection with the transfer of properties from the MOD?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1139 to 1142 and 1144 of 2004.

NO 1144 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**RELOCATION OF MOD FACILITIES**

Can Government state what the total relocation costs it expects to have to meet in connection with the transfer of properties from the MOD?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

I am sure hon Members will appreciate that some of the information they have requested has become public since the date of the answer to this question, but I do not know if they have had an opportunity to see it altogether but I hand to the hon Members a copy of my recent public statement giving details of the properties to be transferred, they may have seen this I think it was set out in full in one of the local newspapers, to be transferred under the MOD/GOG agreement recently signed. Room composition is not currently available to us and we hope to have this information shortly. I hope to be in a position to give it to him the next time he asks the question.

The flats being transferred to GOG at Chilton Court, which are 33 in number, two blocks overlooking Queensway will be as I said publicly for rental for people on the housing waiting lists.

We expect to meet this financial year relocation costs relating to MSG, that is the black and yellow tugs, move to Gun Wharf and some of the Four Corners flat conversions. Total relocation costs are not known at this stage. The costs that Government expect to pay will be in the order of £3.5 million. The other costs will (we intend) be borne by private developers that acquire land for development.





**Statement by the  
Chief Minister  
Peter Caruana**

in relation to details of the  
Lands Transfer Agreement  
between GOG & MOD  
signed on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2004  
by the Chief Minister and the  
Secretary of State for Defence, Geoff Hoon.

Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2004.

For many decades successive Gibraltar Governments have recognised that the transfer of surplus MOD lands and buildings is important to enable and facilitate the social, economic and infrastructural development of Gibraltar.

In more recent years progress in achieving substantial land transfers has been prevented by, mainly, two factors. The MOD's need to decide upon its estate requirements, and, the policy of successive Gibraltar Government's to refuse (given the economic effects of MOD cutbacks) to pay for lands transferred, even in circumstances where the current Lands Memoranda (which regulate MOD/GOG lands transfers generally) require such payments.

Accordingly, in order to break this impasse, whilst preserving GOG's position in relation to the Lands Memoranda, GOG invited MOD at the highest level to engage in a lands negotiation outside the scope of the Lands memoranda, and without prejudice to the position of the parties in that respect. The Agreement signed on Tuesday is the fruit of that negotiation.

During these negotiations the Government has been mindful of certain important issues, as follows: -

- (1) Not to accept lands, and relocate MOD facilities, in a way which confines MOD activities territorially within Gibraltar such that would make the Military Base "red line issue" significantly easier to overcome in the context of any future joint sovereignty initiative between UK & Spain;
- (2) Not to accept lands which resulted in justification for job cuts in the MOD directly employed labour force or in the WSM workforce.
- (3) Not to accept land which undermined the Trade Unions' and the Government's opposition to privatisation and contractorisation of MOD Activities and labour;

- (4) The need to ensure that the interests of the Royal Gibraltar Regiment were properly safeguarded, whilst, at the same time, obtaining important benefits for Gibraltar as a whole.

This Agreement achieves and safeguards all the above.

The following are details of the Agreement. Agreed transfer dates are given in brackets: -

1. Residential Accommodation: Individual houses.

- (1) Bruce's Farm (April 04).
- (2) Ince's Farm (July 04)
- (3) Humphrie's Huts (April 04)
- (4) Lind House (April 04)
- (5) New Aloes (April 04)
- (6) Rock Cottage (April 05)
- (7) St Bernard's House (June 05)
- (8) Beaulieu House (June 05)
- (9) 19 Scud Hill (Sept 06)
- (10) Rose Tree Cottage (Sept 06)
- (11) The Elms (Feb 06)
- (12) Lower Elms (Feb 06)
- (13) Loquat House (April 05)
- (14) St Stephen's House (Feb 06)
- (15) Mount Barbary (April 05)
- (16) Lancashire House (June 05)
- (17) John Snow House (Jan 06)
- (18) Suffolk House (Jan 06)
- (19) Surrey House (Jan 06)

These houses have a very substantial resale value and it is the Government's intention to sell them and to reinvest the proceeds in building more affordable homes for first time local home buyers.

2. Residential Accommodation: blocks/multi-dwellings.

|                          |            |         |
|--------------------------|------------|---------|
| (20) Rosia Court         | (32 units) | July 04 |
| (21) Sandpits House      | (12 units) | July 06 |
| (22) Carter House        | (12 units) | TBC     |
| (23) Tangier View        | (12 units) | Mar 08  |
| (24) South Pavillion OMQ | (9 units)  | Aug 05  |
| (25) Europa Pass Battery | (16 units) | TBC     |
| (26) F Block ONH         | (4 units)  | July 06 |

These units would have a lower market price than the individual houses. But in total have a substantial capital value. It is the Government's intention to sell these houses to local home buyers, and to reinvest the proceeds in building more affordable homes for local home buyers.

3. Chilton Court

(27) 2 Blocks (overlooking Queensway) comprising 32 flats. These flats will be added to the Government's housing stock for rental to people on the housing waiting list on the same terms as Edinburgh House.

4. Sites for Development

(28) Cormorant Wharf (April 04)

(29) Fleet Pavilion (April 04)

The transfer of this site will enable the Government to build a new first and middle school to accommodate demand in the Town and Westside areas

(30) The Coaling Island, basin and berthing strip.

This transfer enables the Government to proceed with the relocation of the small boat owners. (Pending reprovisioning)

- (31) No4 Dock. (Pending reprovisioning)  
The transfer of this site enables major additional development opportunities to proceed, including a large new reclamation in front of Rooke and the RGYC, creating further development land and the construction of a new road linking Westside Reclamation and Queensway.
- (32) Land at Navy W/T Station (April 04)
- (33) Queensway Club Swimming Pool area. (April 04)
- (34) Site of Thompson's cottages/Naval Hospital Hill (April 04)
- (35) North Front Ariel Farm site/Eastern Beach (April 04)
- (36) Dutch Magazine site (except the part occupied by MOD laundry, unless relocated) (April 04)
- (37) MOD Medical Facility, Queensway (when MOD build new hospital)
- (38) RNH Europa Road (when MOD build new hospital)
- (39) Gibraltar Squadron facilities (subject to relocation at Gunwharf)
- (40) Navy W/T Station. (Aug 10)
- (41) Rosia Tanks (April 04)

In its recent election manifesto the Government committed itself to ensuring that some development sites would be made available to private developers on condition that they built low cost, affordable housing for first time local home buyers. This will result in still more such homes being built.

##### 5. Industrial Assets

- (42) MOD ex Motor Transport Garage (Opposite Air Terminal).  
Government intends to use this existing facility as the depot for the new bus service. (April 04)
- (43) The Shell hangar at the airfield. (Pending reprovisioning)
- (44) Large area of land to the North of the airfield. (April 04)
- (45) The old MOD Sullage Plant at North Mole. (April 04)
- (46) Williams Way OFD and Orillion Gap Tunnel. (April 04)

- (47) Coaling Island Cold Store. (April 04)
- (48) Eastside (disused) fuel depot (April 04)
- (49) Eastside Jetty and related instalations. (April 04)
- (50) WSM Stores, Waterport. (July 04)
- (51) Ex-Naafi Stores, Waterport. (Aug 07)
- (52) Commercial Port use, for account of GOG, of Southern (MOD) half of detached mole. (Immediate)

#### 6. Other Sites

- (53) The freehold (subject to existing long lease) of La Rotunda, Winston Churchill Avenue; (April 04)
- (54) The freehold (subject to existing long lease) of Britannia House; (April 04)
- (55) The freehold (subject of 150 leases in favour of MOD & RGR) of the remaining blocks of Chilton Court. (80 flats) (April 05)
- (56) The MOD Eastside Water Catchments. (April 04)
- (57) Middle Hill, Upper Rock. (April 05)

#### 7. Other Social Facilities/Assets

- (58) Ownership of the road leading to Western Beach. (April 04)
- (59) Command Education Centre, Queensway/Bowling Alley. (April 04)
- (60) Queensway Club. (April 04)
- (61) Central Hall. (April 04)
- (62) Navy No1 Ground (Sept 04)
- (63) Land for expansion of Cemetry. (April 04)
- (64) A sea-shore strip of land to link Camp Bay and Little Bay. (April 04)
- (65) Reduction in waters designated as Admiralty Waters. (Pending Re provisioning)

## 8. Other Issues

### (1) Commercial Lettings

In the recent past MOD has been letting premises to commercial entities that competed in the local market. These companies operated in a lower cost environment and therefore competed unfairly with companies established in premises outside the MOD estate. In future such companies will pay rates to GOG and rent to MOD equivalent atleast to their Net Annual Values for rating purposes. Tenancies must be registered with The Rent Assessor, and all GOG authorities and inspectors will have full access. This will eliminate the commercial advantage over competitors.

### (2) Pending documentation

This agreement allows the documentation of the transfer of Cumberland and Tower sites, Rosia Road, to proceed, making two further sites available for development.

## 9. In exchange for all the above, GOG has agreed the following in favour of MOD: -

(1) As is usual practice historically, facilities for which there is continuing need by MOD will be reprovided by GOG at its expense as follows: -

- (a) Weather Balloon Station, airfield.
- (b) 100 car parking spaces for MOD at Commonwealth Parade (until construction of proposed underground car park by GOG at Navy 1 Ground).
- (c) Gibraltar Boat Squadron to new finger jetty at Gunwharf.
- (d) MSG tugs & boats from Coaling Island to Gunwharf.
- (e) Water sports and other facilities from No4 dock to Gunwharf. Gunwharf site thus reverts to MOD.
- (f) Conversion and upgrading of five existing blocks at Four Corners estate into 15 flats.

- (2) £250,000 annual reduction in MOD payment to GOG in lieu of Rates (CILOR) (This corresponds roughly to the exemption of the airfield and the Bufadero training grounds to which GOG does not provide services).
- (3) Return to MOD of current airport car park, which GOG will reprovide next to Air Terminal.

10. Royal Gibraltar Regiment

During the last few days there has been a substantial amount of comment based on misconception and incorrect facts and speculation. Far from being about depriving the Royal Gibraltar Regiment of housing for present or future recruits, the Government's purpose in the negotiation has been to secure that housing for the Regiment indefinitely, thus providing the Regiment with permanent security, so that it can not be withdrawn by MOD in any future spending review.

The issue in the deal is not the question of whether MOD stops providing housing, but rather how financial value can be given to MOD without affecting the housing issue. To understand the logic of this it is necessary first to understand UK Treasury Accounting Rules.

Under UK Treasury Accounting rules which apply to MOD, the MOD is obliged to pay in cash out of its Gibraltar operating budget every year, a sum of money equivalent to several percent of the book value of its property. This reduces the cash budget available for spending on actual MOD operations. By transferring the freehold of the property to GOG the MOD local budget avoids this loss of spending power. It is in Gibraltar's economic interests that the local MOD spendable budget should be as high as possible.



But this does not mean that MOD will cease to provide the housing or that MOD ceases to be the landlord of its RG soldiers. This is because, as part of the deal, GOG will lease back the property for 150 years, free of rent. Therefore the transfer of property is technical only, because it is leased back to MOD for 150 years. A lease for 150 years is what private home owners in Gibraltar get.

In order to give the Gibraltar Regiment long term protection in respect of housing for its soldiers, GOG has opted (in close consultation with the Regiment) to give the 150 lease to the Regiment itself. The Regiment will then in turn give another 150 lease to the MOD. MOD, as 150 year lease holder of these Chilton Court blocks will then continue to let the flats to the Regiment's soldiers on existing terms. These arrangements therefore represent no adverse change whatsoever to the regiment's soldiers.

However, because the Government's lease will be to the Regiment (who then lease – on to MOD), if MOD ever seek to withdraw the housing from Regiment soldiers, the MOD's 150 year lease of the flats reverts to the Regiment, which can then keep the housing facility in place indefinitely.

Furthermore, an agreement has been reached in relation to the Repair and Maintenance of these flats.

The Royal Gibraltar Regiment considers, rightly, that these arrangements are very positive, because without adverse effect on soldiers (who remain MOD tenants) the Regiment keeps its housing entitlements with unprecedented security for the next 150 years. The Government is delighted to have been able to support the Regiment in this very substantial manner.

But this does not mean that MOD will cease to provide the housing or that MOD ceases to be the landlord of its RG soldiers. This is because, as part of the deal, GOG will lease back the property for 150 years, free of rent. Therefore the transfer of property is technical only, because it is leased back to MOD for 150 years. A lease for 150 years is what private home owners in Gibraltar get.

In order to give the Gibraltar Regiment long term protection in respect of housing for its soldiers, GOG has opted (in close consultation with the Regiment) to give the 150 lease to the Regiment itself. The Regiment will then in turn give another 150 lease to the MOD. MOD, as 150 year lease holder of these Chilton Court blocks will then continue to let the flats to the Regiment's soldiers on existing terms. These arrangements therefore represent no adverse change whatsoever to the regiment's soldiers.

However, because the Government's lease will be to the Regiment (who then lease – on to MOD), if MOD ever seek to withdraw the housing from Regiment soldiers, the MOD's 150 year lease of the flats reverts to the Regiment, which can then keep the housing facility in place indefinitely.

Furthermore, an agreement has been reached in relation to the Repair and Maintenance of these flats.

The Royal Gibraltar Regiment considers, rightly, that these arrangements are very positive, because without adverse effect on soldiers (who remain MOD tenants) the Regiment keeps its housing entitlements with unprecedented security for the next 150 years. The Government is delighted to have been able to support the Regiment in this very substantial manner.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1139 TO 1144 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The £3.5 million is the answer to Question No. 1144, is it, which is the total?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is the total. Basically, the re-provision that the Government expect to have to pay for access to the land, obviously there is expenditure on our land once we get it but that is a different matter that is not relocation, is an item which was already on the cards. In other words the cost of moving the MSG to Gun Wharf so that the small boat owners can go into Coaling Island, and four blocks, four or five, a number of blocks in Four Corners Camp that need to be upgraded, I think 25 flats have got to be converted into 15 of a higher grading in MOD jargon, but of course that is spread over a period of time so £3.5 million is our best estimate to date of the whole of that exercise and all of the boats. There are other things, for example, the relocation of the Gib Squadron to Gun Wharf and indeed the relocation of the No 4 Dock, I do not remember I always know it as the Army Watermanship Centre but it is not called that any more. That will involve expense but that will be borne by whoever acquires the development, the Government do not expect themselves to pay out for those relocations but they do arise out of the deal just as the Government do not expect to have to fund it themselves.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can Government state out of those 33 flats that would be available for rental for people on the housing waiting list, whether there are some on the ground floor that could suitably be used for elderly people who have been waiting quite a long time to be given ground floor flats?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course there are ground floor flats. In those two blocks there are two blocks' worth of ground floor flats. I do not know what the policy of the Housing Allocation Committee is. I hope obviously that they bear in mind the physical needs of different tenants when they come to allocate the ground floor flats and they do not put healthy people on the ground floor and then find that they have to put elderly people on the upper floors. I hope that they will take that into consideration. I say that many elderly people are rather looking forward to the elderly peoples housing being built but there will be some demand I suppose for these houses as well.

**NO 1145 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRIVATE SECTOR**

Can Government state what is the estimated number of private sector dwellings built between 1945 and 1959 fit for human habitation and currently rented?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I cannot explain why this question has been allocated to me and been slipped in here when all the rest relating to this issue were dealt with by the Minister for Housing. I think this has been an oversight. I suspect that all of this issue has been fully discussed when there was a similar batch of questions for the Minister. In any case the answer is that this information is not available to Government, which are the views that we exchanged when very similar questions were taken by the Hon Mr Netto.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1145 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably the information on the number of dwellings built between 1945 and 1959 is available to the Government? The Government have got to know when buildings are built.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is not the question. The question is houses built between 1945 and 1959 fit for human habitation and currently rented.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. So what the Government are saying is that they do know how many were built but they do not know whether those that were built are fit for human habitation today and rented today, is that the answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not certain that even that is correct. I suppose somewhere there must be a record of when houses were built but I suspect that it is not as easy as the hon Member might think for the Government to get a list of houses that were built between 1945 and 1959, I cannot even assure him that that information is readily available. There is a property register, I suppose the planning authority must have but that is ownership rather than building of properties. There is presumably, I assume, the planning records go back to 1945. There will be a date when planning permission was granted, even perhaps a certificate of fitness, I do not know, which might suggest completion of construction. There might even be a record of when properties came onto the rating list for example, which might be evidence. So I suppose by those routes it might be possible to construct a picture of when properties were built, but in any case the answer to the question as formulated is that the information is not readily available. I do recall that we have had this exchange before. I mean, the Government cannot know whether properties are fit for human habitation, this is private sector dwellings, unless it were to inspect each and every property.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, I know that has been said generally about the previous questions that tried to establish the pool of houses that were available. That is why the concept of fit was there because if the house is derelict and standing it can hardly be considered to be part of the available housing stock, but of course is it that the Government in fact, having taken a policy decision on the capping of the 45 year rule, when they changed the Landlord and Tenants Ordinance, have done this without having the remotest idea as to how many properties had been affected by the 45 year rule, between 1945 and 1990?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We have debated that very question at the last session of Question Time and I have given him the answer to that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer is what, that they have no idea because they are not able to give the answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is that we have debated the very question of the basis upon which the Government moved to amend the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance the last time that we discussed this, and that is not the question being asked here. The answer to the question asked is that the information is not available to the Government.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. So in fact the answer to Question No. 565 which was that the number of properties each year that became rent controlled since 1990 as a result of having been built 45 years previously, which was five properties, is completely unrelated to the information that they do not have in this question. In other words we are talking about the same 45 year period.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the hon Member can mistreat the words that I utter to him as much as he likes. The question asks 'Can Government state what is the estimated number of private sector dwellings built between 1945 and 1959, fit for human habitation and currently rented?', to which the answer is that Government do not have that information available.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, and since the Government do not have the information that meet the three criteria, I am trying to establish whether the Government have got any notion at all of how many houses were built between 1945 and 1959. Do they have any notion? Were 1,000 houses built between 1945 and 1959 or one? No notion, is that the position? I find it very odd.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That specific question has been dealt with in the exchanges on previous questions between the Hon Mr Bruzon and the Minister for Housing in the last 48 hours.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

What the Minister and I discussed, I think, was the fact that they did not have enough resources or it would cost too much to ensure that inspectors went round all these places to establish whether or not they were empty and so forth.

**HON J J NETTO:**

In addition to what the hon Member does say, I have also additionally said that I have tried to get this information for the hon Members because they have asked this question and when they asked it about three months ago. What I have been informed is that in relation to the private sector, neither the Government Building Control Department has got the register which the Leader of the Opposition was mentioning before, partly due I am told because about five years ago when they were housed in the City Hall there was a lot of water penetration and it went into all the boxes where they had all the register and that meant that they did not have a complete picture of the situation. The Town Planner has not got the information, LPS have not got the information (this is what I have been told) and when I went to the extreme of trying to get the information from the actual source themselves, being the landlords in the private sector, they themselves also have not got the information. So we have tried to provide the information through all these various sources and we

have not been able to provide the information, but this I have said in the House before.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My supplementary is, given that in answer to Question No. 565, which he must have a bit of paper there on it, he told us that there were five properties that became rent controlled in the period 1945 to 1959, having been built in that period, are those five properties then an indication that only five properties were built in all those years?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So then the Minister does know. Five.

**HON J J NETTO:**

This is the information that has been given to me by LPS.

ORAL

NO 1146 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**HARBOUR VIEWS**

Can Government state when they expect to complete the remedial works to the podium at Harbour Views and whether the completion of the remedial works is a prerequisite to the sale of parking places to the tenants of the estate?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Government expect to commence these works this year. The sale of parking places is being held back in case the remedial work throws up the need to offer car parking spaces temporarily to the owners whilst the works are executed.



ORAL

**NO 1147 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**LAND PROPERTY SERVICES LTD**

Can Government state whether they have now concluded a new contract with Land Property Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Not yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1147 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Could the Chief Minister say when they hope to conclude the new contract by?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot give the hon Member a date, I am afraid, no.

ORAL

NO 1148 OF 2004

THE HON S E LINARES

**LATHBURY BARRACKS – RETREAT CENTRE**

Can Government state what has been the cost of refurbishing the Retreat Centre at Lathbury Barracks?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1149 to 1151 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1149 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**LATHBURY BARRACKS – RETREAT CENTRE**

Can Government state how many different groups and/or entities have availed themselves of the facilities of the Lathbury Barracks Retreat Centre since its inauguration?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1148, 1150 and 1151 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1150 OF 2004

THE HON S E LINARES

**LATHBURY BARRACKS – RETREAT CENTRE**

Can Government state who is assigned with the management of the Retreat Centre at Lathbury Barracks?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1148, 1149 and 1151 of 2004.

**NO 1151 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**LATHBURY BARRACKS RETREAT CENTRE**

Can Government state what is the annual cost of the Retreat Centre at Lathbury Barracks?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1148**

The cost of converting the derelict shell at Lathbury Barracks into a Retreat Centre was £1,084,941.37

**Answer to Question No. 1149**

Since its opening in November 2002, the Retreat Centre has been used by 14 different entities, namely: The Mission Group; Christian Charismatic Renewal; Secular Franciscan Order; Faith & Light; World Marriage Encounter; Catholic Youth Ministry; St Paul's Youth Prayer Group; Co-Worker of Mother Theresa; Cursillo Movement; St Anne's School; Royal Gibraltar Police; Marriage Care; Residents of Mount Alvernia; visiting journalists to cover the Referendum; and several persons whose homes were badly affected as a result of the fire at Horse Barrack Lane.

**Answer to Question No. 1150**

The home is run by a charitable trust, the Trustees of which employ a full-time manager to run the facility.

**Answer to Question No. 1151**

The approved estimate for 2003/2004 was £117,000 for the running costs of the home.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1148 TO 1151 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just one question, the charitable trust, is there a specific charitable trust or is it various ones?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is a specific trust. The Government used the same model as for Dr Giraldi originally, and for the New Hope Trust for the Rehabilitation Centre and indeed for the Citizens Advice Bureau. There is a trust set up with trustees. The trustees are representatives of various sectors of the community who run this, and it is a retreat centre for all walks and activities of life. Companies use it, Government Departments use it, Clubs and Associations use it and religious groups use it, of all denominations. So there is a trust, I am not sure that the trust has got a name, we call it the Retreat Centre Trust. There is a trustee even.

**NO 1152 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GARRISON LIBRARY**

Can Government say when was the last time that there were any discussions for the transfer of the Garrison Library to the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

We have agreed with the Senior Officers of the Garrison, which is the phrase that I use only because they are the people who own the library and not the MOD, there is apparently some sort of cohesive body called Senior Officers of the Garrison, they must all be very wealthy given that there are so few of them left and they own the Garrison Library, they are represented by a Senior Officer in the MOD and we have agreed to undertake discussions imminently on this issue. As to his actual question of when was the last time they met, I have not been able to obtain an exact day but it is certainly probably over a year ago. There has now been a resolution so to speak that we will get down to this and discuss it, the agreement was after Easter, well it is now after Easter and I can tell him it has not happened yet but it is on the cards.

ORAL

NO 1153 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GOVERNMENT LAND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

What are the terms of reference and the function of the Government Land Management Committee?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1154 and 1155 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1154 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GOVERNMENT LAND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

Can Government list the composition of the Government Land Management Committee?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1153 and 1155 of 2004.

**NO 1155 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GOVERNMENT LAND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

How often and on what dates have the Government Land Management Committee met in 2003 and 2004 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government do not think it appropriate to provide this information. The Land Management Committee is an informal, internal Government administrative structure to consider and decide upon routine lands issues. It comprises both Ministers and officials, and I would not want the hon Member to get the impression that this is a formal structure. In other words, it is just a label given to the officials that get together with the Ministers that they get together with to decide these issues. I do not mind telling him that there are two Ministers and one of them is the Hon Mr Holliday and the other is the Hon Mr Vinet. They are the members, for the rest it is just relevant officials in the departments concerned with the issues under discussion. So it is not actually a sort of formal, official group it is just a label given to the people that get together to perform this particular administrative function. It is no more than that, it has no legal characteristic.

**ORAL**

**NO 1156 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – HOLDING HANDS**

Can Government say whether they have received any requests for assistance, financial or otherwise, from the organisers of the holding hands round the rock event on the 4 August?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1157 of 2004.

**NO 1157 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – HOLDING HANDS**

Can Government say whether they will be supporting in principle and in practice the holding hands round the rock event on 4 August?

**ANSWER**

**Answer to Question No. 1156**

The organisers of the event held a meeting with my Colleague the Hon Joe Holliday to inform him of the event and to co-ordinate it with other events taking place on 4<sup>th</sup> August. No financial assistance has been requested.

**Answer to Question No. 1157**

Participation by each individual member of the Government in the event is a personal matter for each Member of the Government.

ORAL

NO 1158 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – USA**

What Tercentenary event is planned to take place in the USA?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1159 to 1166 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1159 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – LONDON**

What was the cost with a breakdown of the reception at the Savoy Hotel following the Tercentenary Church service in London?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1158 and 1160 to 1166 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1160 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – LONDON**

How many MPs were invited to the Tercentenary Church service in London, how many attended and who were they?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1158, 1159 and 1161 to 1166 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1161 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY PARLIAMENTARY DINNER**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the Tercentenary Parliamentary dinner in London, and can Government provide a list of those MPs who attended?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1158 to 1160 and 1162 to 1166 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1162 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – LONDON**

Can Government list the persons from Gibraltar who accompanied the Chief Minister for the Tercentenary events in London, showing the cost with the breakdown?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1158 to 1161 and 1163 to 1166 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1163 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – LONDON**

How many persons from Gibraltar were invited by the Government to the Tercentenary church service and Savoy reception and who were they?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1158 to 1162 and 1164 to 1166 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1164 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – LONDON**

How many officials from the Gibraltar Government or Gibraltar Development Corporation were present at the Tercentenary events held in London, what posts do they hold, what hotel did each of them stay in and what was the cost with a breakdown?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1158 to 1163, 1165 and 1166 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1165 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – LONDON**

What were the total flight costs due by Government in respect of persons from Gibraltar who were invited by the Government to the Tercentenary events in London?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1158 to 1164 and 1166 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1166 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – LONDON**

What were the total accommodation costs due by Government in respect of persons from Gibraltar who were invited by the Government to the Tercentenary events in London?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

I am not aware of any formal specific Tercentenary event in the USA.

The other details requested are set out in the Schedule attached.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1166 OF 2004**

Answer to Question 1159/2004

The total cost of the reception at the Savoy Hotel was £35,055. The breakdown of costs is as follows:

**The Savoy Hotel**

|                                 |        |                |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------------|
| Room Hire and Service Charge    |        | 6,518          |
| Consumables                     | 26,633 |                |
| Room set-up                     |        | 1,354          |
| Security                        |        | 500            |
| <b>Total (inclusive of vat)</b> |        | <b>£35,005</b> |

Answer to Question 1160

Contd Answer to Question 1166

A total of 149 MPs were invited to the Tercentenary Church Service. A total of 60 MPs and peers attended the Church Service and they were as follows:

|                |         |                      |     |                                                     |
|----------------|---------|----------------------|-----|-----------------------------------------------------|
| The Rt Hon     | Donald  | Anderson             | MP  | Chairman of the Select Committee on Foreign Affairs |
| The Rt Hon     | Michael | Ancram               | MP  |                                                     |
| The Earl       | John    | Attlee               |     |                                                     |
| The Lord       |         | Bethell              |     |                                                     |
| Mr             | Graham  | Brady                | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Colin   | Breed                | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | David   | Burnside             | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | David   | Chidgey              | MP  |                                                     |
| Mrs            | Helen   | Clark                | MP  |                                                     |
| Sir            | Patrick | Cormack              | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Tom     | Cox                  | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | David   | Crausby              | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Ian     | Davidson             | MP  |                                                     |
| Lord           | David   | Davis of Colty       |     |                                                     |
| Mr             | Jim     | Dobbin               | MP  |                                                     |
| The Rt Hon     | Iain    | Duncan Smith         | MP  |                                                     |
| The Hon<br>Mrs | Gwyneth | Dunwoody             | MP  | Chair of the Transport Select Committee             |
| Mr             | Nigel   | Evans                | MP  |                                                     |
| Lord           | Ronald  | Fearn                |     |                                                     |
| Mr             | Glyn    | Ford                 | MEP |                                                     |
| Mr             | Mark    | Francois             | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Edward  | Garnier              | MP  |                                                     |
| The            | Lord    | Greenway             |     |                                                     |
| Ms             | Cheryl  | Gillan               | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Dominc  | Grieve               | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Jimmy   | Hood                 | MP  |                                                     |
| The Hon        | Lindsay | Hoyle                | MP  | Chairman All Party Gibraltar Group                  |
| Lord           |         | Hoyle                |     |                                                     |
| The Rt Hon     | Michael | Howard               | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Simon   | Hughes               | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Eric    | Illsley              | MP  |                                                     |
| Rt Hon         | Adam    | Ingram               | MP  | Minister of State for the Armed Forces              |
| Mr             | Robert  | Jackson              | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Brian   | Jenkins              | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Nigel   | Jones                | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Robert  | Key                  | MP  |                                                     |
| Mrs            | Eleanor | Laing                | MP  |                                                     |
| Mr             | Bob     | Laxton               | MP  |                                                     |
| Lord           |         | Luce of Adur         |     |                                                     |
| Mr             | John    | Lyons                | MP  |                                                     |
| The Rt Hon     | Francis | Maude                | MP  |                                                     |
| Lord           |         | MacKenzie of Culkein |     |                                                     |

|          |           |                        |     |                                                    |
|----------|-----------|------------------------|-----|----------------------------------------------------|
| Mr       | Andrew    | Mackinlay              | MP  |                                                    |
| Mr       | John      | McWilliam              | MP  |                                                    |
| Mr       | Alan      | Meale                  | MP  |                                                    |
| Lord     |           | Monson                 |     |                                                    |
| Mr       | Michael   | Moore                  | MP  | Shadow Minister for Foreign & Commonwealth Affairs |
| Mr       | Neil      | Parish                 | MEP |                                                    |
| Mr       | Andrew    | Rosindell              | MP  | Chairman C.F.G.                                    |
| Mr       | Jim       | Sheridan               | MP  |                                                    |
| The      | Baroness  | Symons of Vernham Dean |     | Minister of State, Foreign Office                  |
| Miss     | Geraldine | Smith                  | MP  |                                                    |
| Revd     | Martin    | Smyth                  | MP  |                                                    |
| Baroness | Jean      | Strange                |     |                                                    |
| Baroness |           | Thatcher               |     | Former Prime Minister                              |
| Mr       | Dennis    | Turner                 | MP  |                                                    |
| Mr       | Bill      | Tynan                  | MP  |                                                    |
| Sir      | Nicholas  | Winterton              | MP  |                                                    |
| Lady     |           | Winterton              | MP  |                                                    |
| Sir      | Teddy     | Taylor                 | MP  |                                                    |



### **Answer to Question 1161**

The total cost of the Parliamentary Dinner was £6,530 inclusive of VAT and comprised the following:

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Food and Drink            | £5,090 |
| Microphone Hire           | £ 70   |
| Menu Cards                | £ 420  |
| Staff gratuities at 12½ % | £ 745  |
| Supplementary Charges     | £ 218  |
| Total inclusive of VAT    | £6,543 |

Here are the names of those who attended the parliamentary dinner:

|                     |             |            |          |                  |
|---------------------|-------------|------------|----------|------------------|
| Mr                  | David       | Arness     | MP       | House of Commons |
| The Rt Hon          | Michael     | Ancram     | QC DL MP | House of Commons |
| Baroness            |             | Anelay     |          | House of Lords   |
| Mr                  | Tony        | Banks      | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | Harry       | Barnes     | MP       | House of Commons |
| Miss                | Anne        | Begg       | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | Roy         | Beggs      | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | Henry       | Bellingham | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | John        | Bercow     | MP       | House of Commons |
| The Rt Hon the Lord | Peter       | Blaker     | KCMG     | House of Lords   |
| Mr                  | Colin       | Breed      | MP       | House of Commons |
| Lord                |             | Brookman   |          | House of Lords   |
| Mr                  | David       | Burnside   | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | David       | Cameron    | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | Ben         | Chapman    | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | David       | Chidgey    | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | Christopher | Chope      | OBE, MP  | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | Paul        | Clark      | MP       | House of Commons |
| Mr                  | David       | Clelland   | MP       | House of Commons |

|              |         |                  |         |                                |
|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
| Mr           | Tony    | Colman           | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Sir          | Patrick | Cormack          | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Tom     | Cox              | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | David   | Crausby          | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Wayne   | David            | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Ian     | Davidson         | MP      | House of Commons               |
| The Rt Hon   | Denzil  | Davies           | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Lord         | David   | Davies of Colty  | CBE     | House of Lords                 |
| Mr           | Jim     | Dobbin           | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Brian   | Donohoe          | MP      | House of Commons               |
| The Hon      | Gwyneth | Dunwoody         | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mrs          | Louise  | Ellman           | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Nigel   | Evans            | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Lord         |         | Evans of Walford |         | House of Lords                 |
| Mr           | Michael | Fabricant        | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Lord         |         | Fearn            |         | House of Lords                 |
| Mr           | Howard  | Flight           | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Mark    | Francois         | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Edward  | Garnier          | QC MP   | House of Commons               |
| The Rt Hon   | Bruce   | George           | MP      | Chair Defence Select Committee |
| Ms           | Cheryl  | Gillan           | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Roger   | Goddsiff         | MP      | House of Commons               |
| The Baroness | Llin    | Golding          |         | House of Lords                 |
| Lord         |         | Greenway         |         | House of Lords                 |
| Mr           | David   | Hamilton         | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Fabian  | Hamilton         | MP      | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Michael | Hancock          | MP, CBE | House of Commons               |
| Mr           | Nick    | Hawkins          | MP      | House of Commons               |

|                     |         |                  |        |                                        |
|---------------------|---------|------------------|--------|----------------------------------------|
| Rt Hon              | David   | Heathcoat-Amory  | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Ivan    | Henderson        | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Jimmy   | Hood             | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Gary    | Hooper           | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Gerald  | Howarth          | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| The Rt Hon the Lord |         | Howe of Aberavon | CH, QC | House of Lords                         |
| The Hon             | Lindsay | Hoyle            | MP     | Chairman All Party Gibraltar Group     |
| Lord                | Doug    | Hoyle            |        | House of Lords                         |
| Mr                  | Simon   | Hughes           | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mrs                 | Joan    | Humble           | MP     |                                        |
| Mr                  | Eric    | Illsley          | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Rt Hon              | Adam    | Ingram           | MP     | Minister of State for the Armed Forces |
| Mr                  | Brian   | Jenkins          | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Martyn  | Jones            | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Nigel   | Jones            | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| The Rt Hon          | Gerald  | Kaufman          | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Paul    | Keetch           | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Robert  | Key              | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| The Rt Hon the Lord |         | Kilclooney       |        | House of Lords                         |
| Ms                  | Julie   | Kirkbride        | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Dr                  | Ashok   | Kumar            | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mrs                 | Eleanor | Laing            | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Bob     | Laxton           | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Dr                  | Julian  | Lewis            | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | John    | Lyons            | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| The Rt Hon          | Andrew  | MackKay          | MP     | House of Commons                       |
| Mr                  | Andrew  | Mackinlay        | MP     | House of Commons                       |

|            |           |           |        |                                                |
|------------|-----------|-----------|--------|------------------------------------------------|
| The Rt Hon | Francis   | Maude     | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | John      | Maples    | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Ms         | Anne      | McIntosh  | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | John      | McWilliam | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Alan      | Meale     | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| The Lord   | John      | Monson    |        | House of Lords                                 |
| Mr         | Chris     | Mullin    | MP     | FCO                                            |
| The Lord   | Michael   | Naseby    | PC     | House of Lords                                 |
| Baroness   | Northover |           |        | House of Lords                                 |
| Mr         | Eddie     | O'Hara    | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Mike      | Penning   |        | Conservative Party Candidate                   |
| Mr         | ERic      | Pickles   | MP     | Shadow Secretary of State for Local Government |
| Mr         | Colin     | Pickthall | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Peter     | Pike      | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Ken       | Purchase  | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Rt Hon     | Joyce     | Quin      | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | John      | Randall   | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Syd       | Rapson    | BEM MP | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Andrew    | Rosindell | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Frank     | Roy       | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Jim       | Sheridan  | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Keith     | Simpson   | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Miss       | Geraldine | Smith     | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Revd       | Martin    | Smyth     | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Richard   | Spring    | MP     | Shadow Minister of State                       |
| Rt Hon Sir | John      | Stanley   | MP     | House of Commons                               |
| Mr         | Gerry     | Steinberg | MP     | House of Commons                               |

|            |          |                     |                                      |                                             |
|------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Dr         | Howard   | Stoate              | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Baroness   | Jean     | Strange             |                                      | House of Lords                              |
| Mr         | Gary     | Streeter            | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Mr         | Desmond  | Swayne              | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Sir        | Teddy    | Taylor              | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| The Rt Hon | David    | Trimble             | MP, MLA                              | Leader of the Ulster Unionist Party         |
| Lord       |          | Tristan Garel-Jones |                                      | House of Lords                              |
| Mr         | Dennis   | Turner              | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Baroness   | Muriel   | Turner of Camden    |                                      | House of Lords                              |
| Mr         | Bill     | Tynan               | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Mr         | Keith    | Vaz                 | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Mrs        | Angela   | Watkinson           | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Mr         | Brian    | White               | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Mr         | Damian   | White               | Committee Member of the Conservative | Friends of Gibraltar Group                  |
| Mr         | David    | Wilshire            | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Mr         | John     | Wilkinson           |                                      | House of Commons                            |
| Mr         | Peter    | Wilson              |                                      | Senior Researcher for the Hon Lindsay Hoyle |
| Sir        | Nicholas | Winterton           | MP                                   | House of Commons                            |
| Lady       |          | Winterton           | MP                                   |                                             |

**Answer to Question 1162**

The Chief Minister

Mrs C Caruana

Mr Francis Cantos

Mr Martin Figueras

Bishop Charles Caruana

Monsignor Father Bear

The Dean of Gibraltar, Rt Reverend Alan Woods

Nathan Payas

Andrea Martin

Alice Mascarenhas, Gibraltar Chronicle

Stephen Ignacio, Vox

Anselmo Torres, Panorama

Gerard Teuma, GBC

William Bear, GBC

John Bugeja, photographer

Total cost £12,331.12 broken down into Flights £5,924.38, Accommodation and subsistence £6,406.74.

The Minister for Trade Industry and Communications and Mr Peter Canessa accompanied the Chief Minister to the Tercentenary Events in London but were already there on other business.

## **Cont'd Answer to Question 1166**

### **Answer to Question 1163**

There were five people who were invited from Gibraltar to attend the Service of Thanksgiving and Celebration.

The following people attended the Service and Reception:

Mr Marcus Killick, Commissioner, Financial Services Commission,

A representative on behalf of Trevor Thomas of Taylor Woodrow.

Lt Col Mark Randall of the Royal Gibraltar Regiment attended the Service.

Finally Mr Greg Butcher, Managing Director, Ocean Village came with Lt Col Francis Brancato.

### **Answer to Question 1164**

A total of six officials from the Government of Gibraltar were present at the Tercentenary events including the Service of Thanksgiving and the Parliamentary Dinner.

They were:

The Chief Minister

The Minister for Trade, Industry and Communications

The UK Representative

Chief Executive, Gibraltar Tourist Board

The Chief Minister's Press Secretary

The Chief Minister's Private Secretary

The Chief Minister stayed at The Savoy Hotel and the cost was £937.65.

The Minister for Trade, Industry and Communications stayed at the Gloucester Hotel but was in London already for other events therefore does not have a cost.

The same applies to the Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Tourist Board.

The Chief Minister's Press Secretary stayed at the Swissotel The Howard and the cost was £797.46.

The Chief Minister's Private Secretary stayed at the Swissotel The Howard and the cost was £616.

### **Answer to Question 1165**

Total flight costs were £2,736.38, in respect of persons from Gibraltar who were invited by the Government.

### **Answer to Question 1166**

The accommodation costs were £3,553.85 in respect of persons from Gibraltar who were invited by the Government.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1158 TO 1166 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The supplementary on Question No. 1166 which refers to the cost of the reception at the Savoy Hotel which was just over £35,000, the reference to consumables is broken down in terms of room hire and service charges, consumables £26,600 is obviously the food and drink, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I promise that we did not provide cocaine or anything like that. Yes, food and drink.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

As a matter of interest, the parliamentary dinner which it says here cost £6,500, lists as one of the items in the breakdown staff gratuities at 12½ per cent £745, is that a sort of House of Commons practice where one has to give a certain amount?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I am told by the London Office that it is not actually voluntary, it is part of the terms of using the parliamentary dining facilities there.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The reference to the Tercentenary events in the USA was, if I recall correctly, on the website of the Tercentenary website the last time that I looked. Is the Minister able to clarify why that should have been there?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know, I am not aware. Coinciding with my UN visit there is sometimes a lunch that I host for the Gibraltar/American Council and it may be that this year it is going to be called a Tercentenary lunch, but I am not aware of any specific event.



**ORAL**

**NO 1167 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – WAR VETERANS**

Who will organise the catering for the British war veterans who will be invited to Gibraltar as part of the Tercentenary celebrations, how much will it cost and when did this go out to tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1168 to 1171 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1168 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – WAR VETERANS**

What is the projected cost, with a breakdown, of inviting 500 war veterans to Gibraltar during Tercentenary year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1167 and 1169 to 1171 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1169 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – WAR VETERANS**

What airline are Government intending to use to transport 500 war veterans between London and Gibraltar, were both existing airlines allowed to bid for this business or was this the subject of competitive tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1167, 1168, 1170 and 1171 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1170 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – COMMEMORATION**

Have the Gibraltar Government been invited to the Tercentenary commemoration of the loss of Gibraltar by any town in Spain this year and will they be attending or not?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1167 to 1169 and 1171 of 2004.

**NO 1171 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS – SPANISH MAYORS**

Have the Mayors of any Spanish town been invited to any Tercentenary event in Gibraltar this year, if so who and to what event, and will they be attending or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1167**

For the first three groups of visiting veterans, the caterers at Mount Alvernia the cooks, who will at that stage have themselves moved into the Retreat centre kitchen whilst the Mount Alvernia kitchen is being refurbished, will provide the catering. The estimated cost for this is £12.00 per person per day. This will cover the expense of a full breakfast, light lunch and dinner. Once Mount Alvernia caterers vacate the Retreat, local companies will be asked to provide a quotation for the service.

**Answer to Question No. 1168**

Costs based on 10 groups of 50 people each. On that basis the overall cost is estimated at £210,000. Giving a breakdown will provide tenderers with sensitive commercial information given that the number of people is known as is the number of days and meals required.

**Answer to Question No. 1169**

Both schedule airlines serving Gibraltar were asked to tender, subsequently, Monarch Airlines has been chosen to provide the service for all the veterans.

**Answer to Question No. 1171**

No Spanish mayor has yet been invited to any of our events. I emphasize the word “yet” and in relation to whether we have been invited to any of their celebrations for what he calls in his question ‘celebration of the loss of Gibraltar’, I do not think that that is what they are celebrating. I think that certainly Los Barrios is not celebrating that. Los Barrios is celebrating the fact that it is also the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the founding of Los Barrios. They regard the history of Gibraltar as having been

instrumental in the fact that they exist. So this is positive for them not negative. They are not celebrating the loss of Gibraltar, it is true that the loss of Gibraltar resulted in the establishment of San Roque and less publicly known the establishment of Los Barrios as well, and that is what they are celebrating. They are celebrating 300 years of their history just as we are celebrating 300 years of our history, and we are not celebrating the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of a conquest and I do not think they are celebrating the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of any loss.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1167 TO 1171 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation first to the airlines, can the Chief Minister say whether the quote by Monarch was chosen because it was the lowest airline or because logistically it was from Luton airport?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They were the lowest.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the mayors came here in January, there was public reference to collaboration between Gibraltar and the Campo towns as regards Tercentenary celebrations, can the Chief Minister say whether that collaboration has now been progressed and in fact anything is going to be done in that respect?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know what talk of collaboration he is referring to. I certainly recall saying that it was my hope to be able to extend invitations to mayors of the Campo in appropriate events that they felt they could take part in without feeling any degree of discomfiture as Spanish people and Spanish politicians. That was my position then and that remains my position. I sincerely hope that we shall be able to persuade them, or some of them, that this is not a celebration of a military loss or a military conquest but is celebration of 300 years, for good or for bad, for richer for poorer, in richness and in health, 300 years of history of Gibraltar which is worth celebrating and that they are a part of that history and that we should commemorate it together. There are some events which lend themselves to that, mainly the non military ones, the cultural ones, and there are some events which obviously do not lend themselves to that like the military ones. That is the Government's approach.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say how much, going back to the airlines, how much Monarch is charging for the flights for each of the veterans?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it would be wrong to give that information out, which is of a commercial nature, in public but I will tell him privately in the ante room afterwards.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Am I correct in assuming the £210,000 in relation to Question No. 1168, when I asked for the projected cost of inviting them with a breakdown, the £210,000 figure that I was given does not include the flights, is that correct or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It does include the flights.

**ORAL**

**NO 1172 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY GROUP**

Can Government confirm whether or not they consulted the Environmental Safety Group (and if so when) prior to the purchase of the buses now operated by the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited in order to have the benefit of the ESG's views on the type of propulsion and fuel systems employed by the buses?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1173 of 2004.



**NO 1173 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state why the buses now being used by Gibraltar Bus Company Limited met emission standard Euro 3 instead of standard Euro 4, given the impending implementation of the latter?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1172**

The Environmental Safety Group was not formally consulted nor is there any reason why they should be, but they were provided with the environmental credentials of the new buses at their request. I did actually have a general meeting with the Environmental Safety Group dealing with matters generally, at which one of its members, a gentleman who as I recall lives in Estepona, was urging the Government I seem to recall, to buy buses that run on used cooking oil, which the Government took the view was not a practical or realistic solution. Nor did we have any feedback, as far as I am aware of, to the information that we provided them on the buses that we were intending to order.

**Answer to Question No. 1173**

The order for the new buses stipulated that they should fully comply with all the relevant emission standards in force at the time and which incidentally still apply today, namely Euro 3. Buses complying with the Euro 4 standard were not available at the time of placing the order, which as the hon Member knows was early last year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1172 AND 1173 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just seek clarification, in particular of one aspect of what the Chief Minister has said? He said that the Environmental Safety Group were provided with the technical specifications, more or less, of the buses, which he was intending to order. Can I assume from that, that the Government are representing to the House that the ESG were provided with the technical specifications of the buses before the order was placed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, one cannot assume anything. The meeting with me was something quite different, it was a general agenda meeting and there was this gentleman there whose name I do not recall. I cannot say, what I am told is that they were provided with the environmental credentials, not the technical specifications let us be clear, and I cannot say to him whether they were given before or after the event nor I repeat, is the Environmental Safety Group. The Government have their own experts in these matters and the Government are advised, remember these buses were manufactured for Gibraltar they were not just bought. One will have seen the Minister photographed in front of the production line at some time. These buses were manufactured to the latest European environmental standards available. I suppose now it may be that buses are being made to a different standard, but the Euro 4 I am advised, will not affect buses that were in service before and these are the buses that are still being bought for use in the United Kingdom and elsewhere throughout Europe.

ORAL

NO 1174 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the name of the directors of Gibraltar Bus Company Limited as at close of business on Friday 5 March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1175 to 1178 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1175 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state which Government wholly owned company purchased the trans-buses?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1174 and 1176 to 1178 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1176 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state what is the anticipated operating loss of the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited in its first full year of operation?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1174, 1175, 1177 and 1178 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1177 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the terms of the agreement that was concluded between Rock City Services and the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited in respect of the transfer of the licence and when this agreement was signed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1174 to 1176 and 1178 of 2004.

**NO 1178 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state whether the rates of pay and conditions of service of the employee vacancies, as advertised in the edition of the Gibraltar Chronicle of the 6 March 2004, were arrived at by negotiation with any union or determined by the Gibraltar Bus Company and if the latter what analogues were used?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Directors are Andrew Perera, Brian Delaney and Richard Armstrong.

The buses have been acquired by the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited, a wholly owned Government company.

The financial performance of the Company will depend on the usage of it by citizens. It is not possible to assess what that will be at this early stage.

The agreement with Rock City Services was negotiated over a long period of time and completed on 5 April 2004. Government have purchased the licences for the sum of £875,000. Employees' terms were not negotiated nor was any analogue used.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1174 TO 1178 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Chief Minister confirm that the three Directors which are mentioned, I believe there are four not three, the other is the Accountant General, they were in place on 5<sup>th</sup> March 2004, which is the question asked?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I cannot, if he wants to be that specific. I notice that the question was asked at a specific date and the answer that I have been given is that one, which I am assuming is as at the date specified in the question but if he asks me personally to vouchsafe it and to confirm it, I would have to check it out. I assume that my officials have put in front of me the right factual answer.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I would like the Chief Minister to confirm this because the information that I have is that they were not in place on 5<sup>th</sup> March. How was the purchase of the buses funded, by loan to the Gibraltar Bus Company from the Government, and if so was this included in the 2003/2004 estimates or the 2004/2005 estimates?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the bus company is part of the Government's group of companies and was funded from the cash balances held in the Government's company structure. It was not funded from Consolidated Fund sources. As to whether the money has actually been injected by way of loans or by way of share capital, I would need notice of that question because that has been dealt with by the Accountant General. I suspect at this stage it has been dealt with by loan capital which might at some stage be converted.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When the buses were originally purchased, were they purchased in the first instance by the Gibraltar Bus Company or by another Government company and subsequently transferred to the Gibraltar Bus Company?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am relying on memory now so I cannot be certain that what I am saying is exactly correct. I am almost certain it was not the Gibraltar Bus Company. Remember that at the time that the buses were ordered the Government were still in negotiation with Calypso on that issue. I am almost certain but I would need to check, I do not think the buses were ordered, in other words there is a purchase agreement or manufacture/purchase agreement with the suppliers of the buses. I do not think that contract was in the name of the Gibraltar Bus Company, I think it would have been in the name of some other Government entity, but I can check that out and let him have it when next we meet.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I point out to the Government that Question No. 1175 says 'which Government wholly owned company purchased the buses?'. The reply was that 'they have been acquired by the Gibraltar Bus Company'. Well they have been acquired presumably from another company which had previously purchased them, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It does not necessarily follow that way. It may be that by the time it came to actually obtain the title to the buses, that by that stage it was done directly. In other words, there may be a difference between the company that signed the order agreement and the company that eventually took delivery and paid for the buses. That is a possibility too but I would have to check the choreography of that and confirm it to the hon Member.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the Gibraltar Bus Company, given that when it was already inviting applications it was still a company with two £1 shares issued and registered with somebody else, presumably at that stage it did not own any buses?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I do not know about registered with somebody else, whilst the negotiations which ultimately did not come to successful conclusion were being conducted between the Government and Calypso Transport, the parties agreed that we would get on with forming the company that would ultimately deliver the service and that if a successful agreement was concluded, it would be owned in accordance with whatever was agreed in that negotiation, but if there was not a successful agreement it would become a wholly owned Government company. So during the negotiations the company was formed by the lawyer then in effect helping both parties and as the negotiations between those two parties were not successful, and as had been agreed, the Government took over the company at which stage and I think it stayed with that lawyer for a while and then eventually it was changed to wherever the Government companies lived and the registered address is now No. 6 Convent Place and this is why there are Civil Servants who are Directors. So there is a process during which the company is being set up during the negotiating process and then when the service starts taking shape, namely the acquisition of the buses, the acquisition of staff and all that, at that point the company becomes active, but it is not an unusual way of doing business.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It may not be unusual in other circumstances but on this particular occasion, in fact is it not the case that the bus company was already advertising and in fact the bus company was not yet wholly owned by the Government, it was still sort of a shelf company?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think that is true. The Government were the owners of the company from the moment that we broke off negotiations with the other party and the agreement previously in place that on that happening the Government were to be regarded as the sole owners of the company, had been invoked. The fact that shares may not have been issued to the Government is neither here nor there, as the hon Member sitting on his right will advise him. The lawyer who set up the company owns the founding shares on behalf of whoever he regards as his client, which by then had become the Government, because the negotiations with Calypso, which was a negotiation leading to a possible joint venture, we just did not come to terms so the Government proceeded by themselves.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the company that originally placed the order for the buses, would this be one of the property companies which seems to be the company that has actual cash balances?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have already agreed that I will find out the name of the entity which signed the contract and let him know.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In answer to Question No. 1176 the Chief Minister said that the loss or profit of the bus company would depend on the usage by citizens. Is the Chief Minister therefore saying that during the thorough planning stage which the Government went through, they did not construct a business plan so that they had a view as to what the return on investment would be on circa £2 million?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member must be living in cloud-cuckoo-land if he thinks that the Government have entered into this venture with a view to a return on investments. This is a municipal, publicly funded, publicly subsidised public service which has not the remotest chance of delivering a return, probably never even breaking even let alone delivering a return on investment, any more than the Government look for a financial return on investment when they are running a hospital or running schools or running anything else. This is a publicly funded social service to which users make a contribution. It is the Government's decision to proceed with a public transport service of this sort, is in no case linked to the business case that could be made for it. Obviously a lot of information was researched at the time that we were negotiating a joint venture partnership, because we had to understand as between the two joint ventures, who was bringing in more passengers given that they have passenger numbers and Rock City Service that we were going to buy had passenger numbers and obviously there are pro-forma profit and loss accounts. In other words, there is an operating cost analysis for a 12 month period, all that of course is in place, but what the loss would be in other words what the revenue over expenditure will be, or the expenditure over revenue more likely in this case, what the gap between the two will be depends on the amount of traffic that we succeed or passengers that we succeed in attracting to the bus services. Clearly, with the proper working conditions that the staff of the company enjoy, as has to be the case with a Government owned company and indeed should be the case whether they are owned by the Government or not, but certainly the Government are not willing to cut corners with the terms upon which they employ people in companies owned by it, if the traffic, if the volume of usage remains as it used to be when it was run by Rock City Services at a much lower operating cost, then there will certainly be a shortfall of revenue over expenditure. We could calculate what we think that might be, I suppose that now that they have got a few days of paying traffic, they can try and extrapolate that over a 12 month period and do calculations, but remember that it is quite recent that the tariffs have been set and that we have passenger usage numbers. So I suppose the company's management will now start working projections into what revenue they think they can actually raise during the year, bearing in mind that what they hope is going to be one of the principal sources of revenue for the Government have not yet been marketed, that is season tickets, I do not know if that is the right word. The sort of weekly, monthly, quarterly and annual cards, all of which will have a much reduced tariff attached to them, and that is a source of revenue which has not yet been put on the market. So it is very early days to have an idea. My personal view is that it will not even break even and we certainly will not make a profit but it will not break even and this is a publicly subsidised public service.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I agree with the Chief Minister that the bus company will probably at best break even and I think it will make a loss and the basis of the question was for myself to determine what the level of that loss would be. A business case is based on assumptions and assumptions change with the passage of time but it would be very helpful if the Chief Minister could let me know what is the expected carriage of passengers in one year for the bus company.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member expects me to give him that information now? Well I am afraid.....

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Well an assumption, he said before that he had worked with private operators to come up with pro-forma profit and losses et cetera. Surely it must have based those pro-formas, profit and loss and cash flows must have been based on the number of passengers expected to be carried in one year and the average fare per paying passenger?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government's decision to invest in this public service is not based on a business case or a business model. Obviously we know what was the average per day passenger movements when it was being run under the present service, I do not have the figures on my fingertips from memory, I think it was something of the order of 4000 movements per day, there were days when it was more and there were days when it was less. We hope obviously to improve on those figures. Now, by how much we think we are going to improve well time will tell. We are hoping that the fact that the service is in better, more comfortable buses, that is in more attractive, comfortable buses, that it is more regular, that it is more reliable, we hope that all of these things will increase the number of people using buses. Therefore we hope to improve substantially on the daily movements carried by the operator whose activities we have taken over, but we are not sort of prognosticating and converting that prognostication into a sort of profit and loss account. We have obviously got a statement of our anticipated operating costs for the next 12 months. That obviously we have because the Government have got to make sure that the company has sufficient funding to operate on that basis, but it is far too early for the Government to be able to form our own view let alone one that is reliable enough to give to the hon Member as to what might be the performance on the revenue side.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the fact that there is a token figure in the draft estimates an indication that in fact the expectation is that the House will have to vote a sum of money to bridge the gap in the current financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I would put it differently. The fact that there is a token in a document to which he should not yet be making public reference, is .....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think that I am not breaking the fact that it is a confidential document by saying there is a token figure without mentioning the figure.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is fine by me, I am not saying that I am agreeing with his comments he should be making no reference to the content but never mind, it does not matter. The fact that it is a token precisely is a recognition of the fact that we just do not know how much it is going to be. So because the token is there, the funds can be provided either from the Supplementary Funding vote or from virement or from somewhere else. Although the Financial and Development Secretary could create a head during the year, even though one is not provided, I think by the inclusion of the token we wanted to recognise as part of the budget debate that yes, here was a new source of Government expenditure because we are expecting it to be so. We cannot give the House an indication of how much it will be, well we could tell the House how much it would be if there was no revenue at all because we know what the cost is and we can say to the House 'well if we keep the 4000 average movements a day, we can calculate how much we think that is going to produce in terms of revenue', that sort of idea will be available by the time we meet in the budget.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the terms of Question No. 1178, where the company did not use any analogues, to what did it look to decide what was the going rate, or rather perhaps more than the going rate because as the Chief Minister has said the standards in the Government company are not going to be the ones that apply in current bus and coach companies, where quite often people are employed on a casual day basis and they only get paid if they work? They must have used some guidance to decide what a driver should get.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot say, this was a proposal put up by the intended management, the Directors, to the Government and the Government just approved it. I cannot explain to the hon Member what was the rationale. I suspect and I assume that it was a reasonable figure at which they thought they could attract staff of the right calibre. I can only assume that. I notice afterwards that it is not a million miles from what drivers in Government Service get, but of course it is not the same there is no analogue but maybe that might have been an influencing factor in the minds of whoever made this proposal in the first place.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just in relation to Question No. 1177, can the Government confirm exactly what it has paid £875,000 for? Seeing as I assume they are not intending to use the buses which that company was operating at the time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I think the intention is post modification and repainting and all that. I think there are some buses that will be used. I think the double-decker buses, at least two or three of them will be used on the frontier route. There is another bus, a 10 metre bus, which is very important for training because that is under EU directives one needs to pass ones test on such a bus. So some of the buses will be used, in terms of route service we envisage it only being the better standard double-decker, certainly none of the Toyotas will be used on the other routes. In effect what we were purchasing was the licence and the undertaking. In other words, the business as a going concern. The Government could have taken a different approach but we chose not to as a matter of policy. We could have simply de-regulated the public transport system and simply muscled in to the market. We took the view that that was not the basis upon which Government should do business and in effect dispossess an established operator, so even though we had the wherewithal to have done it by another way, we chose to do it on the basis of a purchase and sale of an on-going business. It is just that the assets that the business was using, the buses, were not of the right standard. So in effect what we were buying was "the goodwill, the licences and the established clientele of the route services", that is in effect what we were buying.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Was it therefore a purchase of the shares of the company including its liabilities or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No it was not the purchase of the company it was the purchase of the licences and the vehicles. We had actually acquired the vehicles just as a means of making sure they were taken off the roads so to speak. I should also say to the hon Member that it was not for cash. In other words, it is not that we have paid £875,000 of value and of course in strict financial terms it makes no difference, but it is £875,000 minus, in other words the amount actually paid out in a cheque written out is £875,000 minus the substantial amount which they then owned in Government arrears. I have given the figure of £875,000 because that is in effect the value. It does not cease to be value because it is set off, so in other words, the amount of value, the amount of cost to the taxpayer is £875,000. It is just that in terms of cash flow disbursement a substantial figure, I have here a note of £325,000, was owed to the Government by that company in respect of various things and therefore the figure that was paid was the net figure.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In respect of any other liabilities that company may have had, not to Government, have the Government taken on those liabilities or simply hived down the assets they wanted to take?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think we agreed to make a token, included in the figure of £875,000 there is a token provision I think of £10,000, the Government's token contribution on a no responsibility it is your liability basis, for redundancy costs and redundancy entitlement and all that, but we did not take over those responsibilities, those exceed that amount but the figure of £875,000 as part of the build up has a small £10,000 contribution under that head.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know how many employees the Rock City Services actually had at the time, but would they not have been affected by the transfer of undertakings provision if the service they were providing was now going to be provided by the Gibraltar Bus Company?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No because it was a private company. Some of the employees did apply for jobs in the new company and got them, I cannot remember the exact number there, but I am not an expert on TUPE but my understanding is that this was not a transfer of undertaking as defined in the legislation. I think these transfers of undertaking are mainly from public to private rather than from private to semi public, I believe, but if he knows better so be it, I do not profess to be an expert on employment law.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept that the normal thing is privatisation rather than nationalisation in today's world, but this is in the opposite direction. My recollection is that the requirement does not specify that the transfer of undertaking has to be only from the public to the private and not in the opposite direction.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He may be right, I just do not know.

ORAL

NO 1179 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost incurred up to and including the 31 March 2004 in connection with the technical preparations carried out for the new bus service?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1180 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1180 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of parking bays that were forfeited up to and including the 31st March 2004 in connection with the technical preparations carried out for the new bus service?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 and 1181 to 1197 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1181 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of 27 Cumberland Road?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179, 1180 and 1182 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1182 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of St Joseph's First School, South Barrack?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1181 and 1183 to 1197 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1183 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of Europa Road opposite the Gibraltar Social and Athletic Association?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1182 and 1184 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1184 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of the junction between Main Street and Governor's Lane?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1183 and 1185 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1185 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of Lover's Lane?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1184 and 1186 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1186 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of the Alameda Kiosk, Grand Parade?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1185 and 1187 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1187 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of Trafalgar House, Trafalgar Road?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1186 and 1188 to 1197 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1188 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of Europa Road by the retaining wall of the Tennis Court at The Mount?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1187 and 1189 to 1197 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1189 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of Transport Road?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1188 and 1190 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1190 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the cost of the logistical preparations to start the new bus service carried out in the area of South Pavilion Road?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1189 and 1191 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1191 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of parking bays that were forfeited when carrying out the logistical preparations for the new bus service in the area of 27 Cumberland Road?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1190 and 1192 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1192 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of parking bays that were forfeited when carrying out the logistical preparations for the new bus service in the area of St Joseph's First School, South Barrack?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1191 and 1193 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1193 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of parking bays that were forfeited when carrying out the logistical preparations for the new bus service in the area of Lover's Lane?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1192 and 1194 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1194 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of parking bays that were forfeited when carrying out the logistical preparations for the new bus service in the area of the Alameda Kiosk, Grand Parade?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1193 and 1195 to 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1195 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of parking bays that were forfeited when carrying out the logistical preparations for the new bus service in the area of Europa Road by the retaining wall of the Tennis Court at the Mount?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1194, 1196 and 1197 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1196 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of parking bays that were forfeited when carrying out the logistical preparations for the new bus service in the area of Transport Road?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1179 to 1195 and 1197 of 2004.



NO 1197 OF 2004THE HON L A RANDALL**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of parking bays that were forfeited when carrying out the logistical preparations for the new bus service in the area of South Pavilion Road?

ANSWERTHE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The cost of undertaking the logistical works in connection with the new bus service and the number of parking spaces lost at each of the mentioned locations is as follows:

| <u>AREAS</u>                                            | <u>COST</u>       | <u>NUMBER OF<br/>PARKING<br/>SPACES LOST</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| St Joseph's First School                                | £6,300.00         | 6                                            |
| Europa Road opposite Gibraltar Social & Athletic Assoc. | £4,300.00         | 4                                            |
| Junction between Main Street and Governor's Lane        | £3,800.00         | 0                                            |
| Lover's Lane                                            | £3,711.12         | 6                                            |
| John Mackintosh Hall, Ince's Hall, Charles V Wall       | £20,000.00        | 9                                            |
| Alameda Kiosk, Grand Parade                             | £10,314.91        | 0                                            |
| Trafalgar House                                         | £2,857.62         | 0                                            |
| Europa Road/Tennis Court at The Mount                   | £2,500.00         | 6 m/c                                        |
| Transport Road                                          | £2,300.00         | 0                                            |
| South Pavilion Road                                     | £4,500.00         | 9                                            |
| 27 Cumberland Road                                      | £4,700.00         | 1                                            |
| Brympton                                                | Not yet available | 0                                            |
| Windmill Hill junction                                  | £2,853.00         | 2                                            |
|                                                         | £67,330.65        | 37 + 6 m/c                                   |

The total cost incurred to date on the technical preparations is £67,330.65, of which £17,358.12 was actually paid out as on 31 March 2004, with the balance to be paid during the current Financial Year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1179 TO 1197 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I note that the number of minor road works required were well in excess of the one or two places which they spinned in the press release No. 49 of 2004.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I take the slap on the wrist as perhaps further evidence on behalf of the hon Member that the bus service is very bad for Gibraltar.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I have not said that, he has. What I am saying is that I see my responsibility in this House, is to ensure that the investments the Government make are on a value for money basis, are within the laws of Gibraltar, not changed at the last moment and adhere to the highest standards of health and safety. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than for the bus service to be a successful bus service in Gibraltar, because believe it or not, the Chief Minister may not believe this, but my standing for election was driven by my desire to serve the people of Gibraltar.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe him but there are many who would not. Actually I think on the subject of the buses I do not accept for one moment that he has the interests of Gibraltar first at heart. I think that on the question of the buses he has more than amply demonstrated that he has only his own political party's self interest and opportunistic self interest at heart. That is my personal view with which he would no doubt disagree. I have heard nothing in the nature of the comments that he has made in relation to the buses or in his entire approach, I mean to lead me to believe that there is truth in what he has just said in this House, but that is my personal assessment. He is rightly concerned that the Government should stay within the law and that Government's investments should be value for money. Well, he referred to laws being changed at the last minute, certainly if he is referring to any issue of weight of the buses, he should understand that no laws have been changed, they do not need to be changed, just as they have not needed to be changed for all the previous buses, which also operated on the basis of exemptions under the Statutory law. There has been no change of law in relation to the weight of the buses, last minute or otherwise. There has been a change of the law in relation to the question of the regulations which did not exist, which were envisaged but did not exist in relation to the transferability of licences.

As to value for money, we think Gibraltar at long last has a public transport system of which it can be proud and which I think of which the vast majority of citizens, at least those that come to the issue with an objective mind and not with a desire to simply tarnish everything for political purposes, anybody that comes to the issue of the bus system with an objective mind believes that Gibraltar now has a public transport system of which we can be proud, which we deserve and which brings Gibraltar up into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Frankly, in terms of value for money, I think that £67,330.65 on infrastructure works to facilitate the provision of that service with buses of this size and quality, is excellent value for money, just as I think the buses

are excellent value for money and I regard the loss of 37 parking spaces as minute, it does not even feature on any balance of decision, (a) because the improvement of public transport is more important than the loss of 37 parking spaces; and (b) because we have provided many more than this number of lost parking spaces in other new parking projects that we have created, both in Commonwealth Parade and in the Landport Ditch. So in fact there is a much bigger gain of parking than loss, but in any case even if there had not been any gain, even if we had just lost the 37 parking spaces, I would still think it is a price worth paying, so there has been no failure to comply with the law and in the Government's judgement, with which the hon Members may well disagree, there is also value for money in this logistical work.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I just asked factual questions and I wished to thank the Chief Minister for answering them all. I did not make any comment as to the value for money of the cost of the logistical preparations. This is a further example of how he distorts things to please his.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

To everything that I have said about the hon Member so far he should add lack of memory. The very last thing he said in his last supplementary to which I was answering was that he regards it as his duty to press the Government on changes of legislation at the last minute and value for money. So when I assure him, presumably he was asking a question, this is question time not statement time by the Opposition, I assume that the essence of the supplementary was that he is raising issues about value for money on the basis of the question that he has asked, and I responded to him on the basis of value for money. He may have forgotten that he mentioned the phrase 'value for money' and having forgotten that he mentioned the phrase 'value for money' when I mention the phrase 'value for money' he then gets up and accuses me of yet another example of my distortion. I say to him, 'you see it is not another example of my distortion. It is another example of what I say they do, which is forget what they say and then make false accusations on the basis that they did not say what in fact they did say'. That is what it is another example of, not of any distortion on my part.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I beg to differ with the Chief Minister, obviously, and when I said 'value for money' I said 'value for money' he should not make any assumptions, but I can tell him what I meant by value for money. A project as a whole, and the project as a whole includes what they paid for the licences, what they paid for the buses and the costs of the logistical preparations and the forfeiture of the parking spaces.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is exactly what I addressed through value for money answer. Why he thinks that when I answer that very issue that I am distorting anything is beyond my comprehension.

**ORAL**

**NO 1198 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state what is the service life expectancy of the new trans-buses?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1199 to 1202 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1199 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

Can Government state the life expectancy of the 18 Trans-Buses?

ANSWER

Question withdrawn.

**ORAL**

**NO 1200 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the name of the local company that will be providing the servicing arrangement for the Trans-Buses and their evaluation of the experience of the company with these type of buses?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1198, 1199, 1201 and 1202 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1201 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE – UPPER TOWN**

Can Government state the name of the company that will supply the two vehicles that will provide the bus service to the areas of Moorish Castle and Willis' Road?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1198 to 1200 and 1202 of 2004.

**NO 1202 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE – UPPER TOWN**

Can Government state whether the cost of the two smaller vehicles that will provide the bus service to the areas of Moorish Castle Estate and Willis' Road forms part of the £1.875 million stated by Government in answer to supplementaries to Question No 3 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question Nos. 1198 and 1199**

The life expectancy of the 18 Trans-Buses is between 15 to 20 years provided a regular service programme is maintained. I am sure the hon Member will understand that that life expectancy can be lengthened with good maintenance and shortened with bad maintenance, as with all mechanical equipment.

**Answer to Question No. 1200**

The local company that will be providing servicing arrangements is A M Capurro & Sons. This company was nominated and selected by the manufacturers themselves when they visited Gibraltar and checked the various local companies. Trans-Bus appointed A M Capurro & Sons as their after sales representative after considering experience and facilities available. In other words, it is the vendor that has the obligation for a maintenance period as part of the warranty, and therefore it is the vendor, the bus company, that has to make arrangements to provide servicing arrangements for the buses.

**Answer to Question No. 1201**

The two temporary vehicles for the Upper Town bus service were obtained from Bassadone Motors.

**Answer to Question No. 1202**

The cost of the two smaller vehicles is not included in the stated sum of £1.875 million.



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1198 TO 1202 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Chief Minister confirm that I was wrong when I tabled my question saying two vehicles and that in fact there will be four vehicles as per the press release No. 49 of 2004, and can he inform the House the cost of providing those four additional vehicles?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand that there are only two vehicles in fact, and that the company is evaluating the service, evaluating their performance and may increase the size of the fleet, but the question is right as the facts are at present. At present only two vehicles have been purchased and the cost was £14,500 each.

**ORAL**

**NO 1203 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the date the application for the transfer of the licence from Rock City Services to Gibraltar Bus Company Limited was submitted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1204 of 2004.

**NO 1204 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the date that the transfer of the licence from Rock City Services to Gibraltar Bus Company Limited was authorised?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1203**

The Secretary of the Transport Commission received an application for the transfer of an operator licence from Rock City Services to the Gibraltar Bus Company on 5 April 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 1204**

The Transport Commission approved the transfer of an operator licence from Rock City Services to the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited on 6 April 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1203 and 1204 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that a time frame that any other operator wishing to transfer licences is to expect in respect of transfers?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, when it requires a transition from an old operator to a new operator, without any interruption in the service, and that the old operator has got to continue to be the holder of a licence until the last minute that he provides the service and the new operator has got to be in possession of a new licence as from the first moment that it provides the service. The answer is yes, provided those are the facts and circumstances.

**ORAL**

**NO 1205 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state what was the distribution of average annual earnings in respect of all employee jobs as shown in table 16 of the October 96 Employment Survey Report showing separately the distribution in the case of:

- (a) MOD Employees;
- (b) GoG Employees;
- (c) Government and JVC's;
- (d) Private Sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1206 to 1211 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1206 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state what was the distribution of average earnings in respect of all employee jobs as shown in table 16 of the October 97 Employment Survey Report showing separately the distribution in the case of:

- (a) MOD Employees;
- (b) GoG Employees;
- (c) Government and JVC's;
- (d) Private Sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1205, 1207 to 1211 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1207 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state what was the distribution of average earnings in respect of all employee jobs as shown in table 16 of the October 98 Employment Survey Report showing separately the distribution in the case of:

- (a) MOD Employees;
- (b) GoG Employees;
- (c) Government and JVC's;
- (d) Private Sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1205, 1206 and 1208 to 1211 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1208 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state what was the distribution of average earnings in respect of all employee jobs as shown in table 16 of the October 99 Employment Survey Report showing separately the distribution in the case of:

- (a) MOD Employees;
- (b) GoG Employees;
- (c) Government and JVC's;
- (d) Private Sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1205 to 1207 and 1209 to 1211 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1209 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state what was the distribution of average earnings in respect of all employee jobs as shown in table 16 of the October 2000 Employment Survey Report showing separately the distribution in the case of:

- (a) MOD Employees;
- (b) GoG Employees;
- (c) Government and JVC's;
- (d) Private Sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1205 to 1208, 1210 and 1211 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 1210 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state what was the distribution of average earnings in respect of all employee jobs as shown in table 16 of the October 01 Employment Survey Report showing separately the distribution in the case of:

- (a) MOD Employees;
- (b) GoG Employees;
- (c) Government and JVC's;
- (d) Private Sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1205 to 1209 and 1211 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1211 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state what was the distribution of average annual earnings in respect of all employee jobs as shown in Table 16 of the October 2002 Employment Survey Report showing separately the distribution in the case of:

- (a) MOD Employees;
- (b) Government of Gibraltar Employees;
- (c) Government and Joint Venture Company's;
- (d) Private sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am advised that in respect of October 1996 and October 1997 the information is not available because of the way the Surveys were compiled at that time, but in respect of the subsequent years, the appropriate tables have been created for the hon Member showing the breakdown that he has requested. I should also perhaps point out to him that there is not a joint venture companies breakdown because he would first have to define what he understands by joint venture company, since it is not actually a categorisation used and it is not automatically evident from the Employment Survey records, but it may be possible to provide him with the information if he will give us an indication of what he regards by the phrase 'joint venture companies' of which actually there are not any. Except in the strict sense of the word the only jointventure companies are the Gibtelecom and Lyonnaise.

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1207

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Private Sector Employee Jobs, October 1998

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | PRIVATE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME             | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999               | 1         | 5     | 6                  | 1         | 2     | 3                    | 0         | 3     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                     | 13        | 13    | 0                  | 5         | 5     | 0                    | 8         | 8     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 1                     | 38        | 39    | 1                  | 7         | 8     | 0                    | 31        | 31    |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 1                     | 83        | 84    | 0                  | 22        | 22    | 1                    | 61        | 62    |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 6                     | 157       | 163   | 4                  | 53        | 57    | 2                    | 104       | 106   |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 41                    | 538       | 579   | 12                 | 380       | 392   | 29                   | 158       | 187   |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 92                    | 221       | 313   | 44                 | 49        | 93    | 48                   | 172       | 220   |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 111                   | 133       | 244   | 40                 | 28        | 68    | 71                   | 105       | 176   |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 245                   | 117       | 362   | 119                | 23        | 142   | 126                  | 94        | 220   |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 608                   | 72        | 680   | 312                | 14        | 326   | 296                  | 58        | 354   |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 582                   | 37        | 619   | 297                | 9         | 306   | 285                  | 28        | 313   |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 708                   | 45        | 753   | 438                | 12        | 450   | 270                  | 33        | 303   |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 765                   | 22        | 787   | 578                | 5         | 581   | 189                  | 17        | 206   |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 524                   | 15        | 539   | 365                | 6         | 371   | 159                  | 9         | 168   |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 482                   | 13        | 495   | 326                | 6         | 332   | 156                  | 7         | 163   |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 402                   | 7         | 409   | 271                | 1         | 272   | 131                  | 6         | 137   |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 320                   | 4         | 324   | 228                | 1         | 229   | 92                   | 3         | 95    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 671                   | 5         | 676   | 453                | 3         | 456   | 218                  | 2         | 220   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 437                   | 3         | 440   | 336                | 1         | 337   | 101                  | 2         | 103   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 348                   | 1         | 349   | 277                | 1         | 278   | 71                   | 0         | 71    |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 257                   | 5         | 262   | 208                | 3         | 211   | 49                   | 2         | 51    |
| 25,000 and over | 677                   | 4         | 681   | 621                | 1         | 622   | 56                   | 3         | 59    |
| TOTAL           | 7,279                 | 1,538     | 8,817 | 4,929              | 632       | 5,561 | 2,350                | 906       | 3,256 |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1207

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Gibraltar Government Employee Jobs, October 1998

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | GOG EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 2         | 2     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 2         | 2     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 16                | 1         | 17    | 16                 | 0         | 16    | 0                    | 0         | 1     |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 21                | 100       | 121   | 18                 | 0         | 18    | 3                    | 100       | 103   |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 4                 | 21        | 25    | 1                  | 4         | 5     | 3                    | 17        | 20    |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 10                | 21        | 31    | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 10                   | 21        | 31    |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 19                | 38        | 57    | 4                  | 0         | 4     | 15                   | 38        | 53    |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 93                | 31        | 124   | 49                 | 0         | 49    | 44                   | 31        | 75    |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 87                | 13        | 100   | 40                 | 2         | 42    | 47                   | 11        | 58    |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 193               | 12        | 205   | 138                | 0         | 138   | 55                   | 12        | 193   |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 64                | 10        | 74    | 27                 | 0         | 27    | 37                   | 10        | 47    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 64                | 10        | 74    | 27                 | 0         | 27    | 37                   | 10        | 47    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 151               | 8         | 159   | 57                 | 0         | 57    | 94                   | 8         | 102   |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 83                | 13        | 96    | 41                 | 1         | 42    | 42                   | 12        | 54    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 215               | 11        | 226   | 109                | 0         | 109   | 106                  | 11        | 117   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 219               | 4         | 223   | 119                | 0         | 119   | 100                  | 4         | 104   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 246               | 2         | 248   | 164                | 1         | 165   | 82                   | 1         | 83    |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 308               | 2         | 310   | 200                | 0         | 200   | 108                  | 2         | 110   |
| 25,000 and over | 716               | 2         | 718   | 575                | 1         | 576   | 141                  | 1         | 142   |
| TOTAL           | 2,509             | 301       | 2,810 | 1,585              | 9         | 1,594 | 924                  | 292       | 1,216 |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1207

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of MoD Employee Jobs, October 1998

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | MOD EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 |                   |           |       |                    |           |       |                      |           |       |
| 0 - 999         | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 1         | 1     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 1         | 1     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 8         | 8     | 0                  | 1         | 1     | 0                    | 7         | 7     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 9         | 9     | 0                  | 1         | 1     | 0                    | 8         | 8     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 3         | 3     | 0                  | 1         | 1     | 0                    | 2         | 2     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 0                 | 11        | 11    | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 11        | 11    |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 0                 | 25        | 25    | 0                  | 4         | 4     | 0                    | 21        | 21    |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 3                 | 8         | 11    | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 3                    | 8         | 11    |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 2                 | 13        | 15    | 2                  | 0         | 2     | 0                    | 13        | 15    |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 8                 | 6         | 14    | 3                  | 0         | 3     | 5                    | 6         | 11    |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 5                 | 0         | 5     | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 4                    | 0         | 4     |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 162               | 2         | 164   | 87                 | 0         | 87    | 75                   | 2         | 77    |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 52                | 2         | 54    | 31                 | 0         | 31    | 21                   | 2         | 23    |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 71                | 1         | 72    | 50                 | 0         | 50    | 21                   | 1         | 22    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 120               | 0         | 120   | 86                 | 0         | 86    | 34                   | 0         | 34    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 97                | 0         | 97    | 50                 | 0         | 50    | 47                   | 0         | 47    |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 56                | 0         | 56    | 44                 | 0         | 44    | 12                   | 0         | 12    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 92                | 0         | 92    | 78                 | 0         | 78    | 14                   | 0         | 14    |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 93                | 1         | 94    | 77                 | 0         | 77    | 16                   | 1         | 17    |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 66                | 1         | 67    | 61                 | 0         | 61    | 5                    | 1         | 6     |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 73                | 0         | 73    | 69                 | 0         | 69    | 4                    | 0         | 4     |
| 25,000 and over | 156               | 0         | 156   | 156                | 0         | 156   | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| TOTAL           | 1,056             | 91        | 1,147 | 795                | 7         | 802   | 261                  | 84        | 345   |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1208

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Private Sector Employee Jobs, October, 1999

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | PRIVATE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME             | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999               | 0         | 16    | 16                 | 0         | 10    | 10                   | 0         | 6     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                     | 21        | 21    | 0                  | 8         | 8     | 0                    | 13        | 13    |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                     | 41        | 41    | 0                  | 11        | 11    | 0                    | 30        | 30    |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 1                     | 101       | 102   | 0                  | 34        | 34    | 1                    | 67        | 68    |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 29                    | 218       | 247   | 21                 | 47        | 68    | 8                    | 171       | 179   |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 84                    | 567       | 651   | 55                 | 401       | 456   | 29                   | 166       | 195   |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 48                    | 212       | 260   | 36                 | 56        | 92    | 12                   | 156       | 168   |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 92                    | 161       | 253   | 37                 | 33        | 70    | 55                   | 128       | 183   |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 220                   | 135       | 355   | 97                 | 24        | 121   | 123                  | 111       | 234   |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 552                   | 85        | 637   | 279                | 16        | 295   | 273                  | 69        | 342   |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 517                   | 66        | 583   | 273                | 12        | 285   | 244                  | 54        | 298   |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 670                   | 47        | 717   | 427                | 8         | 435   | 243                  | 39        | 282   |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 677                   | 29        | 706   | 459                | 11        | 470   | 218                  | 18        | 236   |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 567                   | 17        | 584   | 363                | 2         | 365   | 204                  | 15        | 219   |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 632                   | 15        | 647   | 410                | 6         | 416   | 222                  | 9         | 231   |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 411                   | 8         | 419   | 266                | 0         | 266   | 145                  | 8         | 153   |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 368                   | 2         | 370   | 253                | 0         | 253   | 115                  | 2         | 117   |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 712                   | 4         | 716   | 471                | 1         | 472   | 241                  | 3         | 244   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 520                   | 2         | 522   | 391                | 1         | 392   | 129                  | 1         | 130   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 351                   | 2         | 353   | 263                | 1         | 264   | 88                   | 1         | 89    |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 254                   | 2         | 256   | 210                | 1         | 211   | 44                   | 1         | 45    |
| 25,000 and over | 708                   | 0         | 708   | 628                | 0         | 628   | 80                   | 0         | 80    |
| TOTAL           | 7,413                 | 1,751     | 9,164 | 4,939              | 683       | 5,622 | 2,474                | 1,068     | 3,542 |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1208

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of MoD Employee Jobs, October 1999

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | MOD EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 1         | 1     | 0                  | 1         | 1     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 1                 | 1         | 2     | 1                  | 1         | 2     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 0                 | 6         | 6     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 1                 | 14        | 15    | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 0                 | 11        | 11    | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 5                 | 5         | 10    | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 1                    | 4         | 5     |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 5                 | 2         | 7     | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 1                    | 4         | 5     |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 107               | 6         | 113   | 52                 | 4         | 56    | 55                   | 2         | 57    |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 61                | 5         | 66    | 30                 | 4         | 34    | 31                   | 1         | 32    |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 68                | 2         | 70    | 44                 | 1         | 45    | 24                   | 1         | 25    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 79                | 2         | 81    | 55                 | 1         | 56    | 24                   | 1         | 25    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 90                | 0         | 90    | 50                 | 0         | 50    | 40                   | 0         | 40    |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 41                | 1         | 42    | 26                 | 1         | 27    | 15                   | 0         | 15    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 97                | 1         | 98    | 81                 | 1         | 82    | 16                   | 0         | 16    |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 68                | 0         | 68    | 54                 | 0         | 54    | 14                   | 0         | 14    |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 64                | 0         | 64    | 63                 | 0         | 63    | 1                    | 0         | 1     |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 65                | 0         | 65    | 57                 | 0         | 57    | 8                    | 0         | 8     |
| 25,000 and over | 153               | 0         | 153   | 152                | 0         | 152   | 1                    | 0         | 1     |
| TOTAL           | 905               | 57        | 962   | 668                | 14        | 682   | 237                  | 43        | 280   |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1209

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Private Sector Employee Jobs, October 2000

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | PRIVATE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME             | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999               | 0         | 11    | 11                 | 0         | 6     | 6                    | 0         | 5     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                     | 12        | 12    | 0                  | 5         | 5     | 0                    | 7         | 7     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                     | 44        | 44    | 0                  | 20        | 20    | 0                    | 24        | 24    |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 6                     | 84        | 90    | 3                  | 25        | 28    | 3                    | 59        | 62    |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 27                    | 188       | 215   | 13                 | 42        | 55    | 14                   | 146       | 160   |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 1                     | 687       | 688   | 1                  | 466       | 467   | 0                    | 221       | 221   |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 11                    | 250       | 261   | 6                  | 83        | 89    | 5                    | 167       | 172   |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 117                   | 170       | 287   | 45                 | 42        | 87    | 72                   | 128       | 200   |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 214                   | 114       | 328   | 75                 | 23        | 98    | 139                  | 91        | 230   |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 575                   | 76        | 651   | 274                | 27        | 301   | 301                  | 49        | 350   |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 563                   | 36        | 599   | 290                | 8         | 298   | 273                  | 28        | 301   |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 712                   | 34        | 746   | 462                | 11        | 473   | 250                  | 23        | 273   |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 666                   | 12        | 678   | 414                | 5         | 419   | 252                  | 7         | 259   |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 615                   | 16        | 631   | 426                | 5         | 431   | 189                  | 11        | 200   |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 549                   | 7         | 556   | 346                | 4         | 350   | 203                  | 3         | 206   |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 390                   | 4         | 394   | 245                | 2         | 247   | 145                  | 2         | 147   |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 431                   | 1         | 432   | 293                | 1         | 294   | 138                  | 0         | 138   |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 822                   | 11        | 833   | 534                | 9         | 543   | 288                  | 2         | 290   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 512                   | 0         | 512   | 378                | 0         | 378   | 134                  | 0         | 134   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 399                   | 0         | 399   | 302                | 0         | 302   | 97                   | 0         | 97    |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 276                   | 0         | 276   | 204                | 0         | 204   | 72                   | 0         | 72    |
| 25,000 and over | 866                   | 0         | 866   | 713                | 0         | 713   | 153                  | 0         | 153   |
| TOTAL           | 7,752                 | 1,757     | 9,509 | 5,024              | 784       | 5,808 | 2,728                | 973       | 3,701 |



Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1209

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Gibraltar Government Employee Jobs, October 2000

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | GOG EMPLOYEE JOBS |            |              | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |              | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |            |              |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME  | TOTAL        | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL        | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME  | TOTAL        |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0          | 0            | 0                  | 0         | 0            | 0                    | 0          | 0            |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 0          | 0            | 0                  | 0         | 0            | 0                    | 0          | 0            |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 3          | 3            | 0                  | 0         | 0            | 0                    | 3          | 3            |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 1          | 1            | 0                  | 0         | 0            | 0                    | 1          | 1            |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 1          | 1            | 0                  | 0         | 0            | 0                    | 1          | 1            |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 0                 | 9          | 9            | 0                  | 0         | 0            | 0                    | 9          | 9            |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 0                 | 143        | 143          | 0                  | 2         | 2            | 2                    | 141        | 143          |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 10                | 11         | 21           | 3                  | 2         | 5            | 7                    | 14         | 16           |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 4                 | 22         | 26           | 1                  | 3         | 4            | 3                    | 19         | 22           |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 31                | 24         | 55           | 1                  | 0         | 1            | 30                   | 24         | 54           |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 20                | 14         | 34           | 6                  | 0         | 6            | 14                   | 14         | 28           |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 102               | 8          | 110          | 43                 | 0         | 43           | 59                   | 8          | 67           |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 87                | 3          | 90           | 36                 | 0         | 36           | 51                   | 3          | 54           |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 220               | 4          | 224          | 161                | 0         | 161          | 59                   | 4          | 63           |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 103               | 0          | 103          | 39                 | 0         | 39           | 64                   | 0          | 64           |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 113               | 0          | 113          | 43                 | 0         | 43           | 70                   | 0          | 70           |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 97                | 0          | 97           | 38                 | 0         | 38           | 59                   | 0          | 59           |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 194               | 1          | 195          | 83                 | 0         | 83           | 111                  | 1          | 112          |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 218               | 0          | 218          | 112                | 0         | 112          | 106                  | 0          | 106          |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 203               | 0          | 203          | 120                | 0         | 120          | 83                   | 0          | 83           |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 214               | 0          | 214          | 141                | 0         | 141          | 73                   | 0          | 73           |
| 25,000 and over | 959               | 0          | 959          | 705                | 0         | 705          | 254                  | 0          | 254          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | <b>2,575</b>      | <b>244</b> | <b>2,819</b> | <b>1,532</b>       | <b>9</b>  | <b>1,541</b> | <b>1,043</b>         | <b>235</b> | <b>1,278</b> |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1209

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of MoD Employee Jobs, October 2000

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | MOD EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 1         | 1     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 1                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 3         | 3     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 3         | 3     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 0                 | 13        | 13    | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 0                 | 11        | 11    | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 2                 | 12        | 14    | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 1                 | 14        | 15    | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 2                 | 11        | 13    | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 1                    | 1         | 1     |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 4                 | 1         | 5     | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 121               | 5         | 126   | 64                 | 0         | 64    | 0                    | 0         | 64    |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 100               | 2         | 102   | 67                 | 0         | 67    | 0                    | 0         | 67    |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 53                | 1         | 54    | 27                 | 0         | 27    | 0                    | 0         | 27    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 74                | 0         | 74    | 43                 | 0         | 43    | 0                    | 0         | 43    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 65                | 0         | 65    | 37                 | 0         | 37    | 0                    | 0         | 37    |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 74                | 0         | 74    | 46                 | 0         | 46    | 0                    | 0         | 46    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 108               | 1         | 109   | 81                 | 1         | 82    | 1                    | 0         | 83    |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 63                | 0         | 63    | 54                 | 0         | 54    | 0                    | 0         | 54    |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 54                | 0         | 54    | 46                 | 0         | 46    | 0                    | 0         | 46    |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 62                | 0         | 62    | 54                 | 0         | 54    | 0                    | 0         | 54    |
| 25,000 and over | 192               | 0         | 192   | 190                | 0         | 190   | 0                    | 0         | 190   |
| TOTAL           | 975               | 78        | 1,053 | 711                | 8         | 719   | 264                  | 70        | 334   |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1210

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Private Sector Employee Jobs, October 2001

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | PRIVATE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |        | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME             | PART-TIME | TOTAL  | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999               | 0         | 10     | 10                 | 0         | 5     | 5                    | 0         | 5     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                     | 21        | 21     | 0                  | 9         | 9     | 0                    | 12        | 12    |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                     | 38        | 38     | 0                  | 11        | 11    | 0                    | 27        | 27    |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 2                     | 78        | 80     | 1                  | 25        | 26    | 1                    | 53        | 54    |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 28                    | 215       | 243    | 23                 | 52        | 75    | 5                    | 163       | 168   |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 82                    | 177       | 259    | 46                 | 26        | 72    | 36                   | 151       | 187   |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 69                    | 570       | 639    | 45                 | 411       | 456   | 24                   | 159       | 183   |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 74                    | 206       | 280    | 20                 | 39        | 59    | 54                   | 167       | 221   |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 185                   | 129       | 314    | 67                 | 33        | 100   | 118                  | 96        | 214   |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 535                   | 112       | 647    | 259                | 31        | 290   | 276                  | 81        | 357   |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 500                   | 78        | 578    | 230                | 15        | 245   | 270                  | 63        | 333   |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 618                   | 52        | 670    | 362                | 15        | 377   | 256                  | 37        | 293   |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 615                   | 29        | 644    | 398                | 4         | 402   | 217                  | 25        | 242   |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 594                   | 17        | 611    | 403                | 2         | 405   | 191                  | 15        | 206   |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 617                   | 17        | 634    | 401                | 3         | 404   | 216                  | 14        | 230   |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 505                   | 12        | 517    | 321                | 1         | 322   | 184                  | 11        | 195   |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 445                   | 12        | 457    | 277                | 2         | 279   | 168                  | 10        | 178   |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 974                   | 11        | 985    | 669                | 5         | 674   | 305                  | 6         | 311   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 610                   | 6         | 616    | 457                | 2         | 459   | 153                  | 4         | 157   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 507                   | 3         | 510    | 361                | 0         | 361   | 146                  | 3         | 149   |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 366                   | 1         | 367    | 254                | 0         | 254   | 112                  | 1         | 113   |
| 25,000 and over | 979                   | 0         | 979    | 868                | 0         | 868   | 111                  | 0         | 111   |
| TOTAL           | 8,305                 | 1,794     | 10,099 | 5,462              | 691       | 6,153 | 2,843                | 1,103     | 3,946 |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1210

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Gibraltar Government Employee Jobs, October 2001

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | GOG EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 1         | 1     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 1         | 1     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 6         | 6     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 6         | 6     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 3                 | 3         | 6     | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 2                    | 3         | 5     |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 5                 | 3         | 8     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 5                    | 3         | 8     |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 0                 | 122       | 122   | 0                  | 1         | 1     | 0                    | 121       | 121   |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 4                 | 22        | 26    | 1                  | 2         | 3     | 3                    | 20        | 23    |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 7                 | 14        | 21    | 2                  | 0         | 2     | 5                    | 14        | 19    |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 25                | 32        | 57    | 3                  | 1         | 4     | 22                   | 31        | 53    |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 45                | 23        | 68    | 14                 | 0         | 14    | 31                   | 23        | 54    |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 47                | 10        | 57    | 21                 | 0         | 21    | 26                   | 10        | 36    |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 76                | 9         | 85    | 24                 | 0         | 24    | 52                   | 9         | 61    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 125               | 2         | 127   | 77                 | 0         | 77    | 48                   | 2         | 50    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 82                | 1         | 83    | 32                 | 0         | 32    | 50                   | 1         | 51    |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 72                | 0         | 72    | 32                 | 0         | 32    | 40                   | 0         | 40    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 217               | 2         | 219   | 88                 | 0         | 88    | 129                  | 2         | 131   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 200               | 1         | 201   | 97                 | 0         | 97    | 103                  | 1         | 104   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 225               | 1         | 226   | 122                | 0         | 122   | 103                  | 1         | 104   |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 198               | 1         | 199   | 134                | 0         | 134   | 64                   | 1         | 65    |
| 25,000 and over | 1,225             | 0         | 1,225 | 875                | 0         | 875   | 350                  | 0         | 350   |
| TOTAL           | 2,556             | 253       | 2,809 | 1,523              | 4         | 1,527 | 1,033                | 249       | 1,282 |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1210

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Mod Employee Jobs, October 2001

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | MOD EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |              | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |            | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |            |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL        | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL      | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL      |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 0            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 0         | 0          |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 1         | 1            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 0         | 1          |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 1         | 1            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 0         | 1          |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 1         | 1            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 0         | 1          |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 1         | 1            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 0         | 1          |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 0                 | 1         | 1            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 0         | 1          |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 0                 | 4         | 4            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 0         | 4          |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 1                 | 11        | 12           | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 0         | 12         |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 1                 | 19        | 20           | 1                  | 0         | 1          | 0                    | 0         | 19         |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 0                 | 17        | 17           | 0                  | 2         | 2          | 0                    | 0         | 15         |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 2                 | 6         | 8            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 2         | 8          |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 5                 | 1         | 6            | 0                  | 0         | 0          | 0                    | 5         | 6          |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 16                | 1         | 17           | 3                  | 0         | 3          | 0                    | 13        | 14         |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 142               | 1         | 143          | 79                 | 0         | 79         | 0                    | 63        | 64         |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 61                | 0         | 61           | 37                 | 0         | 37         | 0                    | 24        | 24         |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 38                | 0         | 38           | 21                 | 0         | 21         | 0                    | 17        | 17         |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 82                | 0         | 82           | 50                 | 0         | 50         | 0                    | 32        | 32         |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 73                | 0         | 73           | 48                 | 0         | 48         | 0                    | 25        | 25         |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 127               | 0         | 127          | 80                 | 0         | 80         | 0                    | 47        | 47         |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 82                | 0         | 82           | 62                 | 0         | 62         | 0                    | 20        | 20         |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 64                | 0         | 64           | 55                 | 0         | 55         | 0                    | 9         | 9          |
| 25,000 and over | 51                | 0         | 51           | 47                 | 0         | 47         | 0                    | 4         | 4          |
|                 | 215               | 0         | 215          | 202                | 0         | 202        | 0                    | 13        | 13         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>    | <b>959</b>        | <b>64</b> | <b>1,023</b> | <b>685</b>         | <b>2</b>  | <b>687</b> | <b>274</b>           | <b>62</b> | <b>336</b> |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1211

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Private Sector Employee Jobs, October 2002

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | PRIVATE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |        | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME             | PART-TIME | TOTAL  | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 |                       |           |        |                    |           |       |                      |           |       |
| 0 - 999         | 0                     | 11        | 11     | 0                  | 3         | 3     | 0                    | 8         | 8     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                     | 12        | 12     | 0                  | 5         | 5     | 0                    | 7         | 7     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                     | 25        | 25     | 0                  | 6         | 6     | 0                    | 19        | 19    |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 6                     | 57        | 63     | 3                  | 10        | 13    | 3                    | 47        | 50    |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 36                    | 199       | 235    | 22                 | 61        | 83    | 14                   | 138       | 152   |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 61                    | 253       | 314    | 39                 | 58        | 97    | 22                   | 195       | 217   |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 107                   | 548       | 655    | 69                 | 361       | 430   | 38                   | 187       | 225   |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 66                    | 168       | 234    | 25                 | 29        | 54    | 41                   | 139       | 180   |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 172                   | 155       | 327    | 55                 | 44        | 99    | 117                  | 111       | 228   |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 331                   | 100       | 431    | 134                | 28        | 162   | 197                  | 72        | 269   |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 598                   | 64        | 662    | 270                | 14        | 284   | 328                  | 50        | 378   |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 571                   | 64        | 635    | 309                | 13        | 322   | 262                  | 51        | 313   |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 711                   | 38        | 749    | 470                | 10        | 480   | 241                  | 28        | 269   |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 551                   | 27        | 578    | 353                | 3         | 356   | 198                  | 24        | 222   |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 678                   | 29        | 707    | 470                | 7         | 477   | 208                  | 22        | 230   |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 544                   | 15        | 559    | 345                | 3         | 348   | 199                  | 12        | 211   |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 418                   | 11        | 429    | 288                | 2         | 290   | 130                  | 9         | 139   |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 968                   | 22        | 990    | 619                | 7         | 626   | 349                  | 15        | 364   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 638                   | 12        | 650    | 431                | 3         | 434   | 207                  | 9         | 216   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 562                   | 6         | 568    | 425                | 1         | 426   | 137                  | 5         | 142   |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 397                   | 2         | 399    | 312                | 0         | 312   | 85                   | 2         | 87    |
| 25,000 and over | 1,131                 | 3         | 1,134  | 957                | 0         | 957   | 174                  | 3         | 177   |
| TOTAL           | 8,546                 | 1,821     | 10,367 | 5,596              | 668       | 6,264 | 2,950                | 1,153     | 4,103 |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1211

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Gibraltar Government Employee Jobs, October 2002

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | GOG EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 0         | 2     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 13                | 7         | 20    | 7                  | 1         | 8     | 6                    | 2         | 2     |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 0                 | 1         | 1     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 1     |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 0                 | 156       | 156   | 0                  | 1         | 1     | 0                    | 0         | 1     |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 4                 | 20        | 24    | 2                  | 1         | 3     | 2                    | 1         | 155   |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 12                | 13        | 25    | 3                  | 1         | 4     | 9                    | 12        | 21    |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 12                | 7         | 19    | 1                  | 1         | 2     | 11                   | 6         | 21    |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 17                | 28        | 45    | 5                  | 0         | 5     | 12                   | 28        | 17    |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 74                | 13        | 87    | 33                 | 0         | 33    | 41                   | 13        | 40    |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 67                | 7         | 74    | 10                 | 1         | 11    | 57                   | 6         | 54    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 120               | 5         | 125   | 59                 | 0         | 59    | 61                   | 6         | 63    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 86                | 4         | 90    | 44                 | 0         | 44    | 42                   | 4         | 66    |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 76                | 5         | 81    | 35                 | 0         | 35    | 41                   | 4         | 46    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 197               | 7         | 204   | 80                 | 0         | 80    | 117                  | 7         | 46    |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 200               | 5         | 205   | 118                | 0         | 118   | 82                   | 5         | 124   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 193               | 4         | 197   | 95                 | 0         | 95    | 98                   | 4         | 87    |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 219               | 4         | 223   | 134                | 2         | 136   | 85                   | 2         | 102   |
| 25,000 and over | 1,265             | 0         | 1,265 | 913                | 0         | 913   | 352                  | 0         | 87    |
| TOTAL           | 2,555             | 288       | 2,843 | 1,539              | 8         | 1,547 | 1,016                | 280       | 1,296 |

Answer to Question 1211

Answer to Question 1211

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of MoD Employee Jobs, October 2002

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | MOD EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | MALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | FEMALE EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME          | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME            | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 1         | 1     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 1     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 0     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 2         | 2     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 2     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 2         | 2     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 0                    | 0         | 2     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 0                 | 7         | 7     | 0                  | 1         | 1     | 0                    | 0         | 1     |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 2                 | 2         | 4     | 1                  | 1         | 2     | 1                    | 1         | 6     |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 3                 | 19        | 22    | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 2                    | 1         | 2     |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 5                 | 9         | 14    | 2                  | 2         | 4     | 3                    | 19        | 21    |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 15                | 5         | 20    | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 4                    | 7         | 10    |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 6                 | 2         | 8     | 1                  | 0         | 1     | 14                   | 5         | 19    |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 3                 | 3         | 6     | 0                  | 0         | 0     | 6                    | 2         | 8     |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 69                | 6         | 75    | 0                  | 1         | 1     | 3                    | 2         | 5     |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 76                | 2         | 78    | 32                 | 0         | 32    | 37                   | 6         | 43    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 64                | 4         | 68    | 43                 | 1         | 44    | 33                   | 1         | 34    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 72                | 2         | 74    | 41                 | 0         | 41    | 23                   | 4         | 27    |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 53                | 1         | 54    | 43                 | 1         | 44    | 29                   | 1         | 30    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 178               | 2         | 180   | 31                 | 1         | 32    | 22                   | 0         | 22    |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 84                | 0         | 84    | 120                | 0         | 120   | 58                   | 2         | 60    |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 63                | 1         | 64    | 75                 | 0         | 75    | 9                    | 0         | 9     |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 67                | 0         | 67    | 53                 | 1         | 54    | 10                   | 0         | 10    |
| 25,000 and over | 226               | 0         | 226   | 61                 | 0         | 61    | 6                    | 0         | 6     |
| TOTAL           | 986               | 70        | 1,056 | 717                | 10        | 727   | 269                  | 60        | 329   |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1205 TO 1211 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact the breakdown that the question seeks is the same breakdown that is asked in the distribution of tax payable on the PAYE, so effectively I would have expected, although I know it is different departments, but whatever classification the Tax Office uses would be the one that I would be seeking to see how the earnings compare with the tax yields that are provided by the Government in answer to the other question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will ask the department to apply that definition and see if they can get that breakdown for him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am grateful for the information provided.

ORAL

**NO 1212 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state how many of the frontier workers shown in Table 5 of the October 2002 Employment Survey Report were employed directly or indirectly by the Gibraltar Government showing the breakdown by nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

None Sir.

ORAL

**NO 1213 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

When do Government expect to be able to Table the Employment Survey Report 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This is now ready and I expect to be able to table it during this meeting of the House, possibly at the very next sitting.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1213 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it it may be possible to have it before we have the budget debate, will it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh yes, and if by any chance it is not ready for publication then, I will let him have a copy privately so that he can make whatever use he wants of it.

**ORAL**

**NO 1214 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMMUNITY CARE LTD**

Can Government confirm that Community Officers employed by Community Care Ltd are shown as part of the private sector in the Employment Survey Report and if so, can they state in which industrial sector they are included?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1215 of 2004.

**NO 1215 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMMUNITY CARE LTD**

Can Government state in respect of which year's Employment Survey Report, Community Officers employed by Community Care Ltd, were first shown as being in part-time instead of full-time employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I can confirm that Gibraltar Community Care Limited is included for the purposes of the Employment Survey under the private sector and the "Real Estate and Other Business Activities" industry group.

Community Officers employed by the Gibraltar Community Care Limited were re-classified as part-time employees in the October 1998 Employment Survey Report. These officers had been included as part-time employees by the Statistics Office since the start of the Company, up to and including the April 1992 Employment Survey. During the period October 1992 to April 1998, when data input for the Surveys was carried out at the Income Tax Office from the PAYE returns submitted by employers, these officers were then shown as being in full-time employment.

With effect from October 1998 the Survey reverted to a questionnaire basis and has been prepared by the Statistics Office from the information received from all known employers. With effect from this Survey the employment status of Community Officers has been shown as part-time.

**NO 1216 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Further to the answer to Question 285/2004, can Government confirm whether the Europa Incinerator Company Limited and the Regulatory Authority were included as private sector in the 2001 and 2002 Employment Survey Report, and if so, state the number of employees and the industry classification?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Gibraltar Regulatory Authority was included under the private sector and the Public Administration and Defence Industry in the 2001 and 2002 Employment Survey Reports. The number of employees as shown in the questionnaires completed by employers cannot be published under the provisions of the Statistics Ordinance. However, in the case of the Authority, this information is available on their website and as such, I can inform the House that their 2001 return included five employees, and their 2002 return included seven employees. The Europa Incinerator Company Limited did not exist, as such, at the time of these two Surveys. This was a company that the Government formed in order to provide transitory employment to people who were then in the employ of another company called Onyx Gibraltar Limited.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1216 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Should I then ask is Onyx included in the private sector?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He can do. Well, I am very happy to prompt the hon Member's supplementary questions. Yes, that company was included in the private sector electricity and water supply. The company had 16 employees in 2001 and also in 2002.

ORAL

**NO 1217 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CONSTRUCTIVE DISMISSAL**

Will the Government , in the light of the statements made by the Chief Minister in respect of the Employment (Amendment) Ordinance 2004 (Bill No 3 of 2004), confirm what consultation it has undertaken in respect of the potential implementation in Gibraltar of the provisions on Constructive Dismissal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1218 of 2004.

**NO 1218 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CONSTRUCTIVE DISMISSAL**

Have Government now taken a decision on whether or not they will be presenting a Bill to this House for the implementation in Gibraltar of those provisions of United Kingdom legislation which provide for the principle of "constructive dismissal"?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As I previously said would happen, a consultation paper was indeed drawn up and it was tabled to the Labour Advisory Board, which met on 22<sup>nd</sup> April. The Government are now considering the views expressed by the various parties represented on the Labour Advisory Board, and he will be presumably as surprised as I was that on both sides of the fence there were divisions, as between the players on each side of the fence. I should say, that the Government's instinct is to amend the legislation, we are just considering for example one of the Unions represented agreed in principle but said he would like further time in order to fully consider their views. So the Government's position is not that we will only act if there is consensus, a consultation process is a consultation process, it is not the determining factor. The Government's instinct is that there should be full rights of constructive dismissal as requested by the Transport and General Workers Union in their pre-election material, and as to when the legislation will come through I cannot tell him but I would certainly expect it to be this year if the Government decide to proceed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1217 AND 1218 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that answer and for the statement as to what the Government's instinct is, even if the consultation process does not produce an overwhelming suggestion from the Labour Advisory Board that that should be the case, but can I ask him to keep under very active consideration how soon this legislation comes into the House, because even though he has already told me that it is going to come this year, he will understand that there are people presently in employment who may be in a fix as to how they should act, whether they should resign themselves literally to the prospect of having been done out of a job by an employer who is not going to terminate them. Therefore, as it is almost exclusively in his gift to decide when the legislation is to come, that it should come sooner rather than later, but generally, I welcome the statement made by the Chief Minister.



**NO 1219 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR CHRONICLE**

What is the latest position in the negotiations between the Government and the Gibraltar Chronicle Limited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There have been no substantial developments in the negotiations since the matter was last raised by the hon Member in this House. A recently retired Government officer, the previous Commercial Director, when he retired from the Service, has been taken on in some consultancy capacity by the Chronicle to advise them, or to help them on their side of the investigative fence. It is entirely their matter, and I know that there is on my desk some papers but there has been no progress in the negotiations themselves. In other words, nothing has been agreed or consolidated, nor have there been any developments since the last time we discussed this matter.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1219 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the last time, which was some time ago, the indication was that the Government felt that the Chronicle side had not come back with a positive answer or accepting the criteria the Government want, but I think that is where it was last left which was quite some time ago. Has there been any move from that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think that that is precisely what this retired officer is helping them with. In other words, putting together a modus operandi and indeed an incomes plan, a salaries structure that would comply with the Government's criteria for sanitisation and working practices and that sort of thing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has any payment actually been made to the Chronicle in any of this period where the thing has been under discussion between the two sides?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I honestly do not recall, I do not think so. I remember that some time ago we gave them an advance in relation to some consultancy fees or professional fees of some sort. No, I am almost certain that the answer is, certainly not since we last discussed this in the House but if I am wrong I will come back to him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think in answer to a previous question the Government said that what they had actually paid for was the original study carried out by somebody that was brought in, and I think that the hon Member said that the person who actually did the study had been selected by the Chronicle but that the Government had actually given them a grant to pay for it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There may have been, I just say it in order to cover my back. There may have been, although I am not suggesting that there has been, there may have been a payment in relation to legal fees.

**NO 1220 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ROYAL GIBRALTAR POLICE ASSOCIATION**

Can Government state what are the terms of the settlement reached with the Royal Gibraltar Police Association in respect of their outstanding claims?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The outstanding claim from the Royal Gibraltar Police Association related to the application of the rules for overtime payments on rest days and public holidays, which gave rise to underpayments and this has been settled with retrospective effect to 1<sup>st</sup> September 1994. Outstanding payments to both serving and retired officers will be effected as follows:-

- Officers that are due less than £500 will be paid in full in July this year.
- Officers that are due between £500 and £1,000 will be paid in two equal instalments in July 2004 and July 2005.
- Officers that are due more than £1,000 will be paid in three equal instalments in July 2004, July 2005 and July 2006.
- I am assuming that the hon Member knows what the nature of the claim was and how it arose, but am happy to fill him in if he wants to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1220 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Perhaps what the Chief Minister can confirm is, I would be grateful for the details because all I know is that it has something to do with whether the overtime was calculated properly in relation to the analogue in the UK or not, and the argument that I have heard is that it had been miscalculated and that therefore it was an underpayment because somebody had made a mistake in the Treasury.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not a question of mistake and miscalculation, it is a question of the parties signing pay settlement agreements in ignorance, both of them, of a particular feature in the UK pay award which had changed in 1994. The rule in question is that in 1994, I think it was September 1994, the rules changed in the UK so that officers were entitled to be paid overtime hours at a higher rate than usual, if they were not given a certain number of days notice of the requirement to work overtime, and no one had appreciated that that situation had changed in the UK. So, of course, our officers who are analogued to those conditions, had been doing overtime without the necessary notice and had the analogue been properly in place, they would have been entitled to overtime, which they were paid, but at a higher rate under this new agreement. Now the Government's position was that the Government do not normally agree to re-open signed pay agreements, but we agreed to do it in this case in recognition of the fact that uniquely amongst workers in Gibraltar, police officers are not entitled to belong to a Trade Union and therefore do not have full-time, professional Union officials to research these things for them. Had this been another Union the Government would not have agreed to re-open, a deal is a deal and parties are assumed to be advised as to what their rights are in a negotiation, but in recognition of the fact that these workers do not by law have the right to belong to a trade union, and therefore it is a do-it-yourself, it is one of them who does it in his spare time, the Government did not think that it was equitable to hold them to a deal that they had done in ignorance of facts, of which incidentally the Government were ignorant too.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the provision that we have to debate in the budget, did the agreement come too late for that to be reflected in those estimates?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe so, and I believe it is going to be dealt with through the supplementary pay review. I believe it is reflected in the emoluments head of the Police Department.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of on-going costs, from the nature of the explanation we have been given, obviously there is the option there of giving people enough notice in future.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, this was corrected as soon as we discovered it in 2001. So the settlement is between 1994 and 2001. It was corrected in 2001 but of course the hon Member's remarks still applies. They can manage their budget and pay at the lower rate by giving notice, which is possible when one has pre-planned events, ceremonial events but it is very difficult for the Police because a lot of the overtime is when people report ill and that sort of thing.

ORAL

NO 1221 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSING DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state whether the industrial dispute with the Driver and Vehicle Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department has now been resolved?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The staff to which he refers have submitted a claim which Government do not believe to be reasonable or justified and it has therefore not been met. Pursuant to that claim, the effective staff members are declining to carry out certain responsibilities that they have been carrying out in the past. The Government will shortly decide what action to take in this respect.

**ORAL**

**NO 1222 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PAYMENT TO BUILDING CONTRACTORS**

Can Government state how much was paid to building contractors in the financial year ended 31 March 2004, giving a breakdown of the amounts paid to each contractor and in respect of which project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the written Schedule.

| PROJECT                                                       | CONTRACTOR            | EXPENDITURE UP TO 31/3/04 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| New Harbours M & E Works                                      | Rotary                | £355,960.94               |
| Alameda Estate Lift Shafts                                    | GJBS                  | £335,360.70               |
| Alameda Estate Lifts                                          | Otis                  | £95,014.44                |
| Varyl Begg Estate Lift Shafts & Associated Works (Phase I)    | GJBS                  | £1,049,148.80             |
| Varyl Begg Estate Lifts                                       | Otis                  | £47,201.80                |
| Landport Ditch Car Park                                       | GJBS                  | £264,686.61               |
| Frontier Building Refurbishment                               | Sharrock Shand        | £65,168.58                |
| Industrial Park Lathbury Barracks                             | Amco                  | £25,399.19                |
| Retreat Centre Lathbury Barracks                              | Sharrock Shand        | £24,703.00                |
| Incinerator Roof Repairs                                      | Limaran               | £6,785.00                 |
| Gralda Gardens - Toilets                                      | JBS                   | £13,668.15                |
| Administration Block - Victoria Stadium                       | Sharrock Shand        | £353,911.00               |
| Grandstand - Victoria Stadium                                 | Mackley Tricon Wilkie | £674,502.64               |
| Brympton Estate - Stabilisation Works                         | Sharrock Shand        | £194,009.54               |
| Brympton Estate - Various Repairs                             | Profield              | £6,827.42                 |
| 32-36 Town Range                                              | GJBS                  | £49,409.66                |
| Podium Waterproofing - Sir William Jackson Grove              | GJBS                  | £263,085.69               |
| Upper Galleries Retaining Wall                                | Amco                  | £43,790.31                |
| Erection of a Permanent Frangible Boundary Fence (Phase II)   | Amco                  | £12,549.48                |
| Highways Maintenance Term Contract                            | Amco                  | £977,098.85               |
| Gully Cleansing Term Contract                                 | Amco                  | £85,021.68                |
| Replacement of Balconies - Coelho House                       | Brookwest Company Ltd | £35,588.61                |
| Ferry Terminal Phase II                                       | Sharrock Shand        | £17,004.99                |
| Europa Road Resurfacing Works                                 | H.L. Wilkie Ltd       | £7,833.16                 |
| Loreto Convent Retaining Wall                                 | Profield              | £637.86                   |
| Town Centre Beautification Phase IV                           | Amco                  | £26,259.52                |
| John Mackintosh Square                                        | Amco                  | £1,188,070.83             |
| Taxi Signposts                                                | Straits Overseas      | £6,240.00                 |
| Airport Terminal                                              | GJBS                  | £87,623.27                |
| Windows and Shutter Maintenance Term Contract                 | FibreGlass & LIA      | £290,461.56               |
| Scaffolding Maintenance Term Contract                         | Haymills              | £195,202.70               |
| Laguna Estate External Refurbishment                          | Amco                  | £119,764.57               |
| Heathfield House External Refurbishment                       | Sharrock Shand        | £4,360.29                 |
| Renovation of External Corridors 16 George's Lane             | Calpe Construction    | £50,489.94                |
| External Refurbishment of Tankerville House / Prison Quarters | Sando                 | £179,374.98               |
| External Refurbishment of Belvedere House / Electra Flats     | GJBS                  | £531,257.82               |
| External Refurbishment of Rosia House / Vineyard House        | Haymills              | £501,393.03               |
| Upper Withams House / lower Withams House                     | Haymills              | £42,210.27                |
| Renovation of External Staircases - St Joseph's Estate        | GJBS                  | £42,519.28                |
| External Works - Knight's Court                               | GJBS                  | £22,971.08                |
| External Refurbishment of Scud Hill House                     | Haymills              | £374,707.96               |
| Roof and Pavements - Edinburgh House                          | ECS                   | £58,421.22                |

ORAL

NO 1223 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**GIBTEL/NYNEX**

Can Government state what is the latest position regarding the complaints, roaming and numbering, filed with the European Commission by Gibtel and GNC in 1996?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

There has been no change in the complaints and litigation process since the hon Member last raised this matter in the House. Gibtel have initiated proceedings in the roaming case, court proceedings.



**NO 1224 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**FINES ON FOREIGN REGISTERED VEHICLES**

Can Government state what they propose to do to improve on collection rate of the fines imposed on foreign registered vehicles?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Government have no plans at present in this respect. The only possible improvement is to introduce a system of fines payable on the spot which Government are not presently contemplating.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1224 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Do Government not agree that it is unfair to impose a fine of £100 for parking in a bus stop and allow 90 per cent of the fines imposed on foreign registered vehicles to go unpaid?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The situation that the hon Member describes in his supplementary applies and has always applied to fines regardless of the fine involved. It has always been the position.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is it not true that the fine has been raised to level 2, that it was less than £100 before?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is what I have said to him, it is true that the fine has been increased for certain offences related to bus stops to £100. That applies equally to residents and non-residents. The extent to which residents are less able to get away with not paying

the fine than non-residents, is the case whether the fine is for £100 or £25, as has always been the case for all fixed penalty notices related to motoring offences. It does not arise because of this particular £100 situation that he describes.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will the Government therefore not consider introducing the same policy as they said yesterday for unfair trading, namely reciprocity?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, as I said in my answer, the Government are not presently contemplating this. There are issues of wider economic policy to take into consideration. Who are the foreign motorists that come to Gibraltar? What do they do when they come here? What do they come here for? Do we want to encourage or discourage? Do we want to be more or less aggressive with them than we are at the moment? These are wider issues than the simple management of traffic fines. It is a matter of judgement, but no Government in the past has ever thought it appropriate to impose an on-the-spot system of fining. It has always been the case in Spain that certain types of fines are payable on-the-spot, with very severe consequences if one does not. I understand that one gets ejected from ones car and things of the sort. It has never been the policy of successive Gibraltar Governments to replicate that very un-Anglo-Saxon principle of summary justice and the Government are not contemplating to do it now. We do not think that the principle has changed because one fine for one type of offence has risen from £25 to £100. The principles do not change and therefore we can debate the issue by reference to the principles, but it has nothing to do with the bus stops and the £100.

ORAL

NO 1225 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**MERCOMED**

Has the Joint Venture Agreement between Mercomed (Gibraltar and Los Barrios) Ltd and Mercomed (Gibraltar and Los Barrios) SA now been concluded?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1226 and 1227 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1226 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**MERCAMED**

Who will be the Company Directors of Mercomed (Gibraltar and Los Barrios) Ltd and Mercomed (Gibraltar and Los Barrios) SA?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1225 and 1227 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1227 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MERCOMED**

Has Mercomed (Gibraltar and Los Barrios) SA now been incorporated in Spain?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The joint venture agreement has not yet been concluded. The Directors of Mercomed (Gibraltar and Los Barrios) Limited are myself and the Mayor of Los Barrios. Two other Directors and a Secretary have yet to be appointed.

The Directors of Mercomed (Gibraltar and Los Barrios) SA are myself, the Mayor of Los Barrios, the Deputy Mayor of Los Barrios, the Commercial Director of something called Iniciativas Los Barrios, which I understand is their equivalent of our Gibraltar Development Corporation and the Secretary has yet to be appointed.

The incorporation of Mercomed (Gibraltar and Los Barrios) SA has not been concluded.

In short, the position is very much as it was when he last asked the questions.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1225 TO 1227 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I think, I do not know, I am not sure whether we had yourself and the Mayor as Directors at that particular juncture, but is it the policy of the Government that there should be an equal number of directors and shareholders. That the shareholding should be equal between the two sides in both companies, and the number of directors should be equal in both companies?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This has been covered in the draft agreement and I cannot quite remember what it was, but my understanding of it is that we would have more directors in the Gibraltar company, they would have more directors in the Spanish company and there would be an equal number of directors in the EEIG when the two companies come together to form a European interest grouping.

ORAL

**NO 1228 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INVESTMENTS FOR LOS BARRIOS**

Can Government say if any outside investments are planned for Los Barrios through Gibraltar and what are they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

If any. I am not aware of any agreed investments at this time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1228 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Mayors last came to Gibraltar they made a reference to a paper, some kind of paper factory or establishment which had arrived there, was going to arrive there through Gibraltar. Can the Chief Minister throw any light on that comment?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am afraid I do not know anything about that.

**ORAL**

**NO 1229 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**OFFICIAL TRAVEL**

Further to questions 1056/2002, 393/2003 and 473/2004 can Government say what amount of the sum in question refers to:

- (a) official travel by the Chief Minister;
- (b) official travel to Gibraltar by Government guests;
- (c) official travel by civil servants;
- (d) official travel by Ministers;
- (e) official travel by GDC employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1230 of 2004.

**NO 1230 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**OFFICIAL TRAVEL**

Further to questions 1056/2002, 393/2003 and 473/2004 can Government say what subheads or sub totals each of the following is divided into:

- (a) official travel;
- (b) invited guests;
- (c) political?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The breakdown of the sum in question is as follows:

|     |                                                   |            |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------|------------|
| (a) | Official travel by Chief Minister                 | £32,792.64 |
| (b) | Official travel to Gibraltar by Government guests | £ 8,718.10 |
| (c) | Official travel by civil servants                 | £88,235.20 |
| (d) | Official travel by Ministers                      | £12,260.67 |
| (e) | Official travel by GDC employees                  | Nil        |

Official travel is divided into the following sub-categories:-

|     |                                   |
|-----|-----------------------------------|
| (1) | Official travel by Chief Minister |
| (2) | Official travel by civil servants |
| (3) | Official travel by Ministers      |

There are no sub-divisions in respect of invited guests and political.



**ORAL**

**NO 1231 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPEAN ELECTIONS**

On what date will copies of the full European elections register and the edited version of the register be made available to the John Mackintosh Hall Library and British Library?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1232 to 1237 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1232 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPEAN ELECTIONS**

Can Government say whether any request has been made by any entity or individual, for a full copy of the European election register, and if so indicate when the request was made and who was the party?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1231 and 1233 to 1237 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1233 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPEAN ELECTIONS**

Can Government say whether any request has been made by any entity or individual, for a copy of the edited version of the European election register, and if so indicate when the request was made and who was the party?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1231, 1232 and 1234 to 1237 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1234 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPEAN ELECTIONS**

What is the cost, with a breakdown, as at 31 March 2004 of the European elections office?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1231 to 1233 and 1235 to 1237 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1235 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EUROPEAN ELECTIONS**

How many persons have been added on to the European elections register after 27 February 2004, with a breakdown by nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1231 to 1234, 1236 and 1237 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1236 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPEAN ELECTIONS**

What is the total number of persons on the European elections register to date with a breakdown by nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1231 to 1235 and 1237 of 2004.

**NO 1237 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPEAN ELECTIONS**

How many persons had registered to vote for elections to the European Parliament as on 27 February 2004, giving a breakdown showing the numbers who are:

- (a) British/Gibraltarian;
- (b) EU Nationals;
- (c) Commonwealth Citizens (who are not British/Gibraltarian)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As is now known, the Register was published on Tuesday 27 April 2004. I should start perhaps by saying, that this is not a Government activity as such, any of this. The Government are not strictly accountable in this House but I am happy to provide the information that the local Returning Officer has made available to me for answering the question. The Register was published on Tuesday 27 April and a copy of the "Full Register" as provided for in section 48 of the European Parliamentary Elections Ordinance 2004, will be made available to the British Library and the John Mackintosh Hall Library. It may have already been done, I cannot say.

There is no provision in the Ordinance for an "Edited Register" to be made available.

As at 19 April 2004, no requests had been made by any entity or individual for a full copy of the European Register or the edited version of the European election register. The cost, as at 31 March 2004, of the European election office is as follows:

|                         | £     | £      |
|-------------------------|-------|--------|
| Staff Remuneration      |       | 9,725  |
| Advertisements          | 6,193 |        |
| Stationery              | 2,201 |        |
| Mailing Machine Service | 1,877 |        |
| Equipment               | 1,710 |        |
| Telephone               | 1,131 |        |
| Security                | 462   |        |
| Miscellaneous           | 438   |        |
|                         | <hr/> | <hr/>  |
|                         |       | 14,012 |
|                         |       | <hr/>  |
|                         |       | 23,737 |

The remainder of the information as to the number of persons added to the Register after 27 February, with a breakdown of nationality, the total number of persons on the European election register to date, with a breakdown by nationality. The number of persons that had registered to vote for elections to the European Parliament as on 27 February, itself with a breakdown by nationality, is not readily available and is unobtainable without considerable administrative effort and cost. The computer system was not programmed to provide the information on this basis, but I see that the Electoral Officer has now published the final figures of the breakdown, the total number of people on the Register and how many of them were British/Gibraltarian, EU Nationals and Commonwealth Citizens.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1231 TO 1237 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Chief Minister have those figures available for the purposes of Hansard? The final figures on the register which have now been published.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the information is a matter of public record and it is not Government information. It is Electoral Registration Officer information. It is not really for me to place it in Hansard.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Were any records kept as to how many people had registered by 27 February or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot say, but it appears from the fact that the Registration Officer cannot give it, that there cannot have been. If it had been kept, he would not have told me that it cannot be made available.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I understand what the Chief Minister saying but If I recall correctly, there was a date on the registration form which was sent to all households in Gibraltar, that date was 27 February and it was subsequent to that, based on the returns that had been received that they decided to go round house to house and collect the information from those who had not returned the forms. So there must have been some kind of list, so they knew where to go and who had already returned it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I do not know whether that is how it was done, but in any case, the hon Member is perfectly free to contact the Registration Officer directly and put this



information to him. The whole process of organising these Elections is not a Government function, it is an independent function.

**NO 1238 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROVISION OF EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT (DISQUALIFICATION) (UK AND GIBRALTAR) ORDER**

Can Government confirm whether consultations were held with the UK Government on the provisions of the European Parliament (Disqualification) (UK and Gibraltar) Order, and if so, when and with whom?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There was no meaningful consultation as to the content of that particular piece of UK legislation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1238 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the Government aware of the reply given by the Minister in the UK when the Disqualification Order was discussed and a Member of the House of Commons wanted to know to what degree Gibraltar had been consulted?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am not. What I can tell him is what the position is from our point of view. I can tell him that whereas in respect of the other bits of legislation that we debated at length when we were taking the Order, well we did not debate at length but we referred to at length or frequently, when we were debating our local piece of legislation. This is one of the areas where they would not let us legislate on locally, but the substance, the text of this particular legislation I am told by the LSU came through as a fait accompli a couple of days before it was promulgated, with the somewhat disingenuous question, 'do you have any comments?', as if we were still in time to influence the content. This is why I have said in my answer that there has not been any meaningful consultation, because it was sent through with that question, at a time when it could not possibly have given us an opportunity to influence its content. Thitherto, this was one of the items that we wanted to include in our local legislation. So when we had that debate, this was on our list and they did not agree.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Particularly I think in the light of that final bit of information, I think the House in the UK was misled by the Minister who said that we were quite content here to go along with this, and it is quite obvious that it would have been the preference of this House to do it the way the Chief Minister says he tried to persuade the United Kingdom that we should be able to do it, and that is not the impression they have been given in the House of Commons when they were looking in Committee Stage at approving this Order, I can tell him. The impression was quite the contrary, that the parties consulted had gone happily along with it as it was being done.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The information that I have given to him in this House is the information provided to me by the Legislation Support Unit, that have been involved. It has not even come up to me, there was not even time to put it up to me in the timescale, unlike all the other legislation where I have been intimately involved in the toing and froing between Gibraltar and the UK as to content. This is in a different category.

ORAL

**NO 1239 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DATA PROTECTION ORDINANCE**

Can Government say as from what date are local businesses or affected parties expected to comply in full with the Data Protection Ordinance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As I informed the House during the debate on the Bill (as it then was), the transitional implementation provisions of this directive are set out in Article 32 of the Directive. Government intend to use the time available to give a reasonable and proper opportunity to data controllers affected by the Ordinance, to understand its provisions and prepare for compliance. This is quite an onerous burden. To achieve it Government are preparing an explanatory paper for businesses, especially small businesses, and will also consider the organisation of seminars. These are not yet ready. I cannot give the hon Member a date, although Government are also mindful of the desirability of extending the Ordinance's protection to data subjects.

**ORAL**

**NO 1240 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**VISAS**

What was the number of visas issued in British Consular offices in Morocco for non-EU nationals wishing to travel to Gibraltar, on a monthly basis, since January 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The total number of visas for Gibraltar issued in Morocco since 1 January 2004 up to and including 16 April 2004, on a monthly basis is as follows:-

|                                                |   |     |
|------------------------------------------------|---|-----|
| January 2004                                   | - | 91  |
| February 2004                                  | - | 66  |
| March 2004                                     | - | 72  |
| April 2004 (up to and Including 16 April 2004) | - | 35  |
| Total No. of Visas issued                      | - | 264 |

ORAL

NO 1241 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**POLICE AND CRIMINAL EVIDENCE ACT 1984**

Will the Government, in the light of the answer given to question 424 of 2004, confirm what consultation it has undertaken in respect of the potential implementation of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 in Gibraltar in whole or in part?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

At present the situation is that a working party, chaired by the Attorney General and with representation on it from the Bar, the Police and the Government, is doing its work. That working group is almost at the end of its task and is due very shortly to submit its recommendations to the Government. The consultation process would follow that.

**NO 1242 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EXTERNAL FRONTIERS REGULATION**

Have Government now received a substantive reply to the letter sent to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office on 22 December 2003 seeking clarification from HMG regarding Spain's objection in November to Gibraltar's participation in a future External Frontiers Regulation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes Sir. The Regulation to which the hon Member refers is a regulation establishing a European Borders Agency. The UK and Ireland have opted, or tried to opt perhaps is a better word, have opted to participate but the EU has decided that they are not entitled to do so while they remain outside the Schengen borders measures, since this Regulation builds on them. It is now proposed that the UK and Ireland do not form part of the Agency but simply sit in as observers. Spain objects to even that arrangement covering Gibraltar. We have made clear to HMG the importance, given that it is an external borders measure, we have made clear to HMG the importance of Gibraltar being included in whatever degree/manner the United Kingdom participates, whether it is as an observer or whatever. The matter is currently under discussion by the UK in the Justice and Home Affairs Council.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1242 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the implication of Spain's objection that the United Kingdom would not be able to take a seat as an observer if they continue to maintain this issue? Is it something that requires the unanimity of the rest?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the latest text of the Regulation under discussion, contains an article which I think is 10 bis dealing with co-operation with Ireland and the UK, given that their attempt to actually subscribe to it lock, stock and barrel was turned down, and article 10 bis reads '(1) *The Agency shall facilitate operational co-operation of the Member State with Ireland and the United Kingdom in matters covered by its activities and to the extent required for the fulfilment of its task set out in article 2(1).* (2) *Support to*

*be provided by the Agency pursuant to article 2(1)(f) shall cover the organisation of joint return operations of Member States in which Ireland or the UK or both also participate.'* So in other words, they do not participate, they cannot sign up to the Regulation because they have been turned down, they have observer status at the meetings of the Agency, but there is a clause in the Regulation itself permitting co-operation with Ireland and the UK who are not participants. If they were participants they would not need to meet this co-operation clause. Our position is that that clause has got to extend to Gibraltar because it is easy to see what will otherwise happen. This will be the equivalent of the second air liberalisation directive where if there is some sort of Gibraltar language, it will be a precedent, and it will be a precedent all the way up to the actual external.... so we have made it perfectly clear in writing to the United Kingdom what is the importance of Gibraltar not being excluded from any of these arrangements and what the policy consequences will be of that, and it has been clearly spelt out to them that, of course, the document itself does not contain anything which is Gibraltar excluding. I have read to him the clauses UK would normally be deemed to include Gibraltar, but of course the danger is, and I think that this is what Spain was proposing, is that Spain may enter reservations language in the minutes or somewhere to the effect that well, this will not apply as between Spain and Gibraltar, for example, because it is not language, Spain would not need to be excluding language. They would simply have to be excluding Gibraltar from the ambit of the co-operation clause. What we have said to the United Kingdom is that it is not enough for the UK to say we do not accept the language in the minute. In other words, enter a counter reservation, because of course if the UK goes along with this in practice, that is where the damage comes. The fact that they enter a counter reservation, well we do not agree with Spain's counter reservation, is simple words if in practice Gibraltar is excluded from the ambit of the co-operation clause. Of course, in due course if the United Kingdom subscribes to the Schengen Chapters on borders, the UK will then be signing this Regulation in full. Of course it can only join the Regulation as it then stands. Spain would then say 'ah, the regulation does not apply to Gibraltar because remember you conceded the ground to me back in May 2004, when you accepted the....'. The United Kingdom's position on the matter, the position as set out in letters to the Government, is that because this is a Schengen matter we are entitled for its application to us automatically. That is what they are saying to it. Well, automatically once the UK subscribes to it. In other words, that this is an area where there is no scope for exclusion, in other words one is entitled to participate as a matter of right, but that as now they are only observers and they do not have the vote, we have said look that does not stack up. I mean, either UK participates in it with Gibraltar's inclusion or UK participates in it with Gibraltar's exclusion, and that is where the latter would be terribly damaging and that is where the matter presently rests.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the text that the Chief Minister is quoting from, is that a draft at this stage which still has to go through some negotiation or approval, or is that the final thing?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, it is still in draft, it has not yet been approved but it is regarded as more or less settled draft. In other words, the issue for us is not the language of this, the issue for us is things that might be inserted in the minutes, or declaration or minute statements, things of that sort. There is nothing damaging to us in the language of the draft regulation.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it possible for the Government to provide a copy of that, or is it readily available on the internet or something?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will check. This copy has been sent to us by the Foreign Office. Obviously if it is available on the internet there is no reason why I should not give it to him, but I just need to check, that it has reached that stage of publicity.

**NO 1243 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU – REGIONAL SELECTIVITY**

Can Government explain what they and the UK Government have done so far to intervene in the case on Regional Selectivity before the European Court of Justice involving the Azores and Portugal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am informed that at our request the United Kingdom Government have now intervened in that case. Yes, they have a period of time that they did it and they were pressed to do it and they agreed to do it. The Gibraltar Government's own application to the Court for leave for it to intervene, has been turned down by the Court on the grounds that we do not have sufficient interest as a party in the facts of that case. Of course this situation does not arise in the case of the United Kingdom, because under the rules of procedure of the European Court, Member States are always entitled to intervene in all cases as a matter of right, whereas other parties have to establish a sufficient interest. If I could just add, that is why we urged the UK to intervene at the outset, because we feared that this would happen, we were advised that there was a real possibility of this happening and we did not want our situation to be represented together before the Court.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1243 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that in fact the Chief Minister brought this to the attention of the House in last year's budget, can he say what it is that has actually happened in the last 12 months? I mean, as regards the progress of that case.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot remember where the matter stood at that time and therefore what it is that he already knows. I think that the Advocate General has now issued an opinion, I think but let me check with Michael Llamas on that and I will come back to that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can he say when in fact the Government were informed that their application had been turned down by the Court on the grounds that they did not have sufficient interest?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him the date but it was more than several weeks ago, several weeks, two or three months, perhaps around Christmas, New Year, January. Let me just say I do not recollect what it is that we discussed at the budget time but the Government's desire to intervene in this case was to make sure that the Court had not, in an ill-informed way, had made any jurisprudence that would affect our case when our case subsequently came. In other words we wanted to make sure that the Court limited itself to the facts in Azores and not make any general law without us being there to argue that subsequently have impacted on us.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I believe that is in fact the explanation that was given last year at budget time, that it was for that purpose.

**ORAL**

**NO 1244 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

How many persons applied for the vacancy for Regulatory Officer in the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority which was advertised on 3 March?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Gibraltar Regulatory Authority is statutorily independent of the Government. Given its functions, particularly under EU directives that require such independence, the Government would not wish to answer in this House for the GRA in a way that might lead others to believe that such independence is less than it should be. The hon Member should seek that information directly from the GRA.

**NO 1245 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU – AIRLINE OVERBOOKING COMPENSATION**

On what date did the Government last make representations to the United Kingdom for the inclusion of Gibraltar in the EU airline overbooking compensation measures, what was the nature of the representations made and what was the reply from the United Kingdom?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As I have previously stated in this House, on 20 March 2002 the Gibraltar Government were notified that the UK had reached an understanding with Spain on the application of EU aviation measures to Gibraltar. The understanding is that the UK will accept a suspension clause if the Commission, when asked by Spain and the UK jointly, indicates that the relevant EU measure places obligations on airports.

On 8 May 2002, the European Commission Aviation Working Group considered the proposal for a denied boarding compensation regulation. In accordance with the agreed formula, the suspension clause was requested by Spain and surprise, surprise, agreed by the UK.

As the Government have already stated publicly, they reject and condemn these arrangements as illegal and politically unacceptable.

Gibraltar is entitled, in our view, as of right, to participate in all aviation measures. The Government will consider taking legal action to contest these exclusions at the appropriate time, and at the appropriate time means if we can find a way around the procedural hurdles that the hon Members faced when they did the airport case.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1245 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Although no action has been commenced, has legal advice been taken on this subsequent issue?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Let me just tell the hon Member that the matter is under active management, in the terms of legal advice and seeking ways forward. The UK knows that this is an area in which we have every intention of litigating at the earliest opportunity.

**NO 1246 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**REPORTS**

Can Government state what were the nature of each of the reports?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The question is nonsensical and incapable of being answered. It is clear from the plethora of repetitive questions before the House that hon Members value quantity over quality. That is a matter for them, but in stringing out a question into many separate questions in order to boost their total, hon Members should take care to ensure that each question stands by itself.

**NO 1247 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GOVERNMENT LOTTERY**

Can Government state whether they propose to implement any changes to the structure of the lottery, and if so, what are the changes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Options with regard to the structure of the lottery are currently being considered by Government.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1247 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister give me a date by which the considerations will be concluded?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Did the Government not bring out a tender for the commissioning of the lottery which is going to last five years, to the company that is currently running it? Therefore, how can they change now the contract with the tender?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The tender that the hon Member is referring to is to do with the administration of the lottery, but any changes that would become necessary would obviously be done in conjunction with the administrator.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this the same study that has been going on for the last two or three years, or is it a new initiative?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

It is the same change with renewed vigour. The last change occurred in 1993 when the hon Member's party was in government and the lottery has had a volatility and problems since then. That is why this has become necessary.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It has been identified as something that has been necessary for a number of years. Mainly I think, because the fluctuations in whether the Government wins the lottery with the tickets it does not sell, dramatically alter the reliability of the estimates. I think that has been the main thing identified by the Auditor year after year. Is something being looked at in that context?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is one of the issues. Also the fact that since the change in 1993, to fortnightly draws and changing the price of the tickets, the number of returned tickets has dropped from 20 per cent to 32 per cent. That is unacceptable to the Government.

ORAL

NO 1248 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**TRANSFER OF SENTENCED PERSONS**

Can Government state from May 1987 to 2002 what were the provisions in Gibraltar which governed the transfer of sentenced persons?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1249 to 1251 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1249 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TRANSFER OF SENTENCED PERSONS**

Can Government state when the Council of Europe Convention on the transfer of sentenced persons done at Strasburg on 21st May 1983 was extended to Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1248 and 1250 to 1251 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1250 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TRANSFER OF SENTENCED PERSONS**

Can Government state whether the agreement on the application, amongst Member States of the European Community, of the Council of Europe Convention on the transfer of sentenced persons done at Brussels on the 26th May 1987, was applicable in Gibraltar from the same date as other Member States, and if not, what were the different dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1248 to 1249 and 1251 of 2004.

**NO 1251 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TRANSFER OF SENTENCED PERSONS**

Can Government state which were the sections of the Schengen Acquis that Gibraltar had to comply with which required the Transfer of Sentenced Persons Ordinance 2002 to be brought to the House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The 1983 Council of Europe Convention on the Transfer of Sentenced Persons was extended to Gibraltar on 1 May 1987. The Convention entered into force in respect of other Member States as follows:

|         |   |                 |             |   |                 |
|---------|---|-----------------|-------------|---|-----------------|
| Austria | - | 1 January 1987  | Italy       | - | 1 October 1989  |
| Belgium | - | 1 December 1990 | Luxembourg  | - | 1 February 1988 |
| Denmark | - | 1 May 1987      | Netherlands | - | 1 January 1988  |
| Finland | - | 1 May 1987      | Portugal    | - | 1 October 1993  |
| France  | - | 1 July 1985     | Spain       | - | 1 July 1985     |
| Germany | - | 1 February 1992 | Sweden      | - | 1 July 1985     |
| Greece  | - | 1 April 1988    | UK          | - | 1 August 1985   |
| Ireland | - | 1 November 1995 |             |   |                 |

The Convention was implemented in Gibraltar by the Transfer of Sentenced Persons Ordinance 2002, in accordance with our obligations under Article 67 to 69 of the Schengen implementing Convention.

Prior to 2002 we had no legislation covering the ground falling within the ambit of the 1983 Convention, even though it had been extended to us as long ago as May 1987.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1248 TO 1251 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the fact that it was extended to us something that created an obligation for us to have in place something to give effect to the terms of the Convention or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, technically Gibraltar has extended to it in 1987 a Convention that requires it to be willing to do certain things. It should then have put into place local legislation authorising the courts and the Superintendent of Prisons to do those things. In fact it never happened. So we had an international obligation which Gibraltar had not legislated to comply with. It happens that under the Schengen implementing Convention this whole area of sentenced persons was included, and this is how it came to our attention that it had not been legislated for, because it was one of the things that we had to satisfy the EU we had done in order to gain access to the Schengen Convention. So the obligation arises primarily and initially from the extension of the Convention to us in 1987, and then it was repeated as an obligation as part of the Schengen implementing Convention accession provision.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the answer to Question No. 1248 then is none, that there was nothing between 1987 and 2002.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Nothing whatsoever, no.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But in practice something was happening, was there not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. We were able, even the receipt, this area is fraught with difficulty unless one has local legislation, because of course even if somebody offers to send one a prisoner, I remember there was a case of a Gibraltarian in prison in Portugal, even if we have that there has to be statutory authority for the incarceration of the person in Gibraltar. I mean the Superintendent of Prison cannot keep somebody locked up in the territory of Gibraltar just because they have been sentenced by a court in Portugal. Under the local law there has got to be a legitimisation of the withholding of liberty, whatever the phrase is, deprivation of liberty.

ORAL

NO 1252 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**MOD – MANNING LEVELS**

Can Government say whether MOD has any plans to reduce manpower levels below the figures provided for the 31 December 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 1253 of 2004.

**NO 1253 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD – BUDGET FOR GIBRALTAR**

Can Government say what is the approved MOD budget for Gibraltar for the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, the extent of the MOD's approved budget for Gibraltar for the current financial year is not a question that relates to the affairs of Government or to any issue for which the Government are accountable in this House. He should put his question to the MOD, which is what I would have to do. I would have to write to the MOD. In fact, last time he asked me this question there was some reluctance to give it to me and I had to sort of threaten to say that they were refusing to give it to me in the House. So I am reluctant to establish the practice whereby the Government has to go and beg for information in order to bring it to the House, when it is not Government business. He is as entitled to the information as I am directly from the MOD. The Government are not aware of any plans by MOD to reduce its manpower levels.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1252 AND 1253 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Government expect to be informed by MOD of such plans if they existed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Sometimes they bring things to our attention in advance and sometimes they do not. I would hope that they would, and I would most certainly expect if there was anything other than a minimal number of jobs involved, which might be the normal turnover staff, I would certainly hope and expect the MOD to give us maximum advance notice of any significant manning level reductions. I think in fairness to them, when they have been of that nature, they have in the past given us advance notice.



**NO 1254 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES OMBUDSMAN**

Will the Government, in the light of the answer given to question 446 of 2004, make a statement as to what progress if any they have made in respect of the establishment of a body with jurisdiction similar to that of the Financial Services Ombudsman in the UK (and elsewhere in the EU) to deal with complaints relating to licensees under the Financial Services Ordinance 1989 and 1998, and with the power to provide redress to complainants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

When I read this question I had come to the conclusion that it was an opportunity for a statement by the hon Member rather than seeking information from the Government. To ask the Government the question it would have been enough to say 'what progress have the Government made in setting up a financial services ombudsman?'. The answer is, in any event, that there has been no substantial development since Question No. 446 of 2004 was answered. I understand, but I am not party to them myself, that there may have been discussion between the Financial Services Commissioner and the Finance Centre Director. So it is operating at that level at the moment. A specific legislative proposal has not come up to me as Minister.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1254 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As I urged the Chief Minister in relation to PACE, it is in his gift to accelerate these things and I would ask him to consider doing so, given that there have been instances when, in the very recent past, in the past calendar year, the existence of such a body would have been of great assistance to investors, and we never know when again a large number of investors are going to require the assistance of a body such as a financial services ombudsman, or indeed a small number of investors would benefit from the existence in Gibraltar of such a body. I know it is something that the Chief Minister reacted if not warmly then positively to when I first put my question last time, so I would be very grateful if he could press the accelerator on this.

ORAL

NO 1255 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the number of individuals taking up Category 2 status in the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1256 to 1260 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1256 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the number of individuals taking up Category 2 status in the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1255 and 1257 to 1260 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1257 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the number of individuals taking up Category 2 status in the month of March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1255, 1256 and 1258 to 1260 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1258 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals are registered with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1255 to 1257 and 1259 to 1260 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1259 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals are registered with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1255 to 1258 and 1260 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1260 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals are registered with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of the month of March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The information the hon Member has requested is contained in the attached schedule.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1260**

**Answer to Questions 1255, 1256 and 1257**

The breakdown of the number of individuals taking up Category 2 is as follows:

|               |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|
| January 2004  | - | 3 |
| February 2004 | - | 5 |
| March 2004    | - | 5 |

**Answer to Questions 1258, 1259 and 1260**

The number of individuals registered with Category 2 status in Gibraltar is as follows:

|               |   |     |
|---------------|---|-----|
| January 2004  | - | 161 |
| February 2004 | - | 166 |
| March 2004    | - | 171 |



ORAL

NO 1261 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**INVESTMENT SERVICES**

Can Government state if there have been any applications for passporting in investment services in the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1262 and 1263 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1262 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**INVESTMENT SERVICES**

Can Government state if there have been any applications for passporting in investment services in the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1261 and 1263 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1263 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**INVESTMENT SERVICES**

Can Government state if there have been any applications for passporting in investment services in the month of March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The Financial Services Commission has not received any application for passporting in investment services during any of the three months that he asks about.

ORAL

NO 1264 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**COMPANIES ORDINANCE**

Will the Government commit itself to issuing a consolidated version of the Companies Ordinance and subsidiary legislation incorporating all amendments to the legislation to date, which would be of real assistance to professionals in the Finance Centre who are called upon to advise on the legislation?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1265 and 1266 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1265 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**COMPANIES ORDINANCE**

When do Government expect to bring into effect the provisions of Section 45A of the Companies Ordinance?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1264 and 1266 of 2004.

**NO 1266 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES ORDINANCE**

Will Government agree to review the provisions of the Companies Ordinance which relate to the companies trading whilst insolvent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Under current legislation, if a company trades whilst insolvent, the directors are personally liable for the company's debts and obligations. The Government have not received any representations to the effect that this aspect of our legislation should be reviewed.

The Companies Ordinance has been undergoing a process of consolidation for very, very many months now as part of the general consolidation of laws process. This is now complete and the consolidated text is due to be published shortly.

Section 45A will be commenced in full also shortly.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1264 TO 1266 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister will be aware that the provisions in the United Kingdom in relation to directors of companies trading whilst insolvent are much more onerous on those directors than they are in Gibraltar. That is why I raised the issue in this particular case, to protect others in the market who may find themselves dealing with such companies, but I am grateful for his indication that a consolidation of the Companies Ordinance is due soon. Can I ask him whether it is also to be issued to the general public in electronic form, and also how shortly he expects that section 45, which deals to get a little bit technical, with the whitewash procedures and which would be welcome, I think, across the board in the Finance Centre, is to be brought into effect? I note that it has been on the Statute book already for many years.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, actually it was amended, the reason why I said to the hon Member that it would be commenced in full, is that we currently have the somewhat curious situation

whereby section 45 itself was never introduced, but the amendment of it, section 45 was first legislated in 1992 and for reasons we have never understood the previous administration never commenced it, and we spent some time trying to work out whether there was a reason for this or not. In fact, a new Ordinance was passed in 1999, amending that section 45A and the amending Ordinance was commenced but not the original section 45. So that is why I said in full. The amendments were commenced but not the Ordinance itself. I would expect this to happen in the next two or three weeks at the most. That is the sort of timescale. As to the electronic publication, in fact initially it will only be electronic because consolidated texts do not have the force of law until they have been fiatd by the Attorney General. That leaves a lot of these things stacked up, but of course there is nothing to stop the Government, which is what we are going to do, publishing it on the basis of Lexis. So long as people know that it is not a text that they can quote in court, because it has not yet got the force of law, it is still nevertheless very helpful, just like Lexis or one of these computer things. So initially, actually, it will only be published electronically and it will be published on paper when the consolidated version actually has the force of law.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Both of those comments are very welcome.

**ORAL**

**NO 1267 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

In relation to financial services, can the Chief Minister give the dates in the month of January 2004 when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business relating to Financial Services, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited, the names of any officials or other persons travelling with the Chief Minister and a breakdown of the cost of each visit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1268 and 1269 of 2004.



**ORAL**

**NO 1268 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

In relation to financial services, can the Chief Minister give the dates in the month of February 2004 when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business relating to Financial Services, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited, the names of any officials or other persons travelling with the Chief Minister and a breakdown of the cost of each visit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1267 and 1269 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1269 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

In relation to financial services, can the Chief Minister give the dates in the month of March 2004 when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business relating to Financial Services, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited, the names of any officials or other persons travelling with the Chief Minister and a breakdown of the cost of each visit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheet.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1269**

**Answer to Questions 1267, 1268 and 1269**

During the months of January, February and March 2004 the Chief Minister has been away from Gibraltar on Government business relating to Financial Services on one occasion.

Details are as follows:-

Date: Friday 27<sup>th</sup> February 2004  
Event/Function: Meeting to discuss the EU Commission state aid enquiry on Gibraltar tax reform  
Venue: Foreign & Commonwealth Office  
City/Country: London, United Kingdom

Officials Travelling with Chief Minister:

Mr E Montado, Chief Secretary  
Mr J Reyes, Private Secretary (Legal)  
Mr M Llamas, Director, Government of Gibraltar Brussels Office

|                     |                  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Flights             | Total: £2,312.00 |
| Accommodation       | Total: £ 500.00  |
| Travelling Expenses | Total: £ 262.00  |
| Subsistence         | Total: £ 204.00  |
|                     | Total: £3,278.00 |

ORAL

NO 1270 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attending all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the month of January 2004, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1271 and 1272 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1271 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attending all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the month of February 2004, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1270 and 1272 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1272 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attending all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the month of March 2004, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information is on the attached schedule.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1272**

**Answer to Question 1270/2004**

Government did not attend any conferences in January 2004.

**Answer to Question 1271/2004**

In the month of February the Finance Centre attended the “Willis Insurance Seminar in London” on the 24<sup>th</sup> February 2004.

The following 3 (three) persons made up the Government delegation at the “Willis Insurance Seminar in London”:

|               |                                                               |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| James Tipping | Finance Centre Director                                       |
| Joseph Macano | Director Licensing Unit                                       |
| Chris Collins | Financial Services Commission – Head of Insurance Supervision |

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|               |          |
|---------------|----------|
| Flights       | £ 396.00 |
| Accommodation | £ 695.00 |
| Subsistence   | £ 103.00 |
| Expenses      | £ 243.00 |
| Courier       | £ 190.00 |

**TOTAL: £1,627.00**

Cont...

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1272**

**Answer to Question 1272/2004**

In the month of March the Finance Centre hosted an Insurance Seminar in Geneva on 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> March 2004.

The following 5 (five) persons made up the Government delegation at the "Insurance Seminar in Geneva":

|                  |                                                               |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| James Tipping    | Finance Centre Director                                       |
| Joseph Macano    | Director Licensing Unit                                       |
| Guy Canessa      | Marketing and Liaison Officer                                 |
| Maite Mir-Parody | Personal Assistant                                            |
| Chris Collins    | Financial Services Commission – Head of Insurance Supervision |

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                                                                 |                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Flights                                                         | £1,056.00        |
| Accommodation                                                   | £2,084.00        |
| Subsistence                                                     | £ 648.00         |
| Expenses                                                        | £ 852.00         |
| Courier                                                         | £ 617.00         |
| Printing                                                        | £ 248.00         |
| Hire of Equipment                                               | £ 104.00         |
| Hotel Des Bergues<br>Conference Room Hire<br>including Catering | £3,348.00        |
| <b>TOTAL:</b>                                                   | <b>£8,957.00</b> |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1270 TO 1272 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just have clarification from the Chief Minister that the figures provided in relation to the answer to Question No. 1271 represent the cost in respect of the two officials from the Gibraltar Government travelling and not the third official who is with the Financial Services Commission?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am afraid I cannot. I do not know when they go on these Government trips, whether the Government pay for the FSC or whether they pay their own way. I suspect that the Government pays for them, but I do not know the answer to the question. As presented here, it is for the three persons and I have assumed that that meant that the Financial Services Commission Head of Insurance who is making a presentation, has his costs paid for him by the Government. I have assumed that when I read the answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Not out of their budget.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not out of their budget, no. They have no budget for marketing. Marketing is not in their statutory.

ORAL

NO 1273 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies are registered in Gibraltar in the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1274 to 1278 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1274 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies are registered in Gibraltar in the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1273 and 1275 to 1278 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1275 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies are registered in Gibraltar in the month of March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1273, 1274 and 1276 to 1278 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1276 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANY**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the month of January 2004 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1273 to 1275 and 1277 to 1278 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1277 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the month of February 2004 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1273 to 1276 and 1278 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1278 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the month of March 2004 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

During those three months, one Protected Cell Company appears as registered. There are no applications for Protected Cell Companies which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected, between the months of January, February and March 2004.

ORAL

NO 1279 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1280 to 1284 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1280 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1279 and 1281 to 1284 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1281 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the month of March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1279, 1280 and 1282 to 1284 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1282 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in the month of January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1279 to 1281 and 1283 to 1284 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1283 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1279 to 1282 and 1284 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1284 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in the month of March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Assuming that by 'listing the companies' he means how many and not a list of their names, the information is on the attached schedule.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1284**

**Answer to Question 1279, 1280 AND 1281**

The companies formed in Gibraltar in the months of January, February and March 2004 are as follows:

|          |     |
|----------|-----|
| January  | 255 |
| February | 271 |
| March    | 316 |

**Answer to Question 1282, 1283 AND 1284**

The companies removed from the companies register in the months of January, February and March 2004 are as follows:

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| January  | 1671 |
| February | 9727 |
| March    | 332  |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1279 TO 1284 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Chief Minister know, and I appreciate that he may need specific notice of this supplementary question, whether the figure for companies removed includes the figure for companies which may have been redomiciled out of Gibraltar?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I cannot break down the figure for him between strikings out for another reason or redomiciliation. I understand there have been quite a number of redomiciliations so it is not as if the number is not significant, but I cannot give him that information, it has not been provided to me.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just if I may be allowed to go back and ask him whether he knows the month in which these particular PCC's had been formed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I did not tell him that they had been formed in the first quarter. It appears as registered and has been there for some time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just that one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

ORAL

NO 1285 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new applications for banking licences have been received in the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1286 and 1287 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1286 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new applications for banking licences have been received in the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1285 and 1287 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1287 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new applications for banking licenses have been received in the month of March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

As far as the Government are aware, the Financial Services Commission has not received any applications for banking licences during the months of January, February and March 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1288 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the month of January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1289 to 1293 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1289 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the month of February 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1288 and 1290 to 1293 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1290 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the month of March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1288, 1289 and 1292 and 1293 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1291 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the month of January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1288 to 1290 and 1293 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1292 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the month of February 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1288 to 1291 and 1293 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1293 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the month of March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached sheet.



### **ANSWER TO QUESTION 1293**

#### **Answer to Question 1288**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> January 2004 the insurance industry in Gibraltar included 28 employers with a total of 186 registered employees (121 of which are Gibraltarian, 50 British, 1 Belgian, 1 Czech, 1 French, 1 Irish, 1 Portuguese, 10 Spanish).

#### **Answer to Question 1289**

As at 29<sup>th</sup> February 2004 the insurance industry in Gibraltar included 28 employers with a total of 188 registered employees (121 of which are Gibraltarian, 51 British, 1 Belgian, 1 Czech, 1 French, 1 Irish, 1 Portuguese, 11 Spanish).

#### **Answer to Question 1290**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 the insurance industry in Gibraltar included 28 employers with a total of 190 registered employees (120 of which are Gibraltarian, 53 British, 1 Belgian, 1 Czech, 1 French, 1 Irish, 1 Portuguese, 12 Spanish).

#### **Answer to Question 1291**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> January 2004 the banking sector in Gibraltar included 16 employers with a total of 645 registered employees (450 of which are Gibraltarian, 100 British, 18 Danish, 6 Dutch, 3 French, 10 German, 3 Irish, 1 Maltese, 1 Italian, 3 Moroccan, 1 Portuguese, 37 Spanish, 1 Swedish, 11 Swiss).

#### **Answer to Question 1292**

As at 29<sup>th</sup> February 2004 the banking sector in Gibraltar included 16 employers with a total of 640 registered employees (447 of which are Gibraltarian, 100 British, 18 Danish, 6 Dutch, 3 French, 10 German, 3 Irish, 1 Maltese, 1 Italian, 3 Moroccan, 1 Portuguese, 36 Spanish, 1 Swedish, 10 Swiss).

#### **Answer to Question 1293**

As at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 the banking sector in Gibraltar included 15 employers with a total of 644 registered employees (453 of which are Gibraltarian, 101 British, 19 Danish, 6 Dutch, 2 French, 9 German, 3 Irish, 1 Maltese, 1 Italian, 3 Moroccan, 1 Portuguese, 34 Spanish, 1 Swedish, 10 Swiss).

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1288 TO 1293 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government confirm that the source of the information is the number of open contracts registered with the ETB?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes it is.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of information that we have been given in the past, there is a tendency for the commencement to be registered straight away but sometimes a lack in the termination, although probably the insurance industry and the banking industry are better than other sectors of the private sector, but can he confirm that in fact if a termination comes in which refers to something that happened in a previous month, does the ETB register that in the month in which it receives the notice or in the month in which the termination actually took place, when it arrives late?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The de-registration can only be recorded on the date that the de-registration is notified, but I hope, I do not know the answer to the hon Member's question, but when it comes to the management of statistics in terms of how many people were employed in a given sector in a given month, I would hope that the information is on the first basis of his question. In other words, that the information is attributed to the period to which it relates rather than to the period in which it is notified.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the figures come, in fact, updated on the basis of later information?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, and I think that we have had this in the past in the House when in answer to the same question, different answers are given, and the explanation has been that there has been in respect of that period a subsequent notification which caused the figure to be amended.

ORAL

**NO 1294 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TRADED ENDOWMENT POLICIES "TEPS"**

Can Government state whether it has received any further information from the Financial Services Commission, or any member thereof, in relation to the sale in Gibraltar of Traded Endowment Policies ("TEP's), which have occasioned serious loss to a large number of Gibraltarian investors, some of them having lost all their life's savings and only source of income by being induced to invest in a financial services product which was advertised as "guaranteeing" the capital invested?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There has been no substantial change in so far as the Government are concerned, since the hon Member last raised the matter in the House.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1294 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The last time that I raised the matter in the House, the Chief Minister told me that he was from time to time provided with information by the Financial Services Commission or by the Company involved itself. I asked him whether he would be able to share information with the investors and he told me that he could not commit himself to do that because that very much depended on the source of the information and whether that information was provided to him in confidence. In his answer is the Chief Minister telling me that he has received no further information or that the information that he has received he is unable to share with the investors?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The former.

**ORAL**

**NO 1295 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by qualifying companies in October 1998 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1296 to 1299 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1296 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by qualifying companies in October 1999 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1295 and 1297 to 1299 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1297 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by qualifying companies in October 2000 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1295, 1296 and 1298 and 1299 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1298 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by qualifying companies in October 2001 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1295 to 1297 and 1299 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1299 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by qualifying companies in October 2002 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The information that the hon Member requests is set out in the written schedule attached.



**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1299**

**Answer to Questions 1295, 1296, 1297, 1298 and 1299**

According to the Employment and Training Board the total number of persons employed by Qualifying Companies as at March 2004 was 1058.

A breakdown by industry is as follows:

|                           |             |
|---------------------------|-------------|
| Financial Services        | 221         |
| Gaming                    | 468         |
| Bunkering                 | 6           |
| Exporter of Motor Vehicle | 89          |
| Shipping                  | 210         |
| Co. Management            | 33          |
| Philatelic                | 7           |
| I.T.                      | 1           |
| Communications            | 10          |
| Other                     | 13          |
| <b>Total:</b>             | <b>1058</b> |

A breakdown by nationality is as follows:

|              |     |
|--------------|-----|
| Gibraltarian | 424 |
| British      | 369 |
| Irish        | 12  |
| Spanish      | 129 |
| Swiss        | 7   |
| Portuguese   | 15  |
| Danish       | 2   |

Cont.....

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1299**

|               |    |
|---------------|----|
| Dutch         | 6  |
| German        | 6  |
| Australian    | 1  |
| French        | 6  |
| U.S.A.        | 2  |
| Italian       | 3  |
| Swedish       | 1  |
| Hong Kong     | 8  |
| Belgian       | 1  |
| Lithuanian    | 1  |
| Indian        | 1  |
| Moroccan      | 17 |
| Maltese       | 1  |
| Russian       | 4  |
| Bulgarian     | 3  |
| Thailand      | 2  |
| Yugoslavian   | 3  |
| South African | 5  |
| Brazilian     | 2  |
| Canadian      | 1  |
| Greek         | 2  |
| Hungarian     | 1  |

Contd.....

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1299**

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| Israeli   | 4  |
| Korean    | 8  |
| Malaysian | 11 |

**Total: 1058**

It has not been possible within the allocated time frame to provide the above information as at October 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002.

However, statistics from late 2001 available to the Government states that there were "about 1,450 people directly employed by Qualifying Companies".

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1295 TO 1299 OF 2004**

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member will see that the information has been provided in respect of March 2004 and there is a statement that it has not been possible, in the timescale available, to provide the information in respect of the earlier years.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Obviously the March 2004 has nothing to do with the returns made to compile the Employment Survey Reports, I take it. Or is it that we are talking that the March 2004 is the return for October 2003?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not think this is anything to do with the Employment Survey Reports, because the source is the Employment and Training Board.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. Well, I think perhaps I can draw the attention of the Chief Minister that I am asking for October in each year, because what I assumed would be possible would be that knowing that there are 140 companies, the Statistics Office would be able to identify those companies and give me the figure for the 140 companies as reflected in the reports of the private sector of the Employment Surveys, that is why it says October in each year. I take it then that this is the information of the open contracts registered with the ETB?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Chief Minister have a figure as to the number of employers that are involved?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether it would be possible, for example, to find out whether the Statistics Office could do such an exercise in respect of the Employment Survey that is currently being processed, the October 2003?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is physically possible, the Statistics Office can read out of the information as it comes in, of the returns as it comes in against a checklist of the 140 qualifying companies, identify the 140 that relates to the qualifying companies, tot them all up, it is mechanically possible but I do not think it is reasonable for the hon Member to expect that sort of administrative effort to be deployed. What I can do is ask the Statistics Office, because presumably they computerise much of this as it comes in, whether they can create a separate reporting category for qualifying companies, so that in future the information will just be available on the press of a button. I will ask them if that is viable in the context of the next Survey that they do, or at least of the Survey that they have not yet inputted, they have not yet input the current one and it is possible they might do that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the Government agree that in the light of the discontinuance of qualifying companies as a result of the last decision, it is important to know just how many jobs in the private sector are dependant on the existing qualifying companies?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it is very important. Obviously we have an idea, I have an idea operationally on the ground which are the sensitive companies, the gaming companies, for example Bassadone, the one operating the four wheel drive vehicles, that sort of thing. This is one of the issues that we are very acutely aware of in the context of the transition to a new tax scheme. In other words, what is going to happen to these qualifying companies, and of course now that we have to abandon the qualifying company legislation, the Government are considering that, we will probably just grant them all exempt certificates and allow them to trade and alter that.

ORAL

**NO 1300 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government confirm how many qualifying companies were trading in the tax years:

- (a) 1998/1999;
- (b) 1999/2000;
- (c) 2001/2002;
- (d) 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1301 to 1303 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1301 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANY**

Can Government state when was the last qualifying company approved and how many qualifying companies were in existence on that date?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1300, 1302 and 1303 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1302 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many qualifying companies were trading in the tax year 1998/1999, 1999/2000, 2000/2001, 2001/2002 and 2002/2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1300, 1301 and 1303 of 2004.

**NO 1303 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government provide a list of the qualifying companies that have been added to or removed from the active company list previously provided as at 31 October 2001?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1300**

There are currently around 84 Qualifying Companies trading according to the records of the Income Tax Department, out of a total of 122 active Qualifying Companies (according to our records). Qualifying Companies remain registered as active until such time as the company or its representative notifies us to the contrary. It is not possible for the Income Tax Department, within the limited time frame available, to provide the information requested in respect of the previous three years.

**Answer to Question No. 1301**

The last Qualifying Company was approved on 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2002. The total number of Qualifying Companies appearing on the register at that time was in the region of 146. This number included active and dormant companies, some of which were subsequently removed from the register.

**Answer to Question No. 1302**

I refer the hon Member to the answer given to Question No. 1300 of 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 1303**

The Qualifying Companies that have been added to or removed from the active list previously provided as at 31<sup>st</sup> October 2001 are as follows:

|                              |    |
|------------------------------|----|
| Qualifying Companies added   | 5  |
| Qualifying Companies removed | 29 |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1300 TO 1303 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Government provided the list which I think had 147 names on it, on 31<sup>st</sup> October outside the House. Would they be able to provide us now with the added five and the removed 29, so that the list can be amended?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am surprised that the Government did that, there are provisions in the Income Tax Ordinance prohibiting it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, I do not think the Chief Minister is correct, because otherwise what he has just told us is incorrect. He said that the active list had nothing to do with the tax, because there are 84 people according to the tax and 122 according to the Government, and it is the active list and not the.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I suppose that we can give provisions from our own register of Qualifying Companies. There are, as he knows, provisions in the Income Tax Ordinance prohibiting the publication of tax affairs of individual tax payers. If the information was provided before, I do not suppose we can object to continuing to do so. I would not have agreed to do it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know, he was not in the House when it was agreed. We were lucky.

ORAL

NO 1304 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many of the qualifying companies which remained in the month of January 2004 are considered by them to be active or trading?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1305 to 1309 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1305 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many qualifying companies which remained in the month of February 2004 are considered by them to be active or trading?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1304 and 1306 to 1309 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1306 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many qualifying companies which have remained in the month of March 2004 are considered by them to be active or trading?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1304, 1305 and 1307 to 1309 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1307 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

How many qualifying companies have discontinued their qualifying status in the month of January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1304 to 1306, 1308 and 1309 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1308 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

How many qualifying companies have discontinued their qualifying status in the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1304 to 1307 and 1309 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1309 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

How many qualifying companies have discontinued their qualifying status in the month of March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

As far as our records show there were 122 active Qualifying Companies in the months of January, February and March 2004. As far as our records show, during the months of January, February and March 2004, no Qualifying Company discontinued their qualifying status.

ORAL

NO 1310 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state whether they will continue to issue Tax Exempt Certificates in light of the decision by the EU Commission not to approve its tax reform proposals?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1311 to 1320 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1311 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates were issued in the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310 and 1312 to 1320 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1312 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates were issued in the month of February 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310, 1311 and 1313 to 1320 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1313 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates were issued in the month of March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310 to 1312 and 1314 to 1320 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1314 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310 to 1313 and 1315 to 1320 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1315 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the month of February 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310 to 1314 and 1316 to 1320 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1316 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the month of March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310 to 1315 and 1317 to 1320 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1317 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by exempt companies in October 1998 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310 to 1316 and 1318 to 1320 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1318 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by exempt companies in October 1999 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310 to 1317 and 1319 to 1320 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1319 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by exempt companies in October 2000 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1310 to 1318 and 1320 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1320 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state what was the total number of persons employed by exempt companies in October 2001 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

**Answer to Question No. 1310**

The Government will continue to issue tax exempt certificates. The EU Commission's recent Ruling does not relate to Exempt Companies.

The other statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

## **CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1320**

### **Answer to Questions 1311, 1312 and 1313**

The tax exempt certificates that have been issued are as follows:

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| January 2004  | 61  |
| February 2004 | 104 |
| March 2004    | 71  |

### **Answer to Questions 1314, 1315 and 1316**

The tax exempt companies which have terminated their tax exemption certificates are as follows:

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| January 2004  | 106 |
| February 2004 | 84  |
| March 2004    | 91  |

### **Answer to Questions 1317, 1318, 1319 and 1320**

According to the Employment and Training Board the total number of persons employed by Exempt Companies as at March 2004 was 643.

A breakdown by industry is as follows:

|                    |            |
|--------------------|------------|
| Financial Services | 343        |
| Gaming             | 289        |
| Bunkering          | 6          |
| Other              | 5          |
| <b>Total:</b>      | <b>643</b> |

Cont.....

**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1320**

A breakdown by nationality is as follows:

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| Gibraltarian  | 229 |
| British       | 237 |
| Irish         | 11  |
| Spanish       | 37  |
| Swiss         | 10  |
| Portuguese    | 11  |
| Danish        | 2   |
| Australian    | 3   |
| German        | 17  |
| French        | 10  |
| Italian       | 6   |
| Malaysian     | 2   |
| USA           | 5   |
| Philippino    | 1   |
| Greek         | 1   |
| Swedish       | 1   |
| South African | 1   |
| Israeli       | 18  |
| Dutch         | 8   |
| Antiguan      | 10  |
| Austrian      | 3   |
| Brazilian     | 2   |

Cont.....

**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1320**

|              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| Chinese      | 3          |
| Finnish      | 1          |
| Indian       | 1          |
| Japanese     | 1          |
| Korean       | 7          |
| Russian      | 5          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>643</b> |

It has not been possible within the allocated time frame to provide the above information as at October 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1310 TO 1320 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister has rightly said that the Decision of the Commission does not relate to tax exempt certificates, because the Decision of the Commission relates to what we were to put in place of tax exempt certificates. He told the House in answer to Question No. 423 last time, that he had had some indication that he would not be pressed by the United Kingdom to stop the existing regime until the new regime had been put in place. Has he any further assurances in that respect, and is that what leads him to make a statement to the effect that we are able to continue issuing tax exempt certificates?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The subject matter touched on by the hon Member's last supplementary is at an extremely sensitive stage of management in relation to the Commission and the Government are not willing to make any statement publicly on the matter whatsoever.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Chief Minister brief the Opposition in respect of that, not publicly?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not at this stage. I hope to be in a position to do so in the not too distant future but not right now.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government confirm that the employment figures given are on the same basis as in the answer to the questions on the Qualifying Companies?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What basis is the hon Member referring to?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The fact that they were open contracts with the ETB.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, Employment and Training Board source.

ORAL

NO 1321 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**TAX REFORM PROPOSALS**

Can Government state whether they are considering making an application to the European Court of Justice for interim measures in any proceedings the Government may issue in that Court in respect of the rejection by the EU Commission of the Governments tax reform proposals?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

For reasons which will be obvious to the hon Member, the Government will not reveal their tactics and strategy in the forthcoming litigation at this early stage in the process, but the Government hope to avoid the need for the measure that he has mentioned in his question.

SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1321 OF 2004

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Given the sensitive nature of the information requested, I will not be pressing the Chief Minister for anything further.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Sensible.

**NO 1322 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**REFORM OF BUSINESS TAXATION**

Have Government now received a reply from the United Kingdom Government on whether UK's submission to the European Commission in respect of the planned reform of business taxation in Gibraltar can be made available on a confidential basis to the Opposition?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, but I shall pursue it. This matter has fallen off my radar screen and I have just lost sight of it. I will pick up the thread and see where it is.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1322 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible for the Government to supply us with a copy of their own submissions whilst we wait for them to make representations to the UK?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would rather give them to him together if we are going to give them both, and only consider his latter request if the UK decline permission. All this area is beginning to enter very sensitive situations. I have no difficulty giving the Government's arguments to him confidentially, it would always have to be subject to that caveat, but I would prefer to give them both to him together and I would rather ask that he indulges me a bit longer on that, and I will come back to him as soon as possible in the next few days.



ORAL

NO 1323 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**OFFSHORE BETTING**

Have there been any new applications for licences to conduct offshore betting since the last Question Time in this House in January?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 1324 of 2004.

**NO 1324 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**OFFSHORE BETTING**

At what stage are the four applications for licences to conduct offshore betting in Gibraltar which were under consideration in January?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1323**

Since the beginning of January 2004 eight enquiries have been received of which only one is being taken forward.

**Answer to Question No. 1324**

All four applications referred to in answer to Question No. 460 of 2004, have been approved in principle and are at varying stages in the licensing progress.

**ORAL**

**NO 1325 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INDEX OF RETAIL PRICES**

Can Government explain what action has been taken to review the calculation of the index of retail prices and when the review is expected to be concluded?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1326 and 1327 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1326 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INDEX OF RETAIL PRICES**

Can Government state how are increasing residential rent levels reflected in the Index of Retail Prices?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1325 and 1327 of 2004.

**NO 1327 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INDEX OF RETAIL PRICES**

Can Government state how rent levels from office and commercial premises are reflected in the Index of Retail Prices?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1325 of 2004**

A complete review of the basis on which the Index of Retail Prices is calculated is only possible after the conduct of a Family Expenditure Survey. Such a survey is undertaken at times when it is believed that there have been significant changes to the pattern of consumers' expenditure. The present Index, which commenced in April 1998, is based on the weights obtained from the household expenditure patterns of 1995/1996.

Consideration is currently being given to carrying out a new Family Expenditure Survey. Notwithstanding this, the Statistics Office continues to up-date the range of goods and services that are priced as part of the Index of Retail Prices.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1326 and 1327 of 2004**

The Index of Retail Prices measures changes in the retail prices of goods and services available to households in Gibraltar. Increases in the rent levels of office and commercial premises therefore fall outside the parameters of the Index.

Residential rent levels form part of the "Rent" sub-group of the "Housing" group which itself is one of the eight main groups which comprise the Index. Rent levels are determined quarterly both from Government records and from information provided by Land Property Services Ltd. Any increases in rent levels are therefore reflected both in the Housing group and in the overall General Index of Retail Prices.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1325 TO 1327 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am of course aware that there is a survey undertaken of household expenditure and that it was done to construct the present base of the present Index, but perhaps the Chief Minister has forgotten that he said he was asking for a review to be carried out when he announced the 2 per cent minimum increase in Civil Service pensions, because he said he considered the Index was under-reflecting the rate of inflation. That is the review that I am talking about.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not forgotten, that is why consideration is being given to carrying out a new Family Expenditure Survey.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. So when the Chief Minister said a review is being carried out, what he meant was consideration is going to be given to carrying out a new Family Expenditure Survey and constructing a new Index, not that they were actually going to re-examine the existing one to see if there was any explanation as to why there appeared to be such a low level of increase over some of the months of the year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct. The first line of the answer was a complete review of the basis on which the Index of Retail Prices was calculated is only possible, this according to the Statistics Office, after the contact. So I am advised that in order to even contemplate a possible re-structure of the Index, the starting point is a new Survey. That is where the matter lies.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact there will not be a review unless it is decided to have a new Survey. That is the answer, is it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would rather put it a different way. There will not be a review until there is an Expenditure Survey, rather than unless.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, yes, obviously on the basis that at some time in the future there will be another one because there has always been one every sort of 10 or 20 years, but it is not that other than in the normal course of events something is being done because the Government had decided at the time they brought the legislation to make the pension increase 2 per cent minimum, that in fact there was a need to do this because the Index of Retail Prices was not adequately reflecting the level of inflation that was taking place. It is good that we have protected Civil Service pensions against

inflation that may be higher than recorded, but surely it is not a good thing to continue to under-record it if the Government believe that is what is happening.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is why consideration is being given to a new Family Expenditure Survey, much sooner than would otherwise have come up for reconsideration.

ORAL

**NO 1328 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ARREARS REPAYMENT AGREEMENT**

Can Government state which is the company identified by the Principal Auditor that on 24 April 2001 signed an arrears repayment agreement and ceased to honour the agreement after paying one instalment and can they state how much arrears the repayment agreement covered and how much was the instalment paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1329 to 1332 and 1341 of 2004.



**ORAL**

**NO 1329 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ARREARS REPAYMENT AGREEMENT**

Can Government state what action if any has been taken since June 2002 in respect of the company identified by the Principal Auditor which had signed an arrears agreement on the 24 April 2001 and failed to honour it after making one instalment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1328, 1330 to 1332 and 1341 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1330 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ARREARS REPAYMENT AGREEMENT**

Can Government explain why in the case of the company identified by the Principal Auditor that on the 24 April 2001 signed an arrears repayment agreement the Accountant General gave instructions to the CAU on the 15 February 2002 not to proceed with the winding up due on the 5 March 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1328, 1329 to 1332 and 1341 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1331 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ARREARS REPAYMENT AGREEMENT**

Can Government state what was the amount of arrears of social insurance contributions due from the company identified by the Principal Auditor that on the 24 April 2001 signed an arrears repayment agreement and ceased to honour the agreement after paying one instalment in June 2002 and as at the end of December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1328 to 1330, 1332 and 1341 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1332 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ARREARS REPAYMENT AGREEMENT**

Can Government state in respect of the company identified by the Principal Auditor that on the 24 April 2001 signed an arrears repayment agreement and ceased to honour the agreement after paying one instalment, what was the number of employees as at the end of December 2001, 2002 and 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1328 to 1331 and 1341 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1333 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government state as at December 2003 what was the total arrears passed to the Central Arrears Unit since May 1997 and how much had been collected and of the balance how much was covered by agreement and how much pending action?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1335 to 1337 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1334 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government state what criteria is applied by the Treasury in determining whether approval is granted or withheld in respect of proceedings with legal action to collect arrears of revenue and whether such criteria have been established as a matter of Government policy and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Except for final winding up action, where Government approval is required in view of wider economic considerations, follow-up action is taken by the Treasury as far as possible.

**ORAL**

**NO 1335 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government state in respect of each financial year from 1st April 1996, how many companies have been referred to the Treasury for legal proceedings to be started with a view to enforcing collection of arrears of revenue?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1333, 1336 and 1337 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1336 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government state in respect of the companies that have been referred to the Treasury for legal proceedings to enforce collection of arrears, how many have not been proceeded with because of the failure of the Treasury to grant approval with a breakdown by financial year since 1996/1997?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1333, 1335 and 1337 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO 1337 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government state in respect of the companies referred to the Treasury for approval to commence legal proceedings to collect arrears of revenue, what was the amount owed by those companies for which approval for legal action was not granted giving a breakdown by financial year since 1996/1997?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

With the Unified Collection System, arrears are no longer passed to the Central Arrears Unit. The Central Arrears Unit has access to the departmental databases and monitors all arrears. Follow-up action is taken and repayment agreements are entered into as far as possible.

The number of repayment agreements managed by the Central Arrears Unit is currently 429, covering debts amounting to £10,014,699.74.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1333 AND 1335 TO 1337 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably the change that the Chief Minister is talking about has happened subsequent to the last audited published accounts of the Government, because at that stage the Auditor still talks about them being passed to the Central Arrears Unit, unless it is that the Auditor does not know of the new arrangements.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, one or other of those two must be right. Either the Principal Auditor is using inaccurate language, or it started after that Report.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. Does he know which it is?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am just trying to remember when we introduced the unified collection system. It was on 1<sup>st</sup> January the year before.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The last accounts are the ones for the financial year 2001/2002, which were tabled in January this year. There it is still talking about passing it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it is just after that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the Treasury granting or withholding approval, what is the answer to Question No. 1334? The criteria that the Treasury uses.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Sorry, this question has not been included in the batch that I am answering. Has it? I see, it has been read out but it was not supposed to have been included. It is 1335 and 1336 and 1337. This question was done for a separate answer. Question No. 1334 was down for a separate and individual answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I have already asked it. Does the Chief Minister wish me to ask it again?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am happy just to deal with it now. Except for final winding-up action, where Government approval is required in view of the wider economic considerations, follow-up action is taken by the Treasury as far as possible. In other words, they enter into the arrears agreement, they monitor and manage the arrears agreement, if there is a failure to honour the arrears agreement the next step is proceedings to wind-up the company, because there is a view, it sometimes works and sometimes does not, that when one publicly threatens a company with liquidation, that might act as a spur. Of course in some cases it does not and we find ourselves sort of on the court's steps so to speak. Then it comes to me actually so that I can see how many jobs are there and then at stake. If, as sometimes is the case, it reaches that stage in respect of a company that there are many jobs at stake, we make a further effort to explain the gravity of the situation. In other words, there is a further effort, not at political level in the sense of political with a capital 'p', but my office might get involved in making direct contact with the company to see if one final attempt cannot be made to save the company. Not to save the company but really to save the jobs. That is really the routine.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So, in fact, when the Principal Auditor talks about the Treasury withholding permission, it is not really the Treasury at all then.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Treasury is not authorised to authorise the winding-up of companies when there are jobs at stake. That comes to No 6 Convent Place.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I understand that because he has just told me, but in fact the Principal Auditor in this year's Report and almost in every year's Report, constantly says that the effectiveness of the Central Arrears Unit is undermined because nobody takes them seriously, because when they try to take action against somebody that is not complying with what they have agreed to do in terms of payments, they request permission from the Treasury and the Treasury says no. Now, in fact what the Report says is in fact incorrect, the Treasury does not take the responsibility for deciding, it is referred to the Chief Minister's office and then depending on the impact on jobs, the answer is either yes or no.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I cannot say what happens before it gets to me, or what happens to cases that do not get to me. For example, I can tell the hon Member that recently in the last 10 days or so, I have seen a batch, all of which I have allowed through except one which involved a significant number of jobs, and that one has been subjected to the treatment that I have just described. So it is actually quite rare for them to come up to me and for the next step not to be allowed to go ahead. It has to be something with significant economic impact, five, six, seven, eight, ten jobs, that sort of thing. Most of them get approved, the bulk of them get approved, the vast majority of them get approved by my office when they come to us.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably by that stage most of them are either not doing very much or employing very little people.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is normally the case but from time to time, the odd one gets through where they resist, they resist, and they are still active, they are still trading and they are still employing, they are just not responding. Of course, it is a very careful balancing act that needs to be done, because whilst I am sure the hon Member would agree with me that it is worth going the extra mile to save the jobs, by the same token one has got to balance that with the need not to be unfair to competitors of that company who are paying their dues and who are competing with this company, paying their dues. So it is a tight-rope walk act and one does what one can but ultimately, if jobs have to go, jobs have to go because at the end of the day there is little point in retaining jobs

in companies that are simply unviable. If they do not fail now they are going to fail at some further stage down the road. So really it is an attempt to see whether the company is salvageable, and if the company is salvageable then we exercise patience, if it is not then we might as well pull out the rug sooner rather than later.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know whether we are in the process of answering Question No. 1335 or not, because I think that one was called out as well.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, Question No. 1335 has been covered.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not recall having been given the numbers referred in each year from 1<sup>st</sup> April to the Treasury for legal proceedings.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think that this is because there is no longer a referral. I think this is the point. The arrears are no longer passed, it all happens from within the Treasury. So the Treasury then makes the decision, or does not, to initiate proceedings. I think it is on that basis that the information has not been provided.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but since I am asking from 1<sup>st</sup> April 1996 and the system has changed since the last Audited Accounts of 2002, then presumably the answer to the question should have been up to 2002, when the system stopped.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will try and find out that information and will provide him with as much information as can be provided. I do not have it here.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of some of the other questions, they are in fact the supplementaries that would follow if the questions had been answered. So perhaps whoever looks at this question can look at the ones as to what happened to those companies that actually were sent by the Central Arrears Unit to the Treasury, which in fact the Auditor mentions. I am trying to establish what has been the pattern until 2003, when obviously now that there is a new system in place, we will see if that shows up as something else happening from what was happening previously.

**ORAL**

**NO 1338 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government state in respect of the companies referred to the Treasury for approval to commence legal proceedings to collect arrears of revenue, what was the amount owed by those companies for which approval for legal action was granted giving a breakdown by financial year since 1996/1997?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No companies are referred to the Treasury for approval to commence legal proceedings. The Central Arrears Unit monitors all arrears due to Government, enters into repayment agreements where possible, issues reminders, statutory demands, summonses and initiates legal proceedings when this is deemed necessary. That is the basis upon which this question, whoever has drafted these answers has done it on the basis that there is not actually a referral process, but they have not then gone on to provide the information from within so to speak, regardless of referrals.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1338 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

All I can say is that I find it peculiar that there is no referral process. I think the Chief Minister originally was telling me that there is no longer one but that there was one before. I do not know whether, this answer seems to be drafted on the basis that there has never been one. Well, if there has never been one it is most peculiar that the Principal Auditor has audited the accounts all these years thinking there was one in place and nobody has disabused him of that idea, because he mentions it every year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not an illogical supplementary. I will try and get to the bottom of it for him.

NO 1339 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government explain why according to the Principal Auditor there is an apparent unwillingness on the part of the Treasury to take the final step and proceed to wind up companies with a poor payments record and very substantial debts to Government?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The Government do not agree that there is any such reluctance. However, before this decision is taken, Government engage such companies in dialogue to see what scope exists to obtain payments of arrears, keep up to date with current payments and thus save the jobs at stake.

SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1339 OF 2004

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, what the Government are saying is that the Principal Auditor has perceived an apparent unwillingness on the part of the Treasury which (a) is non-existent, and (b) cannot exist because the Treasury have nothing to do with it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

In respect of the first part of the question that is the Treasury's view. In respect of the second part of the question, it is true that where there are jobs at stake, the final decision to press the button to take the final step to wind-up is not taken by the Treasury.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not sure whether there is a distinction being made or not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is not a distinction being made. I am just trying to put it in its correct form.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is to say, I can understand that when there are jobs at stake that is something that is evaluated in terms of is it better to close it down, or is it better not to close it down. That I understand, but is it that the companies that get passed for approval to the Chief Minister's office are those where it is known that there are jobs at stake, and if it is known that there are no jobs at stake the Treasury can take the decision? Or is it that they all go and the Treasury decides on none of them? I am not very sure which of the two it is.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know the answer to that myself. I only see the ones that I see. Now, amongst the ones that I see, they come up to me in a standard form with information on it, name of company, amount due, period of time outstanding, how far down the process towards liquidation it is, whether there is an arrears agreement, are there arrears of that agreement, are they up to date with their current or not. One of the question is number of employees. Now sometimes I have seen some with none. So it is not that only the ones with employees come to me, but I cannot be sure that all of them are coming to me. I only become aware of the ones that come to me, but I can tell the hon Member that sometimes they come up to me with no employees revealed on the form.

**NO 1340 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government state how many companies have been wound up in 2003 because of arrears of revenue owed to Government and can Government provide a breakdown of arrears in each case showing the amounts of PAYE, Social Insurance, general rates, company tax and other arrears?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Eleven companies were wound up during 2003. A full breakdown of arrears is not readily available. I can give the hon Member the arrears relating to corporation tax, Social Insurance and PAYE.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1340 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I note that quite a lot of them have got nil Social Insurance and PAYE, which is rather surprising. Is it that these companies would have been not trading for some time, because otherwise if they had been trading near the time of liquidation it is surprising that they should not have debts in that area?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is the information, how we interpret it is a matter for speculation. This is the amount of debt that was available at the time that the answer was drafted that could be put together. Yes, they are not necessarily trading companies although I recognise some that were. A company can have liability to corporation tax without having liability to PAYE. It may not have many employees.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept that, but given that presumably these people were on the list that he saw at some stage before this happened.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No this was before the event I think.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given the information he gave us earlier, that the trigger was that he saw this list, presumably he must have seen them on another list before they got to this list.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I am saying is, it would suggest that maybe they had actually stopped trading some time back and that the corporation tax could be quite old that they owed. Would that be?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it suggests that amongst other possibilities. I just do not want to say 'yes what he is speculating is right', because I do not know, but it certainly suggests that as a possible explanation for this.

**NO 1341 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government explain why by mid June 2002 no further action was being taken to collect arrears by the CAU from the company identified by the Principal Auditor which had failed to honour an arrears agreement signed on the 24 April 2001 and which by that date owed £139,176, excluding social insurance contributions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I suspect the company is not the one which the hon Member suspects. It is not appropriate for Government to disclose the identity or other information in respect of individual companies. I am willing to give the name of the company to the hon Member privately. Publicly I am willing to tell him that it is a computer company.

The repayment agreement covered £141,000 and the first instalment that was paid was £1,500. Only £3,284 was recovered from the company.

Winding up action on the company was deferred by the Accountant General on receiving knowledge that the company had ceased trading and had no assets. Follow-up action commenced against the director personally for unpaid PAYE debts amounting to £66,000. £39,000 of Social Insurance contribution debt was included in the interim repayment agreement entered into with this company on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2001. The amount due by the company on June 2002 was £80,978, and on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2003, the date the company was wound up, it was £81,828. All contributions assessed amounting to £71,930 have been credited to the employees' Social Insurance records, except for the director of the company. The number of employees, all British, were as follows:

|                                                            |   |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| As at 31 December 2001                                     | 5 |
| As at 31 December 2002                                     | 1 |
| As at the date of winding up (11 <sup>th</sup> April 2003) | 1 |

The company ceased trading in early 2002. However, action did continue by the Central Arrears Unit and the company was finally wound up on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2003.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1328 TO 1332 AND 1341 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In not mentioning the name of the company, if the company has been wound up for failure to pay Government debts, does the name of the company not appear Gazetted in the winding-up?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, but the Government have not yet made a policy decision on any naming and shaming policy. It is one of the options under consideration and we think it would be unfair to subject this one to treatment to which we have not subjected other companies. Yes, he can go to the Gazette of April 2003 and see which was the company which was wound-up by the Accountant General. I am not asking him to do that, I am going to give him the name as soon as we step outside into the ante-room.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given the fact that the Principal Auditor actually mentions this company two years running in the Audited Accounts of the Government, can the Government explain how it is that the explanation that is given today was not provided to the Principal Auditor? Because reading the audited accounts, one gets the impression that the Principal Auditor is saying 'well look, nothing is being done to collect the money from this company and nothing is happening', and there is no indication in the 2002 Report that it was not still trading. It just says the Accountant General says do not do it, without any reason being given. I find it strange that the explanation which has been given here, which is obviously that there was no point in closing it down at that time because it was not trading anyway and had no assets anyway, was not provided to the Principal Auditor.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether it was or it was not, but in any case the flow of information and exchange of correspondence between the Accountant General and the Principal Auditor is a matter for them. We neither get to hear of the Principal Auditor's enquiries nor are we party to the formulation of any response. I cannot imagine that the Accountant General did not provide information which was available to him. It may be that the research was not done to provide him with the answer as it has been done to provide me with this answer. I would be surprised. I have not read, I cannot recollect the part of the Report to which he is replying, so I do not know whether the Principal Auditor uses language which makes clear that no explanation was given to him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I can tell the Chief Minister that the language is the language that is reflected in the questions, which said that nothing was done, and nothing is still being done and the action that was being taken was stopped by the Accountant General. I appreciate that he is not directly involved in that because that is what I used to say to him when

he used to ask me questions about what went on between the Principal Auditor and the Accountant General.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just for clarification, it may be that the Chief Minister does not have the information, but was it the same petition that was finally seen through to wind it up?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know, I assume so but I do not know.

**ORAL**

**NO 1342 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Of the £4.2 million of arrears owed by companies where action was still pending by the CAU as at the 31 March 2002, can Government state the number of companies affected and in respect of how many of these action had been taken by 31 March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The £4.2 million of arrears referred to by the Principal Auditor is in respect of social insurance arrears as at 31 December 2002 and not 31 March 2002. Details of the number of companies is not readily available although follow-up action by the Central Arrears Unit in the form of the issue of reminders, statutory demands and summonses has been initiated on all amounts due. A breakdown in respect of the action taken by 31 March 2003 is not readily available. This more or less confirms what we had speculated might be the position earlier on. In other words, that they had been pursued but that they just cannot put together the information as to which action has been taken in respect of which company, in this sort of timescale.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1342 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer is that action has been taken in respect of all of them. Is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Some stage of the process has been initiated in respect of all the amounts due.

ORAL

NO 1343 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government state how many of the 90 companies wound-up between May 1997 and March 2002 were trading when winding up proceedings were instituted and what was the total number of employees in these companies, giving a breakdown by nationality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 1344 of 2004.

**NO 1344 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the 90 companies wound-up between May 1997 and March 2002 showing the amounts owed by each for PAYE and social insurance and in respect of each the number of employees such payments had been deducted from?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Frankly, as each of these have been wound-up and the fact of the winding-up has been Gazetted, presumably, I see no reason why the House should not have information in respect of them. Theoretically it ought to be possible for them to cobble this information together just by searching all the Gazettes. So, at least in so far as the name of the company, the winding-up date, the amount of PAYE and social insurance, which is the information that is on the schedule, that information has been passed to him. None of the 90 companies were trading at the time they were dissolved. It seems to me that there is a part of this question that is not being answered, and that is in respect of each, the number of employees such payments had been deducted. Unless the officials thought that the answer is nil because as none were trading they did not have any employees, but that is probably not what the hon Member is asking. He is asking in respect of the arrears how many employees were affected by the arrears. That actually would be a very difficult exercise. It would be possible but it would be a very difficult exercise going back. In any event, I understand the policy is to credit, except where the person is culpable I understand these things are credited.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1343 AND 1344 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the last point I imagine if they are credited it must be a provision that is in the Social Insurance Ordinance, or in the Regulations under the Ordinance, because there certainly does not appear a payment from the Government to the Insurance Fund in respect of insurance not collected. So it must be that the rights are preserved in some way.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I presume so, because there is no payment. That is certainly true.



**NO 1345 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CENTRAL ARREARS UNIT**

Can Government state of the companies owing £4.2 million at the 31 March 2002 in respect of which action by the Central Arrears Unit was still pending how many were trading at the time and what was the number of employees in these companies, giving a breakdown by nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am advised that this information is not readily available to the Central Arrears Unit.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1345 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When action is pending by the Central Arrears Unit, which is what the Auditor's Report says, that is the people who have not got agreements, the people who are not paying and the people against whom action is not being taken, what exactly is it that is pending that is stopping anything being done?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

My interpretation of the answer is that there is an arrears situation and internally within the Treasury there is a system or a process by which they get tackled, but at that point and until they start tackling them and investigating them as part of that process, they do not have available to them information as to whether they are trading and the number of employees that they have, with breakdown by nationality. Obviously the Central Arrears Unit knows which are the companies and how much they owe, but that is not the essence of the question. The essence of the question is in respect of those companies, how many were trading and what were the number of employees of these companies, and the Central Arrears Unit is saying that they do not have that information, which I presume at some stage they must get, because by the time the paper reaches me, the paper which I described yesterday, it has that information on it. So that information must be compiled from various sources within the Government, as during the course of processing by the Central Arrears Unit. My interpretation of this answer is that whilst they are pending, in other words they have not been tackled yet, that information is not yet available to them. They start

obtaining that information once they pick up the files so to speak, and start processing that particular company for its arrears.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that what I am quoting is the 2001/2002 Auditor's Report on the Government Accounts, is it that we are being told that of the companies that were pending on 31 March 2002, because I am not asking about the ones that are pending now, I am asking about the ones that were pending two years ago, that they are still pending and that nothing has happened in respect of these companies in the last two years?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him the answer to that but it does not follow from the answer that I have given that that is the case, because of course if they have tackled some but not others, in order to answer the question they would have to go back to the £4.2 million as at March 2002, break it down into each constituent company and see which have been progressed and which have not been progressed. The fact that they are not in a position to give the information in relation to the companies that were pending at £4.2 million does not, as I read the situation, necessarily mean that none of them have been tackled, but I do not want him to misunderstand my answer. Nor am I in a position to tell him with the information that I have in front of me that any of them have been tackled. I just do not have that information here.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably, if some of them have been tackled it would not be all that difficult for the Treasury or the Central Arrears Unit to know which they have tackled. The impression given by the Auditor's Report, when he looks at the procedure that is being followed, and it may no longer be the procedure that exists because I think when he answered the previous questions he said something else was now happening. This is a reference to the situation that existed where there were cases where agreements had been entered, there were cases where action was being taken and there were cases, as it were, in the in-tray waiting to be tackled. I have quoted the case in the in-tray in March 2002. If any had been taken out of that tray and put in the other one, I would not have thought it difficult to know which one it is. Therefore it might be that they might not have been able to give me, for the reasons he has given in respect of all of them, but I would have thought it would have been possible to give an answer in respect of those which have now been moved from the pending list.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It must be possible to give the information in respect of those that have been processed, and some must have been processed because the Central Arrears Unit has remained active throughout these years. This is their working progress so to speak, it is not as if they had been disbanded or anything, so it is hugely improbable, though I dare not commit myself, it is hugely improbable that they have not processed any of these since then, but I cannot now give him a breakdown. Presumably, in respect of the ones that have been dealt with since then, the

information is available, but it has not been provided because it is not available in respect of the whole of the £4.2 million which is what the question asked.

ORAL

**NO 1346 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS PENSION FUND**

Can Government state what was the balance in the Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Pension Fund on the 31 March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Ltd does not have its own pension fund.

A total of 36 employees of Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Ltd are members of the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 1) Pension Scheme. The value of the combined pension fund moneys in respect of these employees, as at 31 March 2003, stood at £1,256,843.11.

In addition, 34 members of Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Ltd employees have pension rights values, in respect of their previous service with the Government, held in a Gibraltar Savings Bank account earning interest at 8 per cent per annum. The total value of these pensions funds, as at 31 March 2003, stood at £389,023.95.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1346 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the No. 1 Pension Fund providing a pension for employees of any other company or is this the only one?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot answer that question with any certainty without notice, but I believe there may be one or two other ex-GSL type people on special terms. They were not the only members of this Fund when it was set up. Whether there are still any left in it I cannot tell him, but it was not set up just for them.

**NO 1347 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS COMPANY LTD**

Can Government say how many Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Co Ltd employees have retired with a right to a pension, giving the year of retirement and what arrangements are in place for the payments of such pensions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of eight employees have retired with pension rights for their service in Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Company Limited as follows:

|      |   |          |
|------|---|----------|
| 1997 | - | 1        |
| 1998 | - | 2        |
| 2000 | - | 1        |
| 2002 | - | 1        |
| 2003 | - | <u>3</u> |
|      |   | <u>8</u> |

Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Company Limited employees are covered by the Gibraltar Provident Fund (No. 1) defined contribution pension scheme. Under this scheme, employees are entitled to receive up to 25 per cent of their accumulated fund as a tax-free gratuity, and to the purchase of an annuity with the remaining 75 per cent, or in certain cases (depending on the size of the accumulated fund) an employee may receive the full accumulated fund in cash. Interest on the accumulated fund attracts interest at 8 per cent per annum from the Gibraltar Savings Bank.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1347 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The arrangements that are in place for the payment of the annuity, has that actually been triggered in respect of any of these eight employees, beginning with the one that started in 1997?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Does the hon Member mean the new arrangements that we are about to make or the historical arrangements?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The ones that were in existence. Have any of these pensioners since 1997 been able to buy an annuity?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. It has only become difficult, now I believe impossible, to buy an annuity in Gibraltar relatively recently in the last year or so, when the last of the UK insurance companies that used to sell annuities to people resident in Gibraltar pulled out on the basis that they were re-trenching to their domestic market in the UK only for annuities. That is why the Government have now arranged for the Gibraltar Savings Bank to become a pensions annuity provider. If the hon Member is intending to ask whether any of those eight employees purchased annuities with their retirement proceeds, the answer is yes. Three have purchased an annuity, one received the accumulated funds in cash and four are awaiting the purchase of an annuity when the Savings Bank publishes its rules, which is imminent.

**NO 1348 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS – PENSIONS**

Can Government state what are the improvements in the pension entitlement of employees of Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners arising from the transfer of the pension scheme to the Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund No 2 Scheme Sub-fund?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Members of the Gibraltar Provident Fund (No. 1) Scheme (which include employees of Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners) who transfer to the Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund (No. 2) Scheme, are able to retain any conditions that are more favourable to them under the Gibraltar Provident Fund (No. 1) Scheme on a personal-to-holder basis.

In addition, they will be able to take advantage of some improved benefits under the Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund (No. 2) Scheme, for example:

- 1) The possibility of a pension draw down from their accumulated fund.
- 2) The possibility of making additional contributions to the scheme; and
- 3) Continued pension benefits payable to dependants.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1348 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Chief Minister explain exactly what a pension draw down means? I thought the pension was payable when they reach pensionable age and not before.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are provisions in the No. 2 Scheme for pension draw down in certain circumstances.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Like illness?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, because remember these are personal funds. Unless and until one buys an annuity, externally, one of the advantages of the Government's new annuity scheme is that it actually protects the capital in the ownership of the pension and its dependents. The hon Member knows that when one buys an annuity in the market place, one gets 75 per cent of ones pension capital rights and one goes and buys an annuity. So in exchange for paying some company £200,000 or £300,000 or whatever it is, they pay one for life an annual sum, hence the word annuity, of x thousand pounds a year. But if one dies the next day, one loses the capital. The Government have devised a scheme whereby the sum of the annuity is the income from the sum, but the sum remains, so that any capital left on the death of the annuitant, so to speak, remains part of the estate of the deceased and is not forfeited to the pension company. In other words, there is no life and death lottery so to speak any more. That is one of the advantages of the new annuity scheme that the Government are going to make available through the Savings Bank. In the context of that, under an actuarial table that is being produced, one is allowed to draw down apart from the income of the fund, a certain percentage of the capital amount of the sum per annum, but this would be under the annuity rules. So for example, if somebody is very ill and still has their capital in tact, they might say 'well, look it is all very well to say my family is going to inherit it, but I would like a bit of extra whilst I am still alive and kicking', and there is a formula by which the older one gets, in other words the nearer death one gets the less capital one theoretically needs, and therefore a small number of percentage points of ones capital is drawn down in addition to the income every year. All this will become clear to the hon Member when the details of that are published, as they will be.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

These are all related to the annuity scheme. That is to say, there is nothing to stop, given that the annuity scheme is going to be available to others, there is nothing to stop anybody else, without being in the No. 2 Pension Fund, accessing it. Is it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is for the whole of Gibraltar, because our Income Tax legislation sensibly requires at least 75 per cent of ones pension fund to be spent on an annuity, and the reason for that is that it is to protect people from blowing their pension fund and then having nothing to live on in their retirement. The problem is that it is now not possible to buy an annuity in Gibraltar, so this is not just for this, this is for everybody in Gibraltar to buy themselves an annuity. That is everybody on a money purchase pension scheme. Obviously it does not apply to people on final salary pension schemes.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I acknowledge that. The point that I am making is that this in fact is not something that people are gaining by virtue of moving from the No. 1 to the No. 2 Pension Scheme, because anybody in Gibraltar would be able to access it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I see, that is his question, I thought I had answered that part of his question much earlier. There are some provisions in the No. 2 Scheme, I am advised, which are not present in the No. 1 Scheme, dealing with the possibility of draw down from the accumulated fund in certain circumstances. With notice of the question I could have found the provision and given him details of it but on my feet I suspect it is not going to jump out at me from the page. I will write to the hon Member and let him know which is that provision in the Pension No. 2 that does not exist in the Pension No. 1. I have got the document here in front of me but I cannot take the House's time just to scan through it. Yes, I can see there is a heading in the No. 2 Scheme benefits payment prior to retirement. I can see that there is a provision here about the transfer of the scheme fund to another permitted or approved scheme, which I think is new and is not there. I would rather give him the answer authoritatively.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just point out, that that is in fact what the original question was asking. That is, the benefits arising from the transfer to the No. 2 Scheme, not the benefits arising out of being able to purchase an annuity from the Savings Bank. I am grateful for that information but that is not what the original question asked.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have given him the three differences.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But the differences that he has given me are the differences that exist in the provision of the annuities by the Government.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. My first answer is the answer to his question. In other words, the benefits of the No. 2 Scheme over the No. 1 Scheme is (1) the possibility of making a pension draw down from accumulated funds. The hon Member has just asked me for details and I have told him I will give him details of that first item. (2) The possibility of making additional contributions to the scheme; and (3) continued pension benefits payable to dependants. Those are three advantages of the No. 2 Scheme over the No. 1 Scheme. Nothing to do with the annuities issue.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But he has also said, and I am identifying that as advantage No. 1 and advantage No. 3, which is that the people who join the scheme from wherever they join it, will be able to draw down some of their accumulated fund. I do not know whether we are using the word 'draw down' in two different circumstances to mean two different things, but if the draw down that is in the No. 2 Scheme is the draw down that is in the annuity, then anybody that buys the annuity will have that advantage, without being in the No. 2 Scheme. If the other advantage is that the capital that survives the death of the annuitant goes to the survivor's estate, that advantage is also available to everybody that buys an annuity, even if they are not in the No. Pension Scheme.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, perhaps I should not have given him so many, or perhaps any details about the annuity scheme. It is a bit of a red herring. There is a Pension No. 1 Scheme and a No. 2 Scheme and the hon Member asked me 'how is one better off transferring from one to the other?'. The first thing I said to him, well any advantages in the No. 1 one keeps. In addition, there are three, and these are the advantages of transferring therefore, there are three. The possibility of making a pension draw down from accumulated funds, the possibility of making additional contributions to the scheme and the continued pension benefit payable to dependants. That is in relation to the No. 1 and the No. 2, nothing to do with the annuity scheme. If the hon Member says 'are those advantages available to anyone from wherever they come who joins the No. 2 Scheme?' the answer is yes, as a matter of No. 2 Scheme rules.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I am saying is, for somebody who is not in the No. 2, wherever they come from, buys an annuity with the 75 per cent, is it not the case that buying an annuity produces the advantage of the draw down and the advantage of the survivor estate getting the accumulated fund, because that is what he told me would be available to everybody in the annuity.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, but that as part of the rules of the annuity scheme, not of the No. 2. Remember the Provident No. 2 Scheme, the principal issue of the rules is the rules whilst one is still at work, there are contribution rules and then there are benefit rules. Whereas the annuity scheme being set up by the Savings Bank, only applies once people have retired and have their pension entitlement in hand so to speak, and are walking around with a lump sum worth 75 per cent of their cashed in pension, saying 'who will sell me an annuity?'. At that stage the Savings Bank Scheme will come into force. At this stage they are still pensioners.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Of the three advantages that he has spoken, the one for example on the balance of the amount in accumulated capital going to the survivor, will not be when the man is working and it will not even be when he is going round saying 'here is my 75 per

cent', it is happening when he has gone to North Front, that is when that comes into play. So that is advantage number three, the survivor getting the cash.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, that is part of the No. 2 Scheme rules, and No. 1 for that matter.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So that is not a difference between the two?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I have not.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, he has. He has told me that that is one of the advantages from moving from No. 1 to No. 2.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have indeed. Continued benefits payable, let me just. Well, the truth is that if the hon Member wants a detailed answer about the rules of the Schemes, he has got to give me notice of the questions. I mean, they are just listed here by the Treasury.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The notice of the question is that I would like to see what the advantages are in the No. 2 Scheme compared to No. 1. If it is something that is more complicated than in the answer that he has given me, and he puts it to me in writing, I would be grateful. On the basis of what he has told me, my interpretation of what he has said is that there are three advantages, two of which would be there from the purchase of the annuity from the Savings Bank even if they were not there in the rules, but I will read what he has to tell me and come back with another question in the future.

**ORAL**

**NO 1349 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government state what was the average rate of interest earned by the Savings Bank's deposits with the Gibraltar Banks in the financial year 2001/2002, the total amount of such deposits and the amount of interest received?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1350 of 2004.

**NO 1350 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government state what was the average rate of interest earned by the Savings Bank's deposits with the Gibraltar Banks in the financial year 2002/2003, the total amount of such deposits and the amount of interest received?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In order to establish a meaningful average rate of interest earned on deposits held in Gibraltar banks by the Gibraltar Savings Bank, the return would have to be both money-weighted and time-weighted – ideally on a daily basis.

These statistics are not readily available by the Treasury.

However, I hand over a statement showing end-of-month Gibraltar Savings Bank deposits in Gibraltar Banks and the interest earned during each month for the financial years 2001/2002 and 2002/2003. Gross average can then be worked out by division by him.

**ANSWER – APPENDIX TO Q 1350****INTEREST EARNED BY THE GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS WITH GIBRALTAR BANKS**

| <b>2001/2002</b> | <b>END OF MONTH DEPOSITS</b> | <b>INTEREST EARNED</b> |
|------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 30/04/01         | £34,000,344.87               | £143,090.45            |
| 30/05/01         | £33,186,256.04               | £133,446.85            |
| 30/06/01         | £22,103,191.46               | £124,908.98            |
| 30/07/01         | £21,816,254.17               | £98,926.19             |
| 29/08/01         | £22,729,703.32               | £85,158.23             |
| 30/09/01         | £21,019,535.30               | £85,054.96             |
| 30/10/01         | £20,056,406.04               | £84,486.55             |
| 30/11/01         | £19,860,322.03               | £60,003.61             |
| 28/12/01         | £15,859,835.58               | £49,898.25             |
| 28/01/02         | £15,996,448.59               | £51,149.61             |
| 28/02/02         | £16,119,306.74               | £45,702.22             |
| 28/03/02         | £29,024,221.87               | £44,185.06             |

| <b>2002/2003</b> | <b>END OF MONTH DEPOSITS</b> | <b>INTEREST EARNED</b> |
|------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 30/04/02         | £26,364,808.85               | £77,990.23             |
| 30/05/02         | £24,162,435.14               | £78,222.68             |
| 30/06/02         | £21,202,263.24               | £62,799.10             |
| 30/07/02         | £22,882,733.66               | £71,501.60             |
| 29/08/02         | £24,338,684.55               | £62,564.73             |
| 30/09/02         | £20,897,100.40               | £79,076.20             |
| 30/10/02         | £17,594,104.85               | £60,336.22             |
| 30/11/02         | £16,007,639.53               | £49,006.87             |
| 31/12/02         | £9,186,595.48                | £37,330.70             |
| 31/01/03         | £18,850,235.56               | £47,838.80             |
| 28/02/03         | £21,520,220.34               | £52,749.16             |
| 31/03/03         | £24,256,336.05               | £60,117.69             |

**NO 1351 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

As at the end of December 2003, what was the value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The value of the Monthly Income Debentures and the Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures as at 31 December 2003 is as follows:

|                                      |             |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Monthly Income Debentures            | £23,241,700 |
| Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures | £53,503,200 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1351 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Chief Minister have readily available the end of March figure, or is that not something that has been given to him?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it is jotted down here under the heading 'Supplementary'. Monthly Income Debentures £24,612,000. Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures £57,737,100.

**NO 1352 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SECURITY GUARDS**

Can Government state how many security guards were employed through the use of contracted services in the financial year 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 and the period of their employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Government employed a total of 22 security guards for the financial year 2002/2003 and 20 for the financial year 2003/2004 through the use of contracted services.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1352 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does that imply that they were employed for the whole of the 12 months? The question of the period of their employment was in case that employment was intermittent in those financial years.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, my only doubt is about when the arrangements commenced. I mean some of them are permanent. For example, he knows that the arrangements for the security guards at No. 6 has been a contracted service for many years and that arrangement has been going on for years. There are other areas of Government where the contract is either for one year or for two years. Also they have different expiry dates. So they are not all.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The reference in the original question to the period of employment, was in case there was a situation where the contract was people coming in for a few months to do a particular security job and then not carrying on. That is not the case?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

From time to time it has happened. For example, at one point security arrangements were put up at one of the Homes, and it is still in place, but that is not necessarily intended as a permanent arrangement. When it will cease to be the case I do not know, but all of these are by contracts for one or two years, which suggests it is not the sort of on and off temporary arrangements that he has described.

**NO 1353 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**RECURRENT REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE**

Can Government state what was the recurrent Government revenue and expenditure as defined in the notes to the audited accounts for the financial year 2002/2003 and give a breakdown?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Either the answerer or the questioner has made a mistake here. The annual accounts for the year 2002/2003 are still being audited. On my feet now I have just thought that he might have meant 2001/2002.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1353 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I meant was that could the Government give the Government Recurrent Revenue and Expenditure as it is defined in the notes to the Audited Accounts. There is a definition of Government Revenue and Expenditure which goes beyond the Consolidated Fund.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government publish annually, and have just in fact laid in this House, the Forecast Outturn Revenue and Expenditure for the year 2003/2004, and the actual figure for the year 2002/2003. That is the format in which the information is laid in this House. If the hon Member is saying that the classification is different in the Audited Accounts and can he have that?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I am saying is, that Government Recurrent Revenue and Government Recurrent Expenditure, in notes 2 and 3 of the 2001/2002 Accounts and in preceding years, is defined differently from being limited to expenditure from the Consolidated Fund only. The final figures for that are not obviously in the Expenditure Estimates

laid before the House because that is only Consolidated Fund, which is what we have to vote.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the hon Member is asking me to give him an advance publication of accounts, which by statute have got to be produced by the Accountant General and then submitted to the Principal Auditor, and then laid before this House in accordance with the terms of legislation and the Constitution, I do not think it is appropriate for him to do that. The Government give as much information as they can but honestly, there comes a time when the hon Member is just, through the mechanism of question time, trying to bring forward by 12 months the production of the Government's Accounts. I do not think that is a reasonable expectation to have of the Government in terms of providing information. I have no difficulty giving him, there is a period of time between the Accountant General signing off the accounts and the Principal Auditor auditing them. I can consult the Principal Auditor and the Accountant General, if they cannot think of any reason why we should not, I do not mind giving him a confidential copy, without prejudice obviously, subject to audit, of the accounts at that stage. That is not asking me to advance the production. That is asking me just to give them to him as soon as they are available rather than waiting until they have been audited. That is a different matter.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The question is not in fact seeking, perhaps I should have been more specific in drafting the question, but it is not seeking an advance copy of the entire book. The final figures for 2002/2003, as the Chief Minister has correctly said, is already in the book that has been tabled in the House today and on a confidential basis in advance of the budget debate, but in notes 2 and 3 of the Audited Accounts what it does is, it produces a different definition of recurrent expenditure and recurrent revenue, which adjusts for movements between the Health Authority, the Savings Bank, the Development Corporation and the Consolidated Fund. All that is an additional three lines to the information that is already available. That information, of course, is not necessarily something that is produced for the Auditor, because the Auditor does not have to actually audit the Health Authority or the Development Corporation, although I think he audits the Savings Bank, but it is something that the Auditor includes in the report, in the same way let me say that the Government do when they produce the tables after we have approved the Estimates. This information is in fact included in the Approved Estimates of Expenditure but not in the Draft Estimates of Expenditure.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I say, I do not think that this is information which the hon Member is entitled in accordance with the Government's obligation to provide factual information to the House at Question Time, but I repeat, I have no difficulty, in fact I have here an advance copy of the Accountant General's report on the accounts for the year March 2003 which contains the notes that he is referring to. So the information now exists, if required to be produced in an accelerated fashion, simply to make it available for him sooner than the system normally produces it, the answer would have been no. I said to him before that if the information is available, and Treasury and the Principal Auditor cannot think of a good reason why we should not advance, in effect I am putting information in the public domain before the Auditor has had a chance to audit

it. Now, I cannot personally, I will not give it to him until after I have consulted the Principal Auditor and the Accountant General to see if there is any reason why that should not happen. If they confirm it, I will send it to him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am grateful for that. It is just that I am pointing out is that what I am asking for is less than that. That is the whole point. All I am asking for is these two pages which do not include anything other than three lines compared to the Estimates he has already tabled. That is to say, of these two pages only the bit at the bottom is not included.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I understand what he is saying, but in the Estimates booklet it is described as Forecast Outturn. In the papers that he is asking me for, it no longer qualifies as being forecast outturn. It is now described as being the signed off figure. So in other words, there is no longer any possibility of coming back and saying 'well the figure has been revised or has been modified'. So before publishing figures that the Accountant General has in effect signed off, but before they have been audited by the Principal Auditor, I just want to check with them that there is no good reason why I should not give the information at this stage to the hon Member. If they confirm that there is no good reason I will send it to him. If they think that there is a good reason, I will explain that reason to him as well.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

All I am doing is, in case they say there is a good reason, can I just say that I do not mind if what I get is the forecast outturn. It is just that at the moment in the Estimates as they are presented, we have got three quarters as forecast outturn and that after we have approved it, in fact, the Government then publish it with the missing quarter. That is the whole point. As forecast outturn.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand. All the less reason why they should have objections. In other words, if the hon Member is willing to accept the information still on the basis that it is not closed, that presumably would address any concerns, but I will come back to him.

ORAL

**NO 1354 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT COMPANIES – CASH RESERVES**

Can Government state whether the Government company cash reserves shown in the audited accounts, as part of Government's general revenue reserve as at 31 March 2002, are based on the actual cash position on that date of each company, or on the cash balances shown in each company's latest available audited accounts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1355 to 1358 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1355 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GOVERNMENT COMPANIES – CASH RESERVES**

Can Government give a breakdown of the Government companies that make up the £4 million of Government revenue reserve at the 31 March 1999, showing the cash available to Government in each such company?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1354 and 1356 to 1358 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1356 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT COMPANIES – CASH RESERVES**

Can Government give a breakdown of the Government companies that make up the £1.1 million of Government revenue reserve at the 31 March 2000, showing the cash available to Government in each such company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1354, 1355, 1357 and 1358 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1357 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT COMPANIES – CASH RESERVES**

Can Government give a breakdown of the Government companies that make up the £6.3 million of Government revenue reserve at the 31 March 2001, showing the cash available to Government in each such company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1354 to 1356 and 1358 of 2004.



**NO 1358 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****GOVERNMENT COMPANIES – CASH RESERVES**

Can Government give a breakdown of the Government companies that make up the £5.4 million of Government revenue reserve at the 31 March 2002, showing the cash available to Government in each such company?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government-owned Company balances shown as part of the end-of-year Government Reserves are based on the actual cash in hand at the end of the financial year. A breakdown of the cash balances held by companies is as follows:

|                                    | <b>£'M<br/>Y/E</b> | <b>£'M<br/>Y/E</b> | <b>£'M<br/>Y/E</b> | <b>£'M<br/>Y/E</b> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                                    | 31/03/99           | 31/03/00           | 31/03/01           | 31/03/02           |
| Gibraltar Land Holdings            | 0.1                | -                  | 0.1                | 0.2                |
| GRP Investments Company Ltd        | 0.2                | -                  | 0.1                | -                  |
| Gibraltar Commercial Company Ltd   | 0.2                | 0.1                | 0.2                | 0.6                |
| Gibraltar Co-Ownership Company Ltd | 1.8                | 0.2                | 4.7                | 2.7                |
| Brympton Co-Ownership Company Ltd  | 0.1                | -                  | -                  | 0.1                |
| Gibraltar Information Bureau       | 0.3                | 0.3                | 0.3                | 0.3                |
| Gibraltar Shiprepair Ltd           | 0.2                | 0.5                | 0.8                | 0.8                |
| Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners      | 0.3                | -                  | -                  | -                  |
|                                    | <b>4.0</b>         | <b>1.1</b>         | <b>6.3</b>         | <b>5.4</b>         |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1354 TO 1358 OF 2004****HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of how the figure is arrived at in respect of each company, it is the end of the Government's financial year not the end of the company's year, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Assuming that there is a difference between the two, yes. In other words, I just cannot remember what is the financial year end of these companies, whether it is March or December.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think quite a lot of them were December.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, in that case, yes. What is the figure that the companies hold on the last day of the Government's financial year, it is at 31 March, which may or may not be the company's own financial year end as well.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That figure constitutes what the cash deposits that they have in this investment account in the Gibraltar Savings Bank, or would it be other cash holdings?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is all in cash, as a matter of Treasury management I do not know whether all of these companies have all of their cash balances in the Savings Bank, or whether they have them elsewhere, but it is all cash. If by other portfolios he meant other sorts of investments, the answer is no. If he meant cash deposits at an entity other than the Savings Bank, possibly, some of these may be held on deposit accounts through the Government, I do not know what the cash holding arrangements are.

**NO 1359 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – EUROPORT BUILDING**

Can Government state what effect, if any, do increases in base rates have on the £3 million annual payment to the Royal Bank of Scotland by the GHA, in respect of the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

None.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1359 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If there are variations in the contract being conducted in building the conversion, is that something that is reflected in the agreement between the Government and the Bank?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Sorry, I do not follow the question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think when we originally told about the agreement, presumably it was based on the amount of money that the Bank was providing for the conversion that was taken on at the time. If there are or have been subsequent changes in the work that was required would that be reflected in that agreement or is the agreement for a fixed sum and that is it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the hon Member will recall when we had a lengthy discussion on this issue at the time in the House, that I explained to him that we had fixed the rate of interest under

a swap arrangement. So, the rate of interest is fixed for the whole period of the arrangement, twenty odd years, and in fact that swap contract is now quite valuable, because interest rates have risen. I think we are more than £1 million up on the capital value of that swap. Obviously it is not worth cashing it in because then one would have re-finance at higher rates of interest, but it does show the value of fixing under a swap, particularly when interest rates were low and really could only go in one direction long term. Now, the arrangement has been repeated in respect of the increased costs of the project.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably the repeated agreements will have reflected what the interest rate was at the time that that was done, it would not have been at the original one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It was struck at a very slightly higher rate. I think the market had moved perhaps up to half a per cent.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the swap arrangement for the whole of the life of the financing period?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, not only is it for the whole of the life but of course, remember that I also explained to him that there were exit provisions.

**NO 1360 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE**

Can the Government now state what has been the estimated receipt of revenue in the current financial year to the 31st December 2003 by head of revenue?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Either we are misunderstanding the same terminology or there is an error here as well. The estimated revenue for the full year ended 31 March 2004 is contained in the Estimates book Tabled in the House at the start of this meeting. Government have not produced the figures for the nine months to 31<sup>st</sup> December.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1360 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In January I asked for the figure for December and the answer that I got in January was that I would be provided that figure at the time that the Estimates were produced. In previous years, when I have asked for the figures for nine months, I have been given the figure for nine months, which is an estimated figure of revenue and expenditure for a nine month period. Since I was told that I was going to be given it at this meeting, I am asking for it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not remember what he was told last time. He now has more than the estimated, of course he has the forecast outturn figure, which is better than an estimate. He now has the forecast outturn figure for the 12 months to March. It would not make sense to speak of the estimated figure to December. He could say the forecast outturn to December but the figure to December is no longer the subject of an estimate, it is now at worst a forecast outturn. I would have hoped by now more than that. By now the figure to December should be pretty certain. If the hon Member is particularly interested in having, I mean amending his question to read forecast outturn instead of estimated, I am sure they can be produced for him. The Treasury has these things on computer and they can, of course the Treasury figure is on a

cash basis. In other words, any PV's that have not come through up to that date would not be included in the figure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is in fact why it would still be an estimate.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it would not be an estimate now.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When I asked for the original information in January, that is what I asked for and that is what I was told would be given to me at a later stage. I think the significance of the December cut off is that that tends to be what then determines the forecast.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct. We start preparing the Draft Estimates long before the end of March and therefore the forecast figure is struck on the basis of the December figure, otherwise we would have to wait until the end of March to start even preparing the Estimates booklet. It would not be an estimate by now, we are now in May. The figure for December might have been subject to fluctuation if one asks in January, because there are still things coming through, but by May the following year it cannot any longer be an estimate. The figure for March might be an estimate. In other words, things in respect of March might still be coming through in April but things in respect of November/December would not still be coming through the system in May. So whatever the figure is available that the machine produces, being the figure as at December, by now, by 7<sup>th</sup> May I would expect it to be more accurate. The hon Member now has the Estimates, is that not sufficient for his purposes?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I now have the Estimates and the forecast outturn. I am asking for it because I was told in January that I could have that information now.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the hon Member continues to want it, I will get it for him. The question that I am asking him is, given that the time that has passed whether it is still of any value to him, because it takes some work to produce.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, it is Okay.

**ORAL**

**NO 1361 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE**

Can the Government now state what has been the estimated expenditure from the Consolidated Fund in the current financial year to the 31st December 2003 by head of expenditure?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The estimated expenditure for the full year ended 31 March 2004 is contained in the Estimates book Tabled in the House at the start of this meeting.

**NO 1362 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH HOMES**

Can Government state what is the source of the receipt of the John Mackintosh Homes sub-fund of £1.5 million for the financial year 2001/2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The sum of £1.5 million held by the John Mackintosh Homes (their money) was made available to the Government by the Board of Governors as part of the agreement to transfer the homes (Mount Alvernia and the Jewish Home) to the Elderly Care Agency. The moneys have been used towards the cost of refurbishment works at Mount Alvernia.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1362 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My question relates to the audited accounts of the Government which shows the receipt of this money in that financial year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, that is the question that I think I have answered. In other words, where did the money come from? What was the source of the receipt? The money came from the governors of the John Mackintosh Trust.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the agreement with the John Mackintosh Trust was done when? At the beginning of the 2001 financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, around 2000 I think it was. It has been going for some time.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Exactly, that is why I am wondering why it is that this happened in 2001/2002.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Remember that this was money for capital works that did not start immediately, so they must have held on to the money and paid it later.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The money appeared originally as being available to the Elderly Care Agency for capital works, but in 2001/2002 a John Mackintosh Home sub-fund appears for the first time, with this receipt.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I am not quite sure what distinction he is trying to draw. We do an agreement with the Mackintosh Trustees, that the Elderly Care Agency is going to take over the building, and we say to the Trustees 'but the building needs revamping, we are relieving you of the running costs of the Home in effect, make that money available to us for the capital works'. The Trustees do that, I cannot tell him exactly the date upon which they paid the money over, but of course the money is ring-fenced for the purpose which the Government asked for it, namely the capital works. Well, the capital works started later. In the meantime the money appears to have been put in something called the John Mackintosh Home sub-fund. I am not understanding what the hon Member is asking about that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I find it odd that the John Mackintosh Home sub-fund should have surfaced in the year 2001/2002 and since there is another question which has not yet been called but is relevant to this, which is Question No. 1364, the Government appear to have issued a special debenture for the money to be put in that debenture. Given that the money originally was provided at an earlier stage for the capital works, it seems to have been put in this fund as if it were going to be put aside for some time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It was just invested, ring-fenced and invested. Initially in a sub-fund and then it was invested in a debenture, and then presumably now it has been cashed in because the works have proceeded.

ORAL

NO 1363 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**JOHN MACKINTOSH HOMES**

Can Government provide the details of the account for the year ended 31st March 2003 of the John Mackintosh Homes sub-fund?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The annual accounts for the year ended 31 March 2003 are not yet available as these are being audited. However, expenditure on refurbishment works funded from the Trust Fund during the year ended 31 March 2003 totalled £693,459 and this is reflected in appendix E of the Government Estimates for 2004/2005.

**NO 1364 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH HOMES**

Can Government say when the £1.5 million 7 per cent tax free debenture 2003 was sold by the Savings Bank to the John Mackintosh Homes sub-fund?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The £1.5 million Gibraltar Savings Bank debenture held by the trustees of the John Mackintosh Homes were transferred to the Government Trust Fund on 25 January 2002.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1364 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the answer is that it was issued to the Trustees prior to the creation of the sub-fund.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, prior to their alienation of the money to the sub-fund, yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, the answer to Question No. 1362 is that the source of the receipt was that in January 2002 the Mackintosh Homes Trust handed over a £1.5 million debenture which they already had.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it is not that the money was invested in that debenture for a particular purpose at that particular time. The debenture was previously held, that was how the Trust previously had their money invested.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Exactly so. The sub-fund is just a legal structure to hold the asset, whether it is cash or debentures, it was debentures.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Then presumably, is that a debenture that is redeemable at the request of the holder? Because if it is in a debenture and we have been told that £653,459 have been spent, that must have come out of the £1.5 million?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

At that point it becomes a matter of Treasury management. If the money was due to be spent before there was a draw down possible, before there was the redemption of the debenture was possible, somebody must have provided bridging liquidity. I do not know what the details of the debenture are, it may be that the debenture was on terms that was redeemable on giving a certain period of notice. I would need details of the actual debenture to see what might have happened.

**ORAL**

**NO 1365 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SALES OF LAND**

Can Government state how much was raised by sales of land and properties and credited to Government owned property companies in the financial year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Revenue raised by sales of properties and credited to Government owned companies during financial year 2003/2004 was £4,350,195.91.

ORAL

NO 1366 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SALES OF LAND**

Can Government state how much was raised by sales of land and properties and credited to the Improvement and Development Fund in the financial year 2003/2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Revenue raised by sale of land and buildings, credited to the Improvement and Development Fund in financial year 2003/2004 was £1,794,303.

**ORAL**

**NO 1367 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE**

Can Government state what is the forecast Government recurrent revenue and expenditure for the financial year 2003/2004 inclusive of the Gibraltar Development Corporation and the Gibraltar Health Authority and give a breakdown?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This information is contained in the Estimates book Tabled in the House at the start of this meeting.

**ORAL**

**NO 1368 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES FUND**

Can Government explain why the contribution from the Employment Injuries Funds to the Gibraltar Health Authority increased in the financial year 1999/2000 from £45,000 to £100,000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1369 of 2004.



**NO 1369 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES FUND**

Can Government explain why the contribution from the Employment Injuries Fund to the Gibraltar Health Authority increased in the financial year 1999/2000 from £45,000 to £100,000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In view of the increasing cost of providing health care, it was considered reasonable to review the contribution accordingly. This contribution had not been increased since 1992. In fact, it may appear from the information in the booklet, that the intention is to increase it further.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1368 AND 1369 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was not aware of that. In fact, is he saying then that the Treasury did an exercise and came to the conclusion that in the year 2000 the average cost had gone up in a proportion of over 100 per cent?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure of the basis on which they do it. The hon Member knows why this transfer takes place in the first place and what it is supposed to cover, the people whose healthcare it is supposed to cover. I cannot tell him whether the increase from 1992 to 1999/2000, which was from 45 to 100, was proportionate to the increased percentage in health spending over those years and whether the increase from 100 to the figure proposed, which I have already mention in the 2003/2004 thing is also a proportion, the figure that I have in front of me seems higher than the percentage by which health spending has increased over the same period. This is the figure that he does not have, he only has the figure of £100,000 which is the figure to which it was raised in 1999/2000. It is intended to raise it again in respect of the year 2003/2004, has been raised. There does not seem to be, necessarily a mathematical thing, since there are more people deemed to be covered. There are two variables the amount and people.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

This is really people who need hospitalisation or hospital treatment, or Health Centre treatment as a result of industrial injuries, because it comes from the Employment Injuries Fund. That is what that covers.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it is in respect of the provision of health services to people in respect of injuries at work.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I agree that there are two variables. Either there are more people with injuries at work or it has become more expensive to treat them. I am not aware that there has been any significant increase in numbers.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not alleging that there is necessarily a mathematical, the last two or three exchanges between us have been on the assumption, which is not a fact necessarily, that there is some scientific formula being applied. It may just be a figure. The original figure was not scientific either.

**ORAL**

**NO 1370 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FUND**

Can Government explain the item of receipts being recovery of maternity allowance misallocated which was credited to the Social Assistance Fund in the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Maternity allowance was introduced as a new social security benefit in July 1999. Pending the enactment of the relevant legislation, payments to beneficiaries were advanced from the Social Assistance Fund. Initially, this was an interim arrangement until payments could be charged to the Short Term Benefit Fund once the Social Security (Insurance) Ordinance had been duly amended. Although the new legislation was enacted in October 1999, due to an oversight payments continued to be charged to the Social Assistance Fund until June 2002. Consequently, an adjustment was made in respect of this misallocation by crediting the Social Assistance Fund with the sum of £137,514.89 (that is, all payments made since July 1999) and debiting the Short Term Benefit Fund with the same amount.

ORAL

NO 1371 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the month of January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1372 and 1373 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1372 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the month of February 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1371 and 1373 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1373 OF 2004

THE HON F R PICARDO

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the month of March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1371, 1372 and 1373**

|                                                  | <b><u>31-Jan-04</u></b> | <b><u>28-Feb-04</u></b> | <b><u>31-Mar-04</u></b> |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account -<br/>Opening Balance</u></b> | £5,656,414              | £5,628,704              | £5,634,843              |
| <u>Add</u>                                       |                         |                         |                         |
| Receipts                                         | £44,257                 | £59,273                 | £39,356                 |
|                                                  | <hr/> £5,700,671        | <hr/> £5,687,977        | <hr/> £5,674,199        |
| <u>Less</u>                                      |                         |                         |                         |
| Payments                                         | (£71,966)               | (£53,134)               | (£56,202)               |
|                                                  | <hr/> (£71,966)         | <hr/> (£53,134)         | <hr/> (£56,202)         |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>                    | <hr/> £5,628,704        | <hr/> £5,634,843        | <hr/> £5,617,997        |

ORAL

NO 1374 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT TERM BENEFITS FUND**

What was the balance of the Short Term Benefits Fund as at the end of the 2002/2003 financial year inclusive of any changes in the market value of the underlying investments?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1375 to 1381 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1375 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT TERM BENEFITS FUND**

What was the estimated balance of the Short Term Benefits Fund as at the end of the 2003/2004 financial year inclusive of any changes in the market value of the underlying investments?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1374 and 1376 to 1381 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1376 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

What was the balance of the Open Long Term Benefits Fund as at the end of the 2002/2003 financial year, inclusive of any changes in the market value of the underlying investments?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1374 to 1375 and 1377 to 1381 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1377 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG TERM BENEFITS FUND**

What was the estimated balance of the Open Long Term Benefits Fund as at the end of the 2003/2004 financial year, inclusive of any changes in the market value of the underlying investments?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1374 to 1376 and 1378 to 1381 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1378 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG TERM BENEFITS FUND**

What was the balance of the Closed Long Term Benefits Fund as at the end of the 2002/2003 financial year, inclusive of any changes in the market value of the underlying investments?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1374 to 1377 and 1379 to 1381 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1379 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

What was the estimated balance of the Closed Long Term Benefits Fund as at the end of the 2003/2004 financial year, inclusive of any changes in the market value of the underlying investments?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1374 to 1378 and 1380 to 1381 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1380 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

What was the estimated balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund as at the end of the 2003/2004 financial year, inclusive of any changes in the market value of the underlying investments?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1374 to 1379 and 1381 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1381 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT TERM BENEFITS FUND**

What was the estimated balance of the Short Term Benefits Fund as at the end of the 2003/2004 Financial Year inclusive of any changes in the market value of the underlying investments?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTIONS 1374/2004 TO 1381/2004**

| <b><u>Fund</u></b>                 | <b><u>31-Mar-03</u></b> | <b><u>31-Mar-04</u></b> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Short Term Benefits Fund           | £6,201,342              | £6,145,961              |
| Employment Injuries Insurance Fund | £6,045,472              | £5,617,997              |
| Closed Long Term Benefits Fund     | £482,863                | £670,835                |
| Open Long Term Benefits Fund       | £14,013,251             | £11,724,519             |



**ORAL**

**NO 1382 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INSOLVENCY FUND**

Can Government state how much has been collected in each financial year in respect of employer's contributions to the Insolvency Fund since 1 April 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1383 and 1384 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1383 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INSOLVENCY FUND**

Can Government state how much has been paid from the Insolvency Fund in each financial year since 1 April 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1382 and 1384 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1384 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INSOLVENCY FUND**

Can Government state how much of the sums paid out from the Insolvency Fund in each financial year, since 1 April 1996 have subsequently been recovered from the assets of the relevant employers to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

## ANSWER TO QUESTION 1384

### Answer to Question 1382

The sums collected by the Gibraltar Development Corporation (Insolvency Fund) in each financial year since 1<sup>st</sup> April 1996 are as follows:

|           |          |                                                           |
|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1996/1997 | £175,388 |                                                           |
| 1997/1998 | £204,013 |                                                           |
| 1998/1999 | £151,245 |                                                           |
| 1999/2000 | £267,718 |                                                           |
| 2000/2001 | £172,234 |                                                           |
| 2001/2002 | £306,019 | }                                                         |
| 2002/2003 | £315,079 | } *Subject to adjustment by Department of Social Security |
| 2003/2004 | £786,438 | }                                                         |

\* Social Insurance contributions have been erroneously allocated to the Insolvency Fund as a result of a computer program malfunction. The adjustment is in the process of being quantified by the Department of Social Security. This anomaly was reported by the Principal Auditor in his report to the Annual Accounts 2001/02 (paragraph 3.3.7 to 3.3.9)

### Answer to Question 1383

The payments made from Gibraltar Development Corporation (Insolvency Fund) in each financial year since 1<sup>st</sup> April 1996, are as follows:

|           |          |
|-----------|----------|
| 1996/1997 | £119,226 |
| 1997/1998 | NIL      |
| 1998/1999 | £34,664  |
| 1999/2000 | £200,267 |
| 2000/2001 | £34,489  |
| 2001/2002 | £45,991  |
| 2002/2003 | £49,193  |
| 2003/2004 | £89,863  |

### Answer to Question 1384

The sums received by the Gibraltar Development Corporation (Insolvency Fund) from assets recovered from companies that have been liquidated since 1<sup>st</sup> April 1996, is as follows:

|           |        |                                            |
|-----------|--------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1996/1997 | £2,022 | (liquidation of Fabri Construction [1992]) |
| 1997/1998 | NIL    |                                            |
| 1998/1999 | NIL    |                                            |
| 1999/2000 | NIL    |                                            |
| 2000/2001 | NIL    |                                            |
| 2001/2002 | £9,028 | (liquidation of Globe Trading Co. Ltd)     |
| 2002/2003 | NIL    |                                            |
| 2003/2004 | NIL    |                                            |

ORAL

NO 1385 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST**

Can Government say what has been the return on investment by the Gibraltar Provident Trust each year since it was set up?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 1386 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1386 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST**

Can Government state what has been the return on investment earned by the Gibraltar Provident Trust each financial year since it was set up?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

In order to establish a meaningful return on investments by the Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund, the return would have to be both money-weighted and time-weighted, ideally on a daily basis.

These statistics are not readily available to the Treasury. However, I hand over a statement showing end of month Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund investments and the interest earned for each year since its inception.

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST NO. 2 PENSION SCHEME**

|         | <b>End of Month Balance</b> | <b>Interest Earned</b> |
|---------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Nov '00 | £240,455.44                 | £223.47                |
| Dec '00 | £247,577.82                 | £1,963.51              |
| Jan '01 | £257,838.48                 | £1,156.54              |
| Feb '01 | £267,793.82                 | £1,094.38              |
| Mar '01 | £283,439.27                 | £1,167.59              |

|           | <b>End of Month Balance</b> | <b>Interest Earned</b> |
|-----------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| April '01 | £329,036.57                 | £1,175.13              |
| May '01   | £379,850.64                 | £1,489.43              |
| June '01  | £433,057.61                 | £1,481.28              |
| July '01  | £479,408.55                 | £1,858.72              |
| Aug '01   | £526,997.18                 | £1,970.30              |
| Sept '01  | £582,089.81                 | £2,024.10              |
| Oct '01   | £635,415.46                 | £2,238.65              |
| Nov '01   | £693,219.09                 | £1,811.40              |
| Dec '01   | £751,468.17                 | £2,536.79              |
| Jan '02   | £806,013.93                 | £2,369.30              |
| Feb '02   | £859,994.90                 | £2,329.31              |
| Mar '02   | £919,262.46                 | £2,822.33              |

|           | <b>End of Month Balance</b> | <b>Interest Earned</b> |
|-----------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| April '02 | £979,999.99                 | £2,676.89              |
| May '02   | £1,036,325.99               | £3,259.18              |
| June '02  | £1,100,840.75               | £2,984.83              |
| July '02  | £1,158,627.49               | £3,375.16              |
| Aug '02   | £1,214,649.22               | £3,860.39              |
| Sept '02  | £1,273,992.47               | £3,780.55              |
| Oct '02   | £1,332,212.57               | £4,144.87              |
| Nov '02   | £1,391,012.77               | £3,706.03              |
| Dec '02   | £1,463,314.83               | £4,086.20              |
| Jan '03   | £1,526,060.86               | £4,360.38              |
| Feb '03   | £1,594,818.71               | £4,098.04              |
| Mar '03   | £1,660,006.06               | £4,916.39              |

|           | <b>End of Month Balance</b> | <b>Interest Earned</b> |
|-----------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| April '03 | £1,727,790.77               | £4,065.42              |
| May '03   | £1,795,972.17               | £4,869.13              |
| June '03  | £1,879,911.32               | £5,013.69              |
| July '03  | £1,948,055.33               | £5,025.53              |
| Aug '03   | £2,006,085.28               | £5,349.36              |
| Sept '03  | £2,079,325.12               | £5,692.93              |
| Oct '03   | £2,139,943.54               | £5,891.39              |
| Nov '03   | £2,223,529.95               | £6,244.43              |
| Dec '03   | £2,306,748.56               | £2,405.69              |
| Jan '04   | £2,405,873.52               | £8,395.74              |
| Feb '04   | £2,509,900.55               | £8,313.60              |
| Mar '04   | £2,594,077.34               | £9,302.31              |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1385 AND 1386 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it the case that until now the Provident Trust has been investing its accumulated funds with the Gibraltar Savings Bank, or has it been handled by the Crown Agents and invested in the UK?

**CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I believe they are handled by the Crown Agents as separate accounts, and the eligible investments opened to the Trustees, there are trustees in these Schemes, is explained in the Fund Rules. Actually each account holder gets I think it is an annual or perhaps an even more frequent statement, showing the accrual to his fund in respect of the year. So there is quite a sophisticated system up and running now.

ORAL

NO 1387 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST FUND**

Can Government state how many persons have retired with an entitlement to an annuity from the Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund giving a breakdown by year and how many are currently being paid a pension purchased by 75 per cent of the accrued sum?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The information requested is provided in the statement that I hand to the hon Member.

**Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund (No 2) Pension Scheme**

| Year | No of Persons Retired | No of Persons Receiving a Pension | No of Persons who Purchased an Annuity | No of Persons Awaiting Purchase of an Annuity | No of Persons who Received the Full Accumulated Fund in Cash |
|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2001 | 2                     | 0                                 | 0                                      | 0                                             | 2                                                            |
| 2002 | 3                     | 0                                 | 0                                      | 0                                             | 3                                                            |
| 2003 | 3                     | 0                                 | 0                                      | 0                                             | 3                                                            |
|      | 8                     | 0                                 | 0                                      | 0                                             | 8                                                            |

**Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund (JMH) Pension Scheme**

| Year | No of Persons Retired | No of Persons who Purchased an Annuity | No of Persons Awaiting Purchase of an Annuity | No of Persons who Received the Full Accumulated Fund in Cash |
|------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2001 | 4                     | 0                                      | 0                                             | 4                                                            |
| 2002 | 2                     | 0                                      | 0                                             | 2                                                            |
| 2003 | 3                     | 0                                      | 0                                             | 3                                                            |
|      | 9                     | 0                                      | 0                                             | 9                                                            |

**Gibraltar Provident Trust Fund (Bond 1)**

| Year | No of Persons Retired | No of Persons who Purchased an Annuity | No of Persons Awaiting Purchase of an Annuity | No of Persons who Received the Full Accumulated Fund in Cash |
|------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1996 | 1                     | 0                                      | 0                                             | 1                                                            |
| 1997 | 5                     | 3                                      | 0                                             | 2                                                            |
| 1998 | 3                     | 3                                      | 0                                             | 0                                                            |
| 1999 | 0                     | 0                                      | 0                                             | 0                                                            |
| 2000 | 1                     | 0                                      | 0                                             | 1                                                            |
| 2001 | 0                     | 0                                      | 0                                             | 0                                                            |
| 2002 | 2                     | 1                                      | 1                                             | 0                                                            |
| 2003 | 3                     | 0                                      | 3                                             | 0                                                            |
|      | 15                    | 7                                      | 4                                             | 4                                                            |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1387 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The final column which shows the people who have received the full accumulated fund in cash, these are the people who have a sum that was too small at the time when annuities were available to get an annuity, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, not so much because it was too small to get an annuity, but because there are rules that say if it is less than a certain amount one can have it in cash and is not bound by the 75 per cent/25 per cent split. A combined annuity for any ridiculously small amount of money is just not worth it. The reason, I suspect, why there are, if one looks at the No. 2 Scheme, no retired person is actually receiving a pension or purchased an annuity, are that when these Government owned companies were given pensionable terms, some people were approaching retirement age and by the time they retired there was not enough money.

ORAL

NO 1388 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**NO. 2 PENSION FUND**

Can Government list the employers that contributed to the No 2 Pension Fund in the year ended 31 March 1999, and further state for each employer, the amount contributed and the number of employees covered by such contributions?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1389 to 1392 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1389 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NO. 2 PENSION FUND**

Can Government list the employers that contributed to the No 2 Pension Fund in the year ended 31 March 2000, and further state for each employer, the amount contributed and the number of employees covered by such contributions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1388 and 1390 to 1392 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1390 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NO. 2 PENSION FUND**

Can Government list the employers that contributed to the No 2 Pension Fund in the year ended 31 March 2001, and further state for each employer, the amount contributed and the number of employees covered by such contributions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1388, 1389, 1391 and 1392 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1391 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NO. 2 PENSION FUND**

Can Government list the employers that contributed to the No 2 Pension Fund in the year ended 31 March 2002, and further state for each employer, the amount contributed and the number of employees covered by such contributions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1388 to 1390 and 1392 of 2004.



**ORAL**

**NO 1392 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NO. 2 PENSION FUND**

Can Government list the employers that contributed to the No 2 Pension Fund in the year ended 31 March 2003, and further state for each employer, the amount contributed and the number of employees covered by such contributions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Let me first say that the Government would not provide this information in respect of a private company. In fact we are providing the information because there are none of those and the Government are happy to provide this information in respect of publicly funded agencies, Government-owned companies and things of that sort. Should any private company ever participate in this Scheme, we might give the numbers of the companies involved and the numbers of employees but we will not provide their names. As it happens, the information requested is provided on the schedule I hand to him, because in fact they are all in the category of things that should be disclosed in this House.

**Financial Year :-****April 98 - March 99**

| <b>Employer</b>                       | <b>Total Contributed</b> | <b>Total No of Employees<br/>as at 31/3/99</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Gibraltar Joinery & Building Services | £60,034.31               | 65                                             |
|                                       | £60,034.31               | 65                                             |

**Financial Year :-****April 99 - March 00**

| <b>Employer</b>                       | <b>Total Contributed</b> | <b>Total No of Employees<br/>as at 31/3/00</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| The Office of the Ombudsman           | £6,252.03                | 5                                              |
| Gibraltar Joinery & Building Services | £61,787.79               | 61                                             |
|                                       | £68,039.82               | 66                                             |

**Financial Year :-****April 00 - March 01**

| <b>Employer</b>                       | <b>Total Contributed</b> | <b>Total No of Employees<br/>as at 31/3/01</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| The Office of the Ombudsman           | £9,450.00                | 5                                              |
| Gibraltar Regulatory Authority        | £2,645.84                | 2                                              |
| Gibraltar Joinery & Building Services | £63,978.81               | 65                                             |
| Gibraltar Community Projects          | £14,942.09               | 168                                            |
|                                       | £91,016.74               | 240                                            |

**Financial Year :-****April 01 - March 02**

| <b>Employer</b>                       | <b>Total Contributed</b> | <b>Total No of Employees<br/>as at 31/3/02</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| The Office of the Ombudsman           | £8,453.57                | 3                                              |
| Gibraltar Regulatory Authority        | £8,027.77                | 4                                              |
| Gibraltar Joinery & Building Services | £77,395.62               | 69                                             |
| Gibraltar Community Projects          | £186,143.37              | 175                                            |
| Gibraltar Development Corporation     | £92,253.95               | 66                                             |
| Elderly Care Agency                   | £46,805.01               | 59                                             |
|                                       | £419,079.29              | 376                                            |

**Financial Year :-****April 02 - March 03**

| <b>Employer</b>                       | <b>Total Contributed</b> | <b>Total No of Employees<br/>as at 31/3/03</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| The Office of the Ombudsman           | £8,414.34                | 4                                              |
| Gibraltar Regulatory Authority        | £11,042.34               | 4                                              |
| Gibraltar Joinery & Building Services | £93,622.83               | 143                                            |
| Gibraltar Community Projects          | £171,728.98              | 163                                            |
| Gibraltar Development Corporation     | £105,817.48              | 71                                             |
| Social Services Agency                | £13,062.02               | 50                                             |
| Elderly Care Agency                   | £73,703.98               | 68                                             |
|                                       | £477,391.97              | 503                                            |

ORAL

NO 1393 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**EUROPA INCINERATOR LIMITED**

Can Government state which is the most recent year in respect of which the accounts of Europa Incinerator Limited have been audited?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Accounts from commencement have not been audited.

**NO 1394 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMMUNITY CARE LIMITED**

Can Government explain why they have come to the conclusion since 1999 that Tabling the accounts of Community Care Limited in the House may enable others to argue that the accounts are not private and non Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, the hon Member knows the answer to the question. I do not consider that it is in the public interest of Gibraltar to air this issue in public.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1394 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, I do not know the answer to the question. Given that I am not aware that anything in relation to Community Care post-1999 has altered, when in fact in 1999 the Government considered it was all right to table it and did table it. Given that in the last financial year, when the Government were proposing to transfer £5 million from the Consolidated Fund, I asked that it should be done through the transfer of Import Duty money to the Social Assistance Fund, and he said that things had now moved on and there was really no need for this mechanism any more, but since I insisted that I would feel more relaxed about it if it were done that way, he said if it made me feel better he would do it. So, in fact, the indications in last year's Budget were that there was not a problem now to the degree that there had been in the past and therefore that is why I cannot understand, if things have improved in terms of the latest pronouncements in relation to Community Care, confirming what we have always argued in this House, that it is a private charity, and we are able to vote in the Budget money for them out of the Consolidated Fund, we are not able to do what we were doing in 1999. I do not understand it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I cannot help the Leader of the Opposition publicly to improve his levels of understanding, except to tell him that the two things to which he has just referred to and has tried to link, has no linkage whatsoever. What I agreed to restore, if he felt happier with it, was simply to describe next to the grant, to put the source of the

funds. That has got nothing to do with the subject matter of the question, which is whether the Government consider that it is appropriate to continue to Table the accounts of Community Care. Those two things are completely unrelated. The fact that the Government were happy to modify the practice on the first, is completely non germane to the second issue. All that I will say on the second issue and no more, however many times he gets up to ask supplementaries, is that the Government's modified position is a sensitive reaction to evolving arguments on the other side. I do not mean the other side of the House, I mean on the other side of those that seek to challenge the arrangements.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is he saying then that the Tabling of the accounts is an evolving argument to the other side? If that is the case then, of course, it is not an argument I have heard used by the other side but it may well be that he has got information that I have not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have said all that I am going to say on this subject.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

This was not something that the Government were concerned about in 1999, which was the last time they Tabled it. Can he confirm? It is something that has developed since 1999.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member presumably knows what the word 'evolving' means.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, yes, I know that he thinks he is omniscient and that the rest of us ought to be put with a pink cap in the corner, but I do know what the word 'evolving' means, without needing to do what he did on National Day in 1996, which is to look in the Oxford Dictionary to find out whether we were a nation or not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will accept that diatribe as a concession on the substance that we were discussing.

**NO 1395 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NATIONAL INCOME ESTIMATES**

When do Government now expect to publish the National Income Estimates for the years 2001/2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I expect to do so during my budget address to this House later during this meeting.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1395 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It will be published what, in the middle of his address?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is simply a repetition of the same question. I do not intend to repeat the answer, it is already in Hansard.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. I do not know whether in fact what the Chief Minister is telling us is that he intends to mention the figures in his speech, and therefore that is the equivalent of publishing them, or in fact a document is going to be circulated but not until he has actually read it out. Is it the case that he wants to make them public only during the budget speech, or that they are not ready until he actually stands up to talk?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The question asked was 'when do Government now expect to publish the National Income Estimates for the year 2001/2002?', to which the answer is 'I expect to do so during my budget address to this House later during this meeting.'

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes and given that the answer that I was given in January was that it was going to happen before then, I am trying to establish what has brought about the change in timetable.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is when the Government now want to do it.

ORAL

NO 1396 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what is the relationship between the gross trading profits component in the income method of calculating GDP and taxable trading profits of companies for any given financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1397 to 1402 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1397 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government confirm that the profits of qualifying companies are included in the gross trading profits shown in the Gross Trading Profits calculation?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1396 and 1398 to 1402 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1398 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP – MANSELL REVIEW**

Can Government list the recommendations made in the Mansell review to improve the accuracy of the calculations of the GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1396, 1397 and 1399 to 1402 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1399 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP – MANSELL REVIEW**

Can Government state in respect of the import and export values in the 1996/1997 expenditure method calculation of GDP, what was the effect of these values for each of the three changes implemented that year as a result of the Mansell Review?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1396 to 1398 and 1400 to 1402 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1400 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NATIONAL INCOME CALCULATION**

What was the imputed rent element in the rent component of the National Income Calculation for each of the years 1994/1995, 1995/1996, 1996/1997, 1997/1998, 1998/1999, 1999/2000 and 2000/2001?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1396 to 1399, 1401 and 1402 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1401 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INPUT/OUTPUT STUDY**

Can Government now provide the fees charged by Professor Fletcher for providing answers to Opposition questions seeking clarification of items in the Input/Output Study Report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1396 to 1400 and 1402 of 2004.

**NO 1402 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP – PAYMENTS TO PROFESSOR FLETCHER**

Can Government state whether any further payments will be made to Professor Fletcher beyond the £46,635 already paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

For National Income purposes, Gross Trading Profits are calculated by the grossing up of the amount of corporation tax received in a given year to arrive at an estimate of taxable profits and the addition of an estimated amount in respect of profits that have not yet been assessed to tax. The profits of qualifying companies are not included in the gross trading profits shown in the GDP calculation.

The recommendations made in the Mansell Review were for the Statistics Office to:

1. Examine the coverage of the estimates for Government trading enterprises.
2. Examine the coverage of the estimates of Government final consumption.
3. Examine the coverage of the estimates of Gross Fixed Capital Formation.
4. Consider whether any further coverage adjustments need to be made to the figures of exports and imports of goods.
5. Consider whether any further activities need to be included in the figures of exports and imports of services.
6. Consider how the hidden economy is to be treated in the accounts.
7. Consider arrangements for compiling long-run series on an improved basis.
8. Examine how tax information can be used to derive estimates for income GDP, and possibly production GDP.
9. Consider certain issues related to the estimation of rent.
10. Assess the quality of the estimates from the Family Expenditure Survey and examine ways in which the benchmark estimates of consumers' expenditure might be projected forward.
11. Improve procedures for and quality of estimates of Gross Fixed Capital Formation.
12. Improve the quality of the estimates of tourist expenditure, for both exports and imports.
13. Improve the estimation methodology for the new components of exports and imports of services.
14. Review the need for a stock-building variable in the accounts.
15. Consider how estimates of net property income from abroad might best be made to estimate GDP.

16. Consider the needs for constant price figures and what new price data might be needed.
17. Consider the importance of the sector accounts in determining priorities for improving the national accounts.
18. Consider arrangements for dealing with the new system of national accounts.
19. Consider arrangements for increased liaison with users and suppliers of data.
20. Consider the need for a timetable for the publication of the national accounts estimates.
21. Consider the resources implications of improving the national accounts.

The effects on the estimated values of imports and exports of goods and services as a result of the adjustments recommended by the Mansell Review were as follows:

1. The gross value of imports of goods, for National Income purposes, fell by £78.5 million as a result of the adjustment in respect of the imports of notes, coins, stamps and gold. The adjustment does not apply to the export side.
2. The adjustment in respect of re-exports of cars increased the value of imports of goods by £4.59 million with no effect on the export side. As regards tobacco, the adjustment is only on the export side with re-exports estimated at £14.28 million.
3. The inclusion of financial and maritime services as export income increased the value of exports of services by £31.54 million and £3 million respectively.

The value of imputed rents contained within the rent element of the National Income Accounts for the period in question was as follows:

|         | £ million |
|---------|-----------|
| 1994/95 | 28.54     |
| 1995/96 | 28.79     |
| 1996/97 | 35.81     |
| 1997/98 | 37.87     |
| 1998/99 | 40.15     |
| 1999/00 | 42.37     |
| 2000/01 | 44.67     |

I can confirm that no fees have been charged by Professor Fletcher in respect of House of Assembly Questions so far, and that the Input/Output model will be updated but as yet no contractual agreement has been finalised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1396 TO 1402 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a particular reason why in 1996/1997 the imputed rent value went up by £7 million, which was a 25 per cent increase, and then it seems to have sort of settled down to £2 million a year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot offer the hon Member, without notice of the question, a reason for that. Presumably the reason must be indicated in the working papers that resulted that produced the figures.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the list of recommendations made in the Mansell Review, which appear from listening to be very extensive, is it that something has only been done that has affected the calculation in respect of the imports and exports, because that seems to be the only ones that he has identified as having had an effect?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Those are the ones that have been implemented that have had an effect. I do not suppose the hon Member was able to take down the full list of recommendations. Well, he can get it when he gets it after the meeting of the House, he can see the whole list in print, otherwise I would have handed him a copy now.



ORAL

NO 1403 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**POBJOY MINT**

On what date did the contact with Pobjoy Mint to produce Gibraltar coinage come to an end?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The contract with Pobjoy Mint expired on 31 October 2003.

**NO 1404 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MINTING OF GIBRALTAR COINS**

When was the contract for the minting of Gibraltar coins put out to tender, how many parties expressed an interest and who were they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The tender for the production of circulating coinage and for the production, marketing and distribution of commemorative coinage was put out to tender on 15 May 2002. All UK Mints were invited to tender.

Four bids were received from the following UK Mints:-

Birmingham Mint  
The Royal Mint  
Pobjoy Mint; and  
Tower Mint

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1404 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say what the different bids were, or whether the contract was awarded to the, in this case, cheapest bidder?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a bit more complex than that, because this is not just a question of price. The Government had grown dissatisfied with the Pobjoy Mint, who were otherwise efficient, but the deal just did not leave enough for the Government. In other words, the Government were getting very little out of those particular arrangements. This agreement that was negotiated with the new tenderer, the new successful tenderer, considerably increases the Gibraltar Government's share of the commercial value of the use of Gibraltar as a jurisdiction for coinage issue, particularly commemorative coinage, and is an altogether more attractive, commercial proposition for the Government, as well as being set up on a more transparent basis than the previous

one. Our disagreement with Pobjoy was not as the result of any unhappiness as to their quality of production or anything of the sort, but it was just not, the hon Member just has to look at the figures in the revenue from these sources over the years to see. For example, now we have a minimum guaranteed revenue which is higher than it used to be all together under the previous arrangements.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

That package, that deal, the best package or deal was the one offered by Tower Mint compared to the Birmingham Mint and the Royal Mint?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, there are extraneous factors in the choice. Let me just say first of all that the Birmingham Mint actually went into liquidation shortly after this tender was issued, so really it was down to three, one of which was the incumbent Pobjoy. The other was Tower and the third was the Royal Mint. There were non financial reasons why the Tower Mint was a better offer for the Government, as well as being the one that was financially more attractive to the Government.

**NO 1405 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOWER MINT**

Can Government say how and when Tower Mint became known to the Government as having the capacity and interest to mint Gibraltar coinage?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Department of Trade and Industry, which was at that time responsible for coinage, in fact it has subsequently been transferred to the Treasury as a responsibility, but at that stage I think it was from the days the Opposition Members were in Government that it first became DTI, I do not know if it had been before that but it certainly was DTI in their days, I have now actually transferred that function to the Treasury where it more logically belongs, but in any case the Department of Trade and Industry at that time approached all the UK Mints and invited them to tender for the coinage contract. The Tower Mint is one of the four UK Mints.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1405 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I understand that but I think the Tower Mint was not involved in the production of coinage before even though it is called Tower Mint. Is that correct or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not correct as the hon Member has stated it. Tower Mint is one of the leading Mints of commemorative coinage and in fact used the same distribution agency network as Pobjoy used to use for the marketing, but they did not have a history in circulating coinage. The difference is basically just security arrangements, the technology is the same, so before giving them the contract, consultants were engaged in the UK by the Treasury, to ensure that they had put in place the necessary security arrangements, and those were checked and audited before the contract was finally confirmed in their favour and production began. So it is in respect of circulating coinage that this is their first major contract, but they were perfectly experienced in commemorative coinage. By commemorative coinage I do not mean, as I read in one of the local newspapers, of chocolate coins. Commemorative coins of the sort that Gibraltar mainly produces, and all other

jurisdictions, but of course the security implications are much greater. The need for security is much greater in the case of circulating coinage.

ORAL

NO 1406 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**TOWER MINT**

Can Government give details of the contract with Tower Mint and explain how this differs from the contract which existed with Pobjoy Mint?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 1407 of 2004.

**NO 1407 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOWER MINT**

Can Government give the reasons why they awarded the contract for the minting of Gibraltar coinage to Tower Mint?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Although the formal contract with Tower Mint has not yet been signed by both parties, the main differences in the contract with Pobjoy Mint and Tower Mint are as follows:

- 1) the cost of supply of circulating coins – Tower Mint prices are lower; and there we are just buying the coins.
- 2) the royalty payments on commemorative coins – the new contract with Tower Mint provides a more equitable share of profits with the Royalties being based on the sale price of coins rather than on the metal value as was the case with Pobjoy Mint. Hon Members should bear in mind that commemorative coins are still legal tender, and therefore the issuing jurisdiction has a technical redemption liability, and a form of contract that gives one as a jurisdiction, with the redeeming obligation a stake only based on the metal value of the metal, where the hon Members can see that that can be very disadvantageous when one has a very high denomination coin with a relatively low metal content value.
- 3) Open Book Accounting – Tower Mint will disclose all accounting details of their coinage operations including costs, sales et cetera. Only limited information was supplied by Pobjoy Mint under the terms of their contract, and to date no details have been forthcoming from them on the sales value of Gibraltar coins sold by them nor on the cost of such sales.
- 4) A proper distinction between commemorative coins and circulating coins are now made and of the royalties payable in each case.

The award of the contract was based on an evaluation of the tender submissions by the various mints. Apart from considerations regarding adequacy of infrastructure and security requirements, other factors taken into account in the selection of the successful tender included:

- 1) Cost of circulating coins to Government.
- 2) Level of Royalty Payments for Commemorative Coins.
- 3) High level of transparency in accounting.



**ORAL**

**NO 1408 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOWER MINT**

On what date did the Government commence negotiations with Tower Mint for the production of Gibraltar coinage, and on what date was the agreement concluded?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The tender was awarded to Tower Mint on 23 September 2003.

Based on the tender submissions, which were agreed to by the Government, a formal contract has been drawn up and this is expected to be formally executed by both parties shortly. Nevertheless, work on the first designs, both circulating and commemorative coins, is already at an advanced stage and these will be minted shortly.

**ORAL**

**NO 1409 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOWER MINT**

Can Government say whether there is a Gibraltar agent for Tower Mint and if so who is it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

We do not believe that there is a Gibraltar agent but certainly the Government through the Treasury deals directly with Tower Mint in the United Kingdom and not through any local agent.

ORAL

**NO 1410 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SALE OF BANK NOTES**

Can Government state whether the system for the sale of the banknotes via the internet is now operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, it is not.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1410 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Chief Minister give us any idea as to when in effect it will be operational by, in view of the comments made by the Auditor in Part 2(10).5 of the 2001/2002 Report?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Treasury is presently reviewing a proposal for the sale of bank notes by the Gibraltar Philatelic Bureau.

ORAL

NO 1411 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX - £5,000 ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state what steps they have taken to establish whether the introduction of £5,000 tax allowance in respect of income from investment has resulted in an increase in personal investment savings?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 1412 of 2004.

**NO 1412 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX - £5,000 ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many taxpayers claimed the £5,000 tax allowance in respect of investment income introduced in the Tax Year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Given that there are many factors that influence the saving habits of individuals, Government cannot gauge with any degree of accuracy the effect of any one of these factors on the collective savings of the tax paying population. Neither can it be ascertained, with any degree of accuracy, if there has been an increase in personal investment and savings as a direct result of the Budget 2002 measures to increase from £600 to £5,000 the exemption from income tax that individuals enjoy on their investment income.

It is also not possible to provide the hon Member with a figure for the number of tax payers that have benefited from Government's decision to increase the exemption limit.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1411 AND 1412 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When it was announced in the Budget, what the Government said was that in fact this was being done to encourage savings, I would have thought they would want to know whether that objective was being achieved or not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not everything in life that one would want is possible. This is not Christmas every day of the year for the Government. There is no means, there is no mechanism to.... How can Government measure whether there has been an increase in savings? Let alone what the reason for the increase in savings is, even if we could follow the savings patterns of locals, one could never say that it is attributable to the fact of the increase in the allowance. One might want to deduce it but there is no means. It is not that we are not interested, these things are done in the knowledge that it will have an effect, but one cannot necessarily measure what the quantum effect is. Nor,

incidentally, does the existence of the allowance necessarily lead to more savings. It is a way of sort of rewarding people who choose to save. In other words, if one saves one can get a bit more income without paying tax on it. There is not necessarily the nexus between the two issues that the hon Member assumes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I only assumed it because that is how I understood the initiative when it was taken. To be an initiative of the Government with the purpose of encouraging more saving to take place. I think he actually said that at the time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not recall if I said it or not, but I am not saying that I did or that I did not. Certainly, this was a tax measure and as a tax measure it is just a way of giving money back to certain categories of taxpayers. At the end of the day I suppose the nexus can be made. In other words, if people think 'if I save money and I invest it, the tax man is going to take 35 per cent of it'. I suppose they might be more encouraged to save if the tax man is not going to take 35 per cent of it. It is just another way of delivering tax cuts.

ORAL

**NO 1413 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – OCCUPATIONAL PENSIONS**

Can Government state whether persons in receipt of an occupational pension from Gibraltar who are living in Spain are entitled to deduct personal allowances in respect of the tax chargeable on such pensions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1414 of 2004.

**NO 1414 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INVESTMENT INCOME**

Can Government say whether persons living in Spain are taxed on investment income arising in Gibraltar, and if so, whether personal allowances are deductible from such income?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information sought by Question No. 1413 and Question No. 1414 is governed by law and is contained in the provisions of the Income Tax Ordinance and subsidiary legislation.

Rule 24 of the Income Tax (Allowances, Deductions and Exemptions) Rules provides that any non-resident individual, irrespective of nationality, who is in receipt of a pension accruing in, derived from, or received in Gibraltar is entitled to deductions, allowances and reliefs as if he was a resident in Gibraltar.

Rule 3(12) of the same Rules exempt from tax any interest received in respect of deposits in Gibraltar in any bank or building society by any non-resident individual.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1413 AND 1414 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the second one, the investment income, is that limited to deposits and investments? For example, would somebody having a business here and drawing income from that business be covered by that Rule?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No it is banked deposits.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in terms of investment income of that other nature, it would be taxable....



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, taxed, if the hon Member will give me the opportunity just to modify my answer to make sure it is complete. The Rule also exempts from tax, interest received by any exempt company. So it is individuals or exempt companies.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But it still.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it is still deposit income.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So an investor, for example, who is a resident in Spain but actually has a business here and gets a dividend, that is taxable.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Absolutely.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is that profit taxable? Can he claim personal allowances against that or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, there was a time when I used to charge a fee for giving tax advice. My understanding is that with the exception of this regulation, many of the other normal tax allowances depend on residence. Some do and some do not. For example, the mortgage interest relief depends on the property being in Gibraltar. I think the insurance premium, life insurance, that is for residents, so the same rule does not necessarily apply to all the allowances.

**ORAL**

**NO 1415 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government now state what was the amount of PAYE payable in the tax year 1995/1996 by area of employment and number of employees in each area as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Government of Gibraltar;
- (c) Government Owned and Joint Venture Companies;
- (d) Private Sector Employment.

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1416 to 1423 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1416 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government now state what was the amount of PAYE payable in the tax year 1996/1997 by area of employment and number of employees in each area as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Government of Gibraltar;
- (c) Government Owned and Joint Venture Companies;
- (d) Private Sector Employment.

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1415 and 1417 to 1423 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1417 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

What is now the current estimated amount of PAYE payable for the tax year 2002/2003 by area of employment and the number of employees as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government owned joint venture companies;
- (d) Private sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1415 to 1416 and 1418 to 1423 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1418 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

What is the amount of tax collected in PAYE in the financial year 2003/2004 by area of employment as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government owned joint venture companies; and
- (d) Private sector employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1415 to 1417 and 1419 to 1423 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1419 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government state what was the total arrears of PAYE as at the 31 March 2004, giving a breakdown by previous tax years from 1988/1989 to 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1415 to 1418 and 1420 to 1423 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1420 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

How much was collected in PAYE each month since November 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1425 to 1419 and 1421 to 1423 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1421 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

As at the end of March 2004 how many employers had returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate and what was the total amount of tax deducted and the number of employees involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1415 to 1420 and 1422 to 1423 of 2004.



**ORAL**

**NO 1422 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

As at the end of March 2004 how many of the employers who had returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate had not paid the full amount of PAYE deducted and what was the shortfall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1415 to 1421 and 1423 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1423 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

As at the end of March 2004 how many employers had not yet returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate and what is the estimated number of employees?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The only recompense for the hard work that goes into producing this information is that whilst he is number crunching and considering it, he cannot be doing anything else. I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information he has requested.

**Answer to Question No 1415 of 2004**

Based on the 1995/1996 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 21 April 2004 the information sought is as follows:

|                                                    | £m          | Approximate No of<br>Employees/Deduction Cards |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------|
| a) MOD                                             | 4.5         | 2750                                           |
| b) Gibraltar Government                            | 13.3        | 5500                                           |
| c) Government owned and joint venture<br>companies | 2.0         | 550                                            |
| d) Private Sector employment                       | <u>22.1</u> | <u>12650</u>                                   |
|                                                    | ====        | =====                                          |

**Answer to Question No 1416 of 2004**

Based on the 1996/1997 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 21 April 2004 the information sought is as follows:

|                                                    | £m          | Approximate No of<br>Employees/Deduction Cards |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------|
| a) MOD                                             | 4.5         | 2850                                           |
| b) Gibraltar Government                            | 13.6        | 5500                                           |
| c) Government owned and joint venture<br>companies | 2.3         | 1150                                           |
| d) Private Sector employment                       | <u>22.1</u> | <u>12700</u>                                   |
|                                                    | ====        | =====                                          |

**Answer to Question No 1417 of 2004**

Based on the 2002/2003 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 21 April 2004 the information sought is as follows:

|                                                    | £m          | Approximate No of<br>Employees/Deduction Cards |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------|
| a) MOD                                             | 4.7         | 2650                                           |
| b) Gibraltar Government                            | 21.1        | 6050                                           |
| c) Government owned and joint venture<br>companies | 3.1         | 700                                            |
| d) Private Sector employment                       | <u>32.3</u> | <u>16600</u>                                   |
|                                                    | ====        | =====                                          |

cont'd.....

**Answer to Question No1418 of 2004**

The exact total amount of PAYE collected in the financial year ended 31 March 2004 is currently pending the reconciliation of the records of the Income Tax Office with the Treasury Books. The following analysis includes an estimate in respect of March 2004 PAYE tax accounted through the Treasury Books and is therefore subject to change.

|                                                  |             |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------|
|                                                  | £M          |
| (a) MOD                                          | 5.0         |
| (b) Government of Gibraltar                      | 24.1        |
| (c) Government owned and joint venture companies | 3.0         |
| (d) Private Sector employment                    | <u>32.0</u> |
|                                                  | <u>64.1</u> |

**Answer to Question No 1419 of 2004**

Total arrears of PAYE tax as at 31 March 2004.

|              |                       |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| Pre 1988/89  | 12,883.95             |
| 1988/1989    | 9,733.92              |
| 1989/1990    | 39,508.43             |
| 1990/1991    | 83,666.65             |
| 1991/1992    | 57,406.79             |
| 1992/1993    | 157,788.45            |
| 1993/1994    | 114,602.17            |
| 1994/1995    | 114,747.75            |
| 1995/1996    | 141,944.35            |
| 1996/1997    | 214,737.60            |
| 1997/1998    | 368,988.44            |
| 1998/1999    | 608,317.41            |
| 1999/2000    | 526,845.26            |
| 2000/2001    | 841,162.82            |
| 2001/2002    | 2,540,177.42          |
| 2002/2003    | 2,605,382.26          |
| 2003/2004    | 6,061.07              |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>£ 8,443,954.74</b> |

cont'd....

**Answer to Question No 1420 of 2004**

The PAYE (net of refunds) collected since November 2003 is as follows:-

|               | £m             |
|---------------|----------------|
| December 2003 | 5.2            |
| January 2004  | 6.8            |
| February 2004 | 6.0            |
| March 2004    | 6.2 (Estimate) |

**Answer to Question No 1421 of 2004**

A total of 1681 returns for the year 2002/2003 had been received at the Income Tax Office by the 22 April 2004. The total PAYE tax deducted and payable was £61.2m in respect of 26016 employee/deduction cards.

**Answer to Question No 1422 of 2004**

Based on the 2002/2003 Annual PAYE Employer's Returns received at the Income Tax Office by the 31 March 2004, 225 such employers owed PAYE tax totalling £2.6m

**Answer to Question No 1423 of 2004**

As at 31 March 2004, 310 employers had not returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate. The estimated number of employees affected was 532.

ORAL

NO 1424 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX – SELF EMPLOYED**

Can Government state as at the end of March 2004 what were the amounts assessed in respect of self-employed persons for each tax year 1995/1996 to 2002/2003 giving the amounts discharged, confirmed and paid and the number of taxpayers involved in each year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information he has requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1424 OF 2004**

|                  | 1995/96 | 1996/97 | 1997/98 | 1998/99 | 1999/00 | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                  | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      |
| Assessed         | 8.0     | 8.5     | 11.1    | 11.1    | 46.4    | 14.6    | 14.5    | 8.9     |
| Discharged       | 5.5     | 5.5     | 7.1     | 6.9     | 41.9    | 9.1     | 8.3     | 3.8     |
|                  | 2.5     | 3.0     | 4.0     | 4.2     | 4.5     | 5.5     | 6.2     | 5.1     |
| Paid             | 2.0     | 2.4     | 2.8     | 3.1     | 3.4     | 3.6     | 3.7     | 2.9     |
| Outstanding      | 0.5     | 0.6     | 1.2     | 1.1     | 1.1     | 1.9     | 2.5     | 2.2     |
| No. of Taxpayers | 1236    | 1216    | 1252    | 1232    | 1265    | 1193    | 1075    | 871     |

ORAL

NO 1425 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX – ASSESSMENTS**

Can Government state what is the most recent tax year for which tax assessments have been completed in respect of individuals?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The year of assessment 1999/2000 is the most recent year that the issue of income tax assessments on individuals on the PAYE system has been completed. Also issued are approximately 50 per cent of the assessments for the year of assessment 2000/2001.



**ORAL**

**NO 1426 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state in respect of each tax year since 1995/1996 how many High Net Worth or Category 2 Individuals were liable to a tax payment of either £10,000 or in excess of £10,000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1427 to 1432 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1427 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state in respect of each tax year since 1995/1996 how much tax was payable in respect of all the High Net Worth and Category 2 Individuals registered in each particular year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1426 and 1428 to 1432 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1428 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government say as at the 31 March 2004 how much had been collected in respect of tax due from High Net Worth or Category 2 Individuals for each tax year from 1995/1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1426 to 1427 and 1429 to 1432 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1429 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

How much revenue was received in respect of tax paid by High Net Worth and Category 2 Individuals in the financial year 2001/2002, and in which category in the breakdown given in paragraph 3.1.1 on page 20 of the Principal Auditor's Report of that financial year, is this sum reflected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1426 to 1428 and 1430 to 1432 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1430 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state in respect of each tax year, since 1995/1996, how many High Net Worth or Category 2 Individuals were liable to a tax payment of:

- (a) £10,000;
- (b) in excess of £10,000,

and in each case the total amount of tax liability in respect of all such individuals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1426 to 1429 and 1431 to 1432 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1431 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state in respect of each tax year since 1995/1996 how much of the tax liability in respect of High Net Worth and Category 2 Individuals had been paid by the 31 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1426 to 1430 and 1432 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1432 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state in respect of each financial year since 1995/1996, how much income was received from the payment of tax by High Net Worth or Category 2 Individuals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The data sought by the hon Member in Question Nos. 1426 to 1432 of 2004 is not available in the format required. However, I can, and now do, hand the hon Member a comprehensive table providing detailed information regarding the assessment and collection of tax payable by High Net Worth and Category 2 Individuals for the years of assessment 1995/1996 to 2002/2003. In other words, this is the most information that can be provided.

**Answer to Question 1432 of 2004**

|                                               | 1995/96     | 1996/97     | 1997/98     | 1998/99     | 1999/2000   | 2000/01     | 2001/02     | 2002/03     |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Individuals with liability of £10,000 or less | 48          | 55          | 72          | 83          | 106         | 142         | 148         | 138         |
|                                               | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          |
| Tax payable                                   | 0.49        | 0.56        | 0.72        | 0.82        | 0.94        | 1.21        | 1.31        | 1.32        |
| Tax paid                                      | <u>0.41</u> | <u>0.49</u> | <u>0.68</u> | <u>0.76</u> | <u>0.86</u> | <u>1.07</u> | <u>1.22</u> | <u>1.14</u> |
| Outstanding                                   | <u>0.08</u> | <u>0.07</u> | <u>0.04</u> | <u>0.06</u> | <u>0.08</u> | <u>0.14</u> | <u>0.09</u> | <u>0.18</u> |

|                                               |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Individuals with liability of £10,000 or more | 7           | 21          | 39          | 42          | 35          | 40          | 41          | 35          |
|                                               | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          | £M          |
| Tax payable                                   | 0.14        | 0.43        | 0.78        | 0.85        | 0.68        | 0.76        | 0.75        | 0.62        |
| Tax paid                                      | <u>0.06</u> | <u>0.11</u> | <u>0.26</u> | <u>0.39</u> | <u>0.44</u> | <u>0.51</u> | <u>0.48</u> | <u>0.44</u> |
| Outstanding                                   | <u>0.08</u> | <u>0.32</u> | <u>0.53</u> | <u>0.46</u> | <u>0.24</u> | <u>0.25</u> | <u>0.27</u> | <u>0.18</u> |

In answer to the second part of Question 1429 of 2004 I can confirm that the tax paid by High Net Worth and Category 2 Individuals is reduced under 'Individuals' in the breakdown shown in paragraph 3.1.1 on page 20 of the Principal Auditor's Report for the financial year 2001/2002.



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1426 TO 1432 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a mechanism whereby they lose the status if they do not pay? Is there a time limit?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a good question. The certificate is issued and to be withdrawn it would have to be recovered. In other words, it would have to be cancelled. There is, to my knowledge, there would almost be no point if they are not paying, withdrawing the certificate would expose them. The ones that do not pay are not here. This is the problem, they have gone. So there would be, I suppose, some theoretical effect of exposure but no probability of recovery. So yes, we can recover the certificate, one can even cancel the status but it will not necessarily result in any further collections of tax.

ORAL

NO 1433 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £7,000**

Can Government state in respect of the tax year 2001/2002, how many persons had a taxable income below £7,000?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1434 to 1444 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1434 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £7,000**

Can Government state of the persons who had a taxable income below £7,000 for the tax year 2001/2002, how many were eligible to apply for the tax refund of up to £100?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 and 1435 to 1444 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1435 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £7,000**

Can Government state for the persons eligible for a tax refund of up to £100 because they had a taxable income below £7,000 in the tax year 2001/2002, how many have applied to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1434 and 1436 to 1444 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1436 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £7,000**

Of the persons who have applied to date for the tax refund of up to £100 because they had a taxable income below £7,000 in the tax year 2001/2002, how many have been granted the refund, and what has been the total amount refunded in respect of such persons?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1435 and 1437 to 1444 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1437 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – REFUNDS**

Of the persons who have applied to date for a tax refund of up to £100, how many had a tax liability of £100 or less and how many had a tax liability of more than £100?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1436 and 1438 to 1444 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1438 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £8,000**

Can Government state in respect of the tax year 2002/2003, how many persons had a taxable income below £8,000?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1437 and 1439 to 1444 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1439 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £8,000**

Can Government state of the persons who had a taxable income below £8,000 for the tax year 2002/2003, how many were eligible to apply for the tax refund of up to £130.00?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1438 and 1440 to 1444 of 2004.



**ORAL**

**NO 1440 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £8,000**

Can Government state for the persons eligible for a tax refund of up to £130.00 because they had a taxable income below £8,000 in the year 2002/2003, how many have applied to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1439 and 1441 to 1444 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1441 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £8,000**

Of the persons who have applied to date for the tax refund of up to £130.00 because they had a taxable income below £8,000 in the tax year 2002/2003, how many have been granted the refund, and what has been the total amount refunded in respect of such persons?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1440 and 1442 to 1444 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1442 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £7,000**

Can Government state whether persons with income below £7,000 in respect of the year 2001/2002 whose employers have not paid their PAYE have been able to claim their £100.00 refund?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1441 and 1443 to 1444 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1443 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – INCOME BELOW £8,000**

Can Government state whether persons with income below £8,000 in respect of the year 2002/2003 whose employers have not paid their PAYE have been able to claim their £130.00 refund?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1433 to 1442 and 1444 of 2004.

**NO 1444 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – REFUNDS**

Can Government state what is the position of employees whose assessments show that they are due a tax refund in cases where the employer has not paid their PAYE?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There are a number of errors in terminology and concept in the hon Member's questions. The first is that this is not a matter of a refund, this is a matter of a tax credit. One can deduce, however, from his questions that he is referring to the Low Income Earner's Tax Credit, which are the only things to which the figure of £7,000 and £8,000 of income relate. So I am answering the question to the extent that it is possible to answer the questions, ignoring all references to refunds and assuming that they are references to entitlement to tax credit, it is not a refund as such.

The detailed administrative statistical data that the hon Member seeks is not available. However, I can appraise him on the legislation and the operational measures introduced to give effect to that Budget measure, information that hopefully will allow him to formulate substantive supplementary questions on the Tax Credit if he wishes to.

Before I do so, however, I need to point out that the information relates to taxable income that the hon Member seeks in eight of his questions, is irrelevant to issues regarding the tax credit given that the tax credit is based on the assessable income of tax payers and not on taxable income.

The tax credit is a mechanism by which tax payers, whose computed assessable income is equal to or less than £7,000 in the year of assessment 2001/2002, or equal to or less than £8,000 in the years of assessment 2002/2003 and 2003/2004, are entitled to a credit amounting to a deduction or a reduction of their liability of £100 in the first year and £130 in the year 2002/2003 and £230 in the case of year 2003/2004. Where an individual's tax liability does not exceed the amount of the entitlement, the tax credit is obviously limited to the amount of the liability. In other words, there is no net balance in favour of the tax payer. It is the amount of the liability or the tax credit, whichever is greater.

The Commissioner of Income Tax, in accordance with the legislation enacted when the tax credit was introduced, does not require tax payers to claim the deduction as is required for the normal allowances, for example, life insurance or mortgage interest relief. Entitlement to the deduction is established at assessment time when the

necessary deduction is made from the total liability due. In other words, this is not something that is claimed by the tax payer. If somebody submits a return and the figure qualifies, it is simply factored in by the Income Tax Office.

The tax credit is therefore allowed at assessment time. There is, as I informed the hon Member in answer to previous questions, a backlog in the issue of assessments to those on the PAYE system. Consequently, the benefit has, in the main, not yet filtered through to those it targets. Every effort is being made to reduce the backlog and it is expected that the issue of 2001/2002 assessments, that is the year that the deduction kicks in, will commence before the end of the year.

In answer to Question No. 1444, I can inform the hon Member that assessments on those whose employer has not paid over the PAYE tax deducted are not raised until payment is made. The legislation, in circumstances where an employer has failed to pay over to Government any PAYE tax deducted, does not allow the Commissioner of Income Tax to set off that tax against the tax otherwise chargeable. Therefore unless the tax deducted is actually paid over there is no tax credit.

However, there is no loss to any individual as the legislation allows the tax not paid by the employer to be set off once the amount not paid over has been abandoned and written off. So in other words, there is a sort of deferment of value rather than a loss of value.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1433 TO 1444 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Let me say that when the Chief Minister announced the £8,000 and £130, which was of course before the Election, he actually said in his speech that he urged people to claim the £100 credit for the allowance. That is why I have used the word 'claim'.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That was before the legislation was done. This was the measure. When it came to doing the legislation it was decided to eliminate the need for the claim. People have to claim the Homeowners Allowance for example, but this was done in the form of tax credit. In other words, it is a credit, evident from the..... I am not sure I actually said that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I can produce Hansard for him, I read it before I wrote the question, but I accept the point. If the legislation subsequently did something different then I had not noticed that change in the legislation. This business of it not being a refund, surely if people have not been given the credit before the tax has been deducted, then will the credit not result in a refund when the assessment is made? If somebody has £7,000 in the year 2001/2002 and in the near future they are going to be identified as someone that should have had the credit, that will mean they will get £100 refunded, if they have paid £100, yes?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that is why I said at the beginning that it was a matter of terminology. A refund, in the language of tax administration, is when one gets back tax that one has paid. This is not getting back tax that one has paid, this is the tax bill being reduced before one pays it, to reduce the amount that one pays. There is no refund as such, and even in the case that he has just explained of the people whose entitlement is in fact deferred, in the event that their employer has not paid their PAYE, it will still be a credit.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, I am afraid I do not think that he has understood my question. I am saying, when this starts happening there are bound to be people who will have an assessment made which does not require them to pay more tax. It will result in a repayment of the tax that they have paid because of the £100 but that is not a refund.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not a refund. There is a difference between a refund, in terms of tax assessment there is a difference between a refund and a tax credit. Of course if the assessment is in arrears, and the effect of a credit is to reduce the amount of tax payable to the amount of tax that was actually deducted in PAYE and paid over, then that will result in money being due to the taxpayer, but it does not arise in the form of the way refunds normally arise. It is a tax credit. I do not want to make too much of that point, I just did not want the hon Member to think that the way this works is that the tax is calculated, a sum is declared payable, the taxpayer pays it and then he is returned money. The mechanism is that it is allowed above the line so to speak. In other words, the credit is credited before the amount of tax payable is calculated, but of course in cash flow terms, if a payment is due one gets a cheque in the post. If that is the hon Member's definition of refund, yes, to that extent.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It will always have to be delivered like that, because in fact, how can the Tax know.....?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is in the case of PAYE people not the self-employed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well how is the Tax going to know that somebody is below £7,000 until after they have received the return by which time surely the tax has been paid?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Only in the case of PAYE payers. In the case of self-employed people, there is no payment in advance of assessment. That is the importance of distinguishing them. The mechanics, even though the result is a cheque in the post in the case of PAYE payers, the correct analysis is not of a refund because in respect of those taxpayers who are not on the PAYE system, self-employed, it is not a refund even as he is defining it, because it never comes to that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In practice, given that there are 500 self-employed and 26,000 PAYE, and that one assumes that there are not all that many people self-employed for £7,000, which is below the minimum wage, unless there is something very peculiar in their returns, there may be people who say they only make £7,000 self-employed but I cannot see why they are doing that instead of working as labourers on the minimum wage.



**ORAL**

**NO 1445 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2004, how many companies in each tax year 1995/1996 to 2002/2003 had been assessed for company tax, and what were the amounts of tax payable and paid in respect of each tax year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1446 to 1449 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1446 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2004 how many companies, in each tax year 1995/1996 to 2002/2003 had been assessed for company tax, and what were the amounts of tax payable and paid in respect of each tax year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1445 and 1447 to 1449 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO 1447 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2004 how many companies had been assessed by the Commissioner of Income Tax without having made a return of taxable profit:

- (a) below £35,000; and
- (b) above £35,000 for the years 1998/1999 to 2002/2003,

what was the tax assessed and paid in each case and for each category and each year and what were the amounts assessed and paid by qualifying companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1445 to 1446 and 1448 to 1449 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1448 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

What was the amount of Company Tax collected in each month since November 2003?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1445 to 1447 and 1449 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO 1449 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2004 how many companies had declared taxable profits:

- (a) above £35,000; and
- (b) below £35,000

for each of the tax years 1998/1999 to 2002/2003, what was the tax assessed and paid in each category and can Government state in each category and for each year how many were qualifying companies and what were the amounts of tax assessed and paid by such companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information requested.

Question No 1445 duplicates Question No 1446 and is therefore ignored in this answer.

**Answer to Question 1446 of 2004**

|                  | 1995/96 | 1996/97 | 1997/98 | 1998/99 | 1999/00 | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                  | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      |
| Assessed         | 15.8    | 15.6    | 18.6    | 25.1    | 88.2    | 26.6    | 24.6    | 25.8    |
| Discharged       | 5.6     | 4.9     | 7.8     | 12.0    | 74.0    | 13.0    | 10.9    | 13.0    |
|                  | 10.2    | 10.7    | 10.8    | 13.1    | 14.2    | 13.6    | 13.7    | 12.8    |
| Paid             | 9.5     | 10.3    | 10.3    | 12.5    | 13.6    | 12.7    | 12.9    | 11.0    |
| Outstanding      | 0.7     | 0.4     | 0.5     | 0.6     | 0.6     | 0.9     | 0.8     | 1.8     |
| No. of Companies | 1443    | 1418    | 1465    | 1445    | 1522    | 1538    | 1430    | 1294    |

**Answer to Question 1447 of 2004**

**COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

| YEAR OF ASSESSMENT                      | 1998/1999 | 1999/2000 | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                                         | £         | £         | £         | £         | £         |
| <b>Under £35,000</b>                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| No of Companies assessed                | 806       | 655       | 411       | 460       | 577       |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 1.6M      | 1.1M      | 0.8M      | 1.0M      | 1.4M      |
| Total paid                              | 1.2M      | 0.7M      | 0.3M      | 0.3M      | 0.3M      |
| <b>OVER £35,000</b>                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| No of Companies assessed                | 45        | 36        | 9         | 22        | 31        |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 2.9M      | 2.7M      | 0.2M      | 1.4M      | 1.3M      |
| Total paid                              | 2.8M      | 2.6M      | 0.1M      | 1.2M      | 0.8M      |
| <b>QUALIFYING COMPANIES</b>             |           |           |           |           |           |
| <b>UNDER £35,000</b>                    |           |           |           |           |           |
| No of Companies assessed                | 12        | 13        | 11        | 1         | 2         |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 13K       | 13K       | 13K       | 1K        | 3K        |
| Total paid                              | 3K        | 1K        | NIL       | NIL       | NIL       |
| <b>OVER £35,000</b>                     |           |           |           |           |           |
| No of Companies assessed                | 1         | 4         | 5         | NIL       | NIL       |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 18K       | 0.3M      | 0.4M      | NIL       | NIL       |
| Total paid                              | NIL       | NIL       | NIL       | NIL       | NIL       |

**Answer to Question No 1448 of 2004**

The Corporation Tax collected (net of refunds) in each month since November 2003 is as follows:

|               | £M  |
|---------------|-----|
| December 2003 | 0.3 |
| January 2004  | 0.3 |
| February 2004 | 0.3 |
| March 2004    | 6.6 |

**Answer to Question No 1449 of 2004**

**COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

|                                         | Year of Assessment |           |           |           |           |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|                                         | 1998/1999          | 1999/2000 | 2000/2001 | 2001/2002 | 2002/2003 |
|                                         | £                  | £         | £         | £         | £         |
| <b><u>Under £35,000</u></b>             |                    |           |           |           |           |
| No of Companies assessed                | 197                | 262       | 329       | 351       | 278       |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 461K               | 515K      | 767K      | 824K      | 695K      |
| Total paid                              | 438K               | 479K      | 729K      | 768K      | 646K      |
| <b><u>Over £35,000</u></b>              |                    |           |           |           |           |
| No of Companies assessed                | 63                 | 73        | 96        | 103       | 100       |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 5.3M               | 7.5M      | 10.2M     | 10.1M     | 10.6M     |
| Total paid                              | 5.2M               | 7.5M      | 10.1M     | 10.0M     | 10.4M     |

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

**Under £35,000**

|                                         |    |    |    |    |      |
|-----------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|------|
| No of Companies assessed                | 6  | 9  | 6  | 6  | 1    |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 3K | 6K | 3K | 4K | 0.2K |
| Total paid                              | 3K | 6K | 3K | 3K | 0.2K |

**Over £35,000**

|                                         |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| No of Companies assessed                | 9    | 20   | 23   | 16   | 4    |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 852K | 1.7M | 1.4M | 856K | 164K |
| Total paid                              | 852K | 1.7M | 1.4M | 672K | 96K  |

ORAL

NO 1450 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government explain why only 29 qualifying companies were assessed for company tax for the tax year 1998/1999 by January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1451 to 1454 of 2004.



ORAL

NO 1451 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government explain why only 46 qualifying companies were assessed for company tax for the tax year 1999/2000 by January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1450 and 1452 to 1454 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1452 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government explain why only 47 qualifying companies were assessed for company tax for the tax year 2000/2001 by January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1450 to 1451 and 1453 to 1454 of 2004.

ORAL

NO 1453 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government explain why only 13 qualifying companies were assessed for company tax for the tax year 2001/2002 by January 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1450 to 1452 and 1454 of 2004.

**NO 1454 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government explain why only five qualifying companies were assessed for company tax for the tax year 2002/2003 by January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am advised by the Commissioner of Income Tax that as at the end of December 2003, all Qualifying companies that required the issue of an assessment for any of the years of assessment 1998/1999, 1999/2000 and 2000/2001 had had an assessment raised.

As at the same date the issue of estimated 2001/2002 assessments was delayed and the issue of estimated 2002/2003 assessments was, following departmental practice, not yet due. Estimated assessments are issued in cases where financial accounts are not submitted to the Income Tax Office and the Commissioner is of the opinion that a company may be in receipt of taxable profits.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1450 TO 1454 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The figures that I have quoted are the figures from the answer provided to Question No. 552 of 2004, which is the equivalent of the information I have been given in this House, where the figures may have gone up, but at that time, if they had all been assessed on that date as we have just been told, then presumably there will be no difference in the numbers that I have been given today compared to the numbers that I was given in January. In answer to a previous question he said that the Tax Office considered there were 85 Qualifying Companies trading. Well, there are not 85 in any year either in the answer he gave me in January or in the answer he has given me today.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Indeed, if what the hon Member wants to do is try to reconcile the number of assessments raised with the number of companies with qualifying status, it is not an exercise that would be constructive for him to try. There are, as he says,

approximately 100 I cannot remember the figure in the answer I gave him earlier in this meeting, companies with qualifying status. The Tax Office nevertheless raises assessments only on those companies that to the best of its knowledge have taxable profits.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. So there must be a reason why they thought there were 47 of those in 2001 and only 13 in 2002.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The issue of estimated 2001/2002 assessments and 2002/2003 assessments on those qualifying companies that have not submitted accounts will be undertaken shortly.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I could understand it if in fact there was an indication here that if the ones that had submitted accounts is less, the ones who have been assessed for not submitting accounts was higher, but that is not the pattern in the answers he has given me. The pattern shows that, and if I may remind the Chief Minister, although we have had a figure of qualifying companies that were trading which was over 100, but what he said was that the ones that the Tax Office considered to be trading, and that actually means actually making money, was 85, that was the figure he gave me in answer to an earlier question. That the Tax Office treated 85 of them as actually trading and therefore, although I was relating I must say, the figures I have been given to the 147. Even when we relate it to the 85, in the information he has provided today for example, in 2001 we have 29 that made returns and 29 that did not make returns. There is another lot that either did not make it or made it. I would have thought they would have to fall into one or the other, they make it or they did not make it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. Of the ones who make returns, of course there may not be an assessment because they may show no profit. Not all qualifying companies are profitable. I happen to know that quite a lot of resource goes into the administration of this area of tax, because they think there are companies that if there is something to be paid would pay quickly and it is not for me to defend the nitty gritty of the tax administration system, but it seems to me that companies fall into three categories. They could be those who submit returns showing a profit, which would then be assessed because there will be something payable. Those who submit a return, accounts rather, showing a loss, in which case there is nothing to assess. Or those that have a qualifying certificate but do not submit returns. Now, that last category may include two types of company. It may include companies that are active, either profitably or unprofitably, we do not know, and who simply default in submitting a return. The only reason why they have qualifying status is usually for some overseas tax planning purpose and it would be very unusual that such a company would prejudice that to save themselves tax, which in any case he has volunteered to pay. Otherwise he would have applied for exempt status. The third category could then include companies who do not submit accounts and are not trading and are defunct

and the system has not yet recognised the fact that they are defunct, but it is highly unlikely that somebody liable to pay money into the coffers, does not do so. Remember these guys are doing this voluntarily, they could be on a certificate that requires them to pay nothing, namely an exempt certificate. There are a few exceptions to that obviously. There are a couple of local trading companies with qualifying status that do not fall into that generic description.

ORAL

**NO 1455 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government confirm that the answer given to Question No 555 of 2004 regarding the difference in the number of total companies and those liable to tax, also applies to the number of companies since 1988/1989 given in answer to Question Nos 552, 553 and 554 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I can provide the hon Member the confirmation he requires on the assumption that the reference to 1988/1989 in the question is a typographical error, and that the correct year is 1998/1999.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1455 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO. 1456 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – HOMES FOR THE ELDERLY**

Can Government state if it is their intention to begin constructing the second home for the elderly, similar to Bishop Canilla, in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Government expect the construction contract tender to be awarded this calendar year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1456 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could I ask the hon Minister for Housing if this contract refers specifically to Bishop Canilla House and not necessarily to the homes for the elderly that are being planned on The Sands near the Coach Park?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I notice a bit of confusion in the hon Member's question. This is a particular Bishop Canilla style for senior citizens adjacent to The Sands plot of land on the other side of the road.



**NO. 1457 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ALLOCATION PROCEDURES**

Can Government state if it is their view that there is a need to introduce changes to the housing allocation procedures that will improve the system?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Yes, Government expect to make an announcement of major reforms during the remainder of this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1457 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I trust that these reforms will see the light of day. I know that it is not an easy issue but I do believe that during the course of the tenure of office of the GSD administration there have been many promises made, and many statements made about schemes and so forth, I do hope, for the benefit of many, many people on the housing waiting list, that these reports will materialise into actual solutions to the problem. Are the Government not aware of the problems we have had?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I do not quite clearly see the actual question itself. However, the fact of the matter is that in the last four years there already have been changes to the allocation rules, but as my main answer referred to, the Government propose to do major reforms in terms of the housing allocation rules and indeed of the Ordinance.

ORAL

**NO. 1458 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many of the 24 applicants that were identified as medically categorised in answer to Question 587.2004, have now been allocated homes, giving a breakdown of their medical category and date of completion?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 1459 of 2004.

**NO. 1459 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many applicants on the housing waiting list are medically recommended, giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

In answer to Question No. 1458, three applicants in the medical 'A' list have been allocated a flat since March 2004 as follows: two in April and one in July.

In answer to Question No. 1459, a total of 21 applicants are on the housing waiting list and medically categorised as follows:

|             |   |   |
|-------------|---|---|
| Medical 'A' | - | 5 |
| Medical 'B' | - | 7 |
| Medical 'C' | - | 9 |

ORAL

**NO. 1460 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the housing waiting list to date, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 1461 of 2004.

**NO. 1461 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the pre-list for housing to date, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The number of applicants on the housing waiting list to date is 540, broken down by flat requirement as follows:

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 1RKB | - | 279 |
| 2RKB | - | 55  |
| 3RKB | - | 128 |
| 4RKB | - | 68  |
| 5RKB | - | 9   |
| 6RKB | - | 1   |

In answer to Question No. 1461, the number of applicants on the pre-list to date is 545, broken down by flat requirement as follows:

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 1RKB | - | 347 |
| 2RKB | - | 39  |
| 3RKB | - | 110 |
| 4RKB | - | 44  |
| 5RKB | - | 3   |
| 6RKB | - | 2   |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1460 AND 1461 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is the Minister aware that the numbers are increasing and not decreasing?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes, I am aware.

ORAL

**NO. 1462 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PENSIONER EXCHANGE LIST**

In answer to Question No. 578 of 2004 this House was informed that, as at the end of March 2004, there were 275 applicants on the Pensioner Exchange List. Can Government state how many exchanges have now been completed for these applicants, giving details of room composition and date of completion?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Five applicants on the Pensioner Exchange List have been allocated a flat as follows:

|          |   |                                 |
|----------|---|---------------------------------|
| 3 x 2RKB | - | 1 in March and 2 in September   |
| 2 x 1RKB | - | 1 in September and 1 in October |

**NO. 1463 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ASSET REGISTER**

Can Government state if the Asset Register mentioned in answer to Questions 570 and 571 of 2004 concerning properties on the voids list, has now been completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1463 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Does the Minister have any idea as to when it will be completed, because in answer to the questions that I put to him in the last House, information could not be provided to the Opposition because of the Asset Register not being ready?

**HON J J NETTO:**

I do not think that is quite accurate and probably if the hon Member looks to Hansard, he will probably find that I gave an exhaustive explanation as to what really is the function of the Asset Register. That said, I have to once again, I suppose, say that the database for the Asset Register is currently being established by carrying out internal and external surveys of Government properties. This will however be on an on-going process and will never really be completed as it will have to be reviewed on a continuous basis to keep it up to date through the passage of time. Ministry for Housing personnel carrying out duties which are then recorded in the survey for the Asset Register do not only perform this function. Such staff are also engaged in the production of Government tenders, monitoring of contracts, technical advice to Buildings and Works on an on-going basis.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say how far they have gone in the Asset Register the first time round? Presumably, from the answer he has given, when they finish the lot they will go back again but, how have they gone in the first attempt?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Standing as I am in the House, I can recall some conversations which I have had with the person in charge of this particular unit, and I think a high level of external surveys, something to the tune of about 80 per cent of external surveys have been carried out, but the hon Opposition Member should not rush to conclusions very easily, in the sense that it does therefore follow that given the speed of doing the external surveys that the internal surveys will be as quick, because it all depends on the state of the property, what particular type of survey, and there are surveys which one can do for half an hour and then there are dilapidated surveys which I understand are very time consuming. So, the hon Member should not rush in that particular sense. I have always said in these kinds of debate, and I have said it a lot of times in this House, doing an Asset Register of Government properties, which we are talking about being the largest landlord in Gibraltar, is not something that one can do in five minutes, nor in three months, nor even a year. I think Hansard will show that I have said on many occasions that to do a proper Asset Register, as explained to me, will take a number of years actually, to take it to the level and the degree that it ought to be done. Hopefully, once it is done, it is not only important for the Government to be able to say this is the state of our property, but indeed some of the other things which we have seen year after year, after year in terms of when Principal Auditors have submitted their accounts here, like I think today has been the case, that historically speaking we have never been able to reconcile much of the problem that we have. That is another element of doing the Asset Register but not the only part.

ORAL

**NO. 1464 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – POST-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many of the 52 post-war flats that were identified as vacant, in answer to Question 568/2004, have been allocated, giving details of room composition and date of allocation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1465 and 1466 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1465 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many of the 35 pre-war flats that were identified as empty, in answer to Question 567/2004, have been allocated, giving details of room composition and date of allocation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1464 and 1466 of 2004.

**NO. 1466 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war housing units have been allocated during the months of May, June, July, August and September of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Since 1<sup>st</sup> March 2004 a total of 34 post-war flats have been allocated as follows:

|           |   |    |
|-----------|---|----|
| March     | - | 10 |
| April     | - | 4  |
| May       | - | 6  |
| June      | - | 6  |
| August    | - | 3  |
| September | - | 5  |

The room composition is as follows:

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 1RKB | - | 6  |
| 2RKB | - | 12 |
| 3RKB | - | 10 |
| 4RKB | - | 6  |

In relation to the answer to Question Nos. 1465 and 1466, since 1<sup>st</sup> March 2004 a total of 21 pre-war flats have been allocated as follows:

|           |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|
| March     | - | 9 |
| April     | - | 5 |
| May       | - | 3 |
| June      | - | 3 |
| September | - | 1 |

The room composition is as follows:

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 1RKB | - | 2  |
| 2RKB | - | 12 |
| 3RKB | - | 5  |
| 4RKB | - | 2  |

In relation to Question Nos. 1464 and 1465, the computerised updates change on a regular basis and, therefore, since previous addresses were not administratively kept at the time, it follows that without such information the dates and corresponding properties are unavailable.

**NO. 1467 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state the result of the discussions with the Union regarding the move into a proposed Authority for the Buildings and Works Department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Such discussions are on-going.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1467 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Could the Minister provide a date by which he considers they could be finalised?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No, there is not such a date as to when they should be finalised. As I said, the discussions are on-going, I think for the time being they are going well, but for any person who has got experience in dealing with industrial relation matters through negotiations, they will know that just because negotiations are going well it does not mean that they will end well. All I am saying is that they are on-going and apparently, at the moment they are going well.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

How often are these discussions taking place? Are they taking place once a week, once a month, quarterly?

**HON J J NETTO:**

The negotiations are not going by way of weekly, quarterly or monthly. We have had a number of meetings and more meetings are envisaged in the future.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have any proposals been put to the workforce for them to vote on?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Not yet.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think we should be clear about that. It depends whether for them to vote on is the purpose of the question. The Government have tabled proposals to the workforce. The Union has not yet invited the workforce to vote on them. If I could just de-segregate the two parts of the Question to make sure the answer is not misleading.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The proposals are in the hands of the Union but the membership have not yet been consulted on it, as far as Government are concerned.

**HON J J NETTO:**

That is correct.

ORAL

**NO. 1468 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state how many of the persons who applied for the vacancy of (a) carpenters; and (b) masons in the Buildings and Works Department were registered as unemployed with the ETB at the time of their application?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1469 to 1474 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1469 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government confirm that all applicants for the vacancies of carpenters and masons in the Buildings and Works Department were persons resident in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1468 and 1470 to 1474 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1470 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDAL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state of the persons who applied for the vacancies of (a) carpenters; and (b) masons in the Buildings and Works Department in June, how many had the qualifications specified in (i) apprenticeship or (ii) (a) NVQ2 in plumbing or wall and floor tiling or (b) seven years experience as masons within the building trade in Gibraltar or (iii) NVQ level 2 in carpentry and joinery and in each case give a breakdown by nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1468, 1469 and 1471 to 1474 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1471 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state how many vacancies of (a) carpenters and (b) masons in the Buildings and Works Department were open to applicants in May 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1468 to 1470 and 1472 to 1474 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1472 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state how many applications were received for the post of (a) carpenters and (b) masons in the Buildings and Works Department by the closing date of 11<sup>th</sup> June 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1468 to 1471, 1473 and 1474 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1473 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state how many of the applicants for the vacancies of (a) carpenters and (b) masons in the Buildings and Works Department were successful and give the nationality of the successful applicants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1468 to 1472 and 1474 of 2004.

**NO. 1474 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS AND WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state how many of the applicants for the vacancies of (a) carpenters and (b) masons in the Buildings and Works Department were employed with (a) the MOD, (b) the Gibraltar Government owned joint venture companies, or (c) private sector employers, at the time of their applications?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 1468**

The number of persons registered as unemployed with the Employment Service was as follows:

- (a) masons – three; and
- (b) carpenters – three.

**Answer to Question No. 1469**

Only one Spanish applicant resident in Spain applied for the vacancy of mason; all the other applicants are resident in Gibraltar.

**Answer to Question No. 1470**

The information requested is as follows:

|                   |             | <b>British</b> | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>Portuguese</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Carpenters</b> | Ind App     | 11             |                |                   |                 |
|                   | NVQ Level 2 | 11             |                |                   |                 |
|                   |             |                |                |                   |                 |
| <b>Masons</b>     | Ind App     | 4              |                |                   |                 |
|                   | NVQ Level 2 | 5              |                |                   |                 |
|                   | 7 yrs exp   | 3              | 1              | 1                 | 3               |

**Answer to Question No. 1471**

There were three vacancies for carpenters and three vacancies for masons.

**Answer to Question No. 1472**

A total of 39 applications were received broken down as follows:

- (a) masons – 17; and
- (b) carpenters – 22.

**Answer to Question No. 1473**

Selection has not yet taken place.

**Answer to Question No. 1474**

|                   | <b>GOG</b> | <b>MOD</b> | <b>Joint Venture</b> | <b>Private Sector</b> | <b>Unemployed</b> |
|-------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Masons</b>     | -          | 1          | 2                    | 10                    | 4                 |
| <b>Carpenters</b> | 2          | 1          | 6                    | 9                     | 4                 |

**NO. 1475 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**HOUSING – SCAFFOLDING**

Can Government explain why scaffolding erected to paint and carry out repairs to blocks in Humphries and Varyl Begg Estates were recently removed before the works were apparently completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Scaffolding erected to carry out refurbishment works at Varyl Begg Estate was only removed on completion of the works. A similar situation applies in Alameda Estate.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1475 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can Government state whether they are aware that the expectations of the tenants of the flats the blocks at Varyl Begg Estate were not met. They had expectations of painting and repair works which were not carried out.

**HON J J NETTO:**

No such expectation has been manifested to the Ministry for Housing, neither to officials, neither to my knowledge and recollection by the Tenants Association. So I do not know what expectation the hon Member might individually have been brought to his notice.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I refer to representations which were made to me at Party Headquarters to the effect.



**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could the Minister for Housing answer me this question? Are the people engaged in putting up the scaffolding and removing scaffolding the same people who go to attend to peoples needs when there is a leak in a roof, or whether there is a problem in a house? I have got reports from people who have come to me with problems, with regards to difficulties they have in their homes, and in March of this year there is a letter from the Ministry for Housing which says that there were 986 cases on the list marked 'urgent'. So obviously there must be something wrong with the system.

**HON J J NETTO:**

The hon Member is confusing two separate issues. In relation to the scaffolding and to the works being referred to in the Question, this is by way of a contract. We are not talking about the works that BUILDINGS AND WORKS does. The contract at the moment is being carried out by GJBS. So therefore, it has got nothing to do with the work that BUILDINGS AND WORKS does. This is done by way of contract.

ORAL

**NO. 1476 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**MUSIC CENTRE**

Can Government state how much money has been given to date to the Music Centre at Straits – Vision House for its refurbishment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1495 and 1496 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1477 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state whether any progress has been made in relation to the Theatre Royal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1478 to 1482 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1478 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government say whether the EU money already obtained for the Theatre Royal Project will have to be returned until the project commences again in the future?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1477 and 1479 to 1482 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1479 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Will Government state how much has been spent to date on the Theatre Royal project and whether there is any current expenditure other than that given to the landlords on an annual basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1477, 1478 and 1480 to 1482 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1480 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state whether the contractors with the original contract will be completing the Theatre Royal project once Government commences it again or will Government re-advertise for new tenders?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1477 to 1479 and 1481 to 1482 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1481 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Will Government be re-altering the design of the Theatre Royal Project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1477 to 1480 and 1482 of 2004.

**NO. 1482 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Will Government state how long it will take before the Theatre Royal project is to recommence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

**In answer to Question Nos. 1477, 1480, 1481 and 1482:**

As already announced by the Government, the Theatre Royal Project is currently under suspension – the question of progress and all other such considerations do not therefore arise.

**In answer to Question No. 1478:**

No, Sir.

**In answer to Question No. 1479:**

The total amount spent to date on the Theatre Royal project is £3,161,895.97. No other expenditure, apart from the agreed rental to the landlord, is envisaged.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1477 TO 1482 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to Question No. 1478 the Minister just answered 'No, Sir'. No, Sir as to whether the money has to be returned, or whether the money has been lost. Can the Minister explain what he means as in 'No, Sir'?



**HON C BELTRAN:**

The money does not have to be returned.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Will Government be re-applying for more money, more funds, in order to complete the Theatre Royal?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Government will be applying for funds as and when it feels that it is necessary to do so in respect of this or any other project.

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to Question No. 1479, the Minister has just confirmed that to date we have spent £3.161 million. Can the Chief Minister then state whether he was either misleading the public or misleading this House when he announced in Viewpoint about two weeks ago that the Government had spent just over £2 million, when he knew when he answered the previous question that I posed here, that it was £3.63 million that was spent on the Theatre Royal?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot answer his question on a multiple choice basis if he is only going to give me the two choices that he has just described. In other words, to invite me to confirm whether I was misleading this House or the people of Gibraltar requires me to accept that I was misleading one or the other. The answer is that I was not doing either, and asked how much money has the Theatre Royal cost, my recollection is that I said over £2 million. Well, £3 million is over £2 million. If one imagines that these invoices come in from time to time, and I do not carry the actual project accounting on the back of my non-existent cigarette packet, the hon Member will realise that the fact that I give a figure which is actually accurate, an answer which is actually accurate, over £2 million, does not fall into either of the two categories that he has somewhat harshly offered me by way of choice.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Well, what was interesting at the time was that the question was not answered by the Minister for Culture, it was actually answered by the Chief Minister himself, who stated the actual amount that was spent. So he was quite misleading in the sense that he told this House that he had spent at the time, now it is over that, but at the time he had spent £3.063 million. That means £3,063,000. Then he goes on television saying just over £2 million. I am sure that either he lost his memory at the time or he was trying to mislead the public.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

At least he now offers me a third choice. A third, if he does not mind my saying, much more likely. Why he should think I would wish to misquote a figure, knowing that I am misquoting it having already put the correct figure in the public domain, if at least the hon Member could say that I knew privately what the right figure was and chose not to give it, then I suppose he could begin to spin his web of intrigue, but given as he quite rightly says I have already myself in this House publicly given the figure of just over £3 million, if several months later I get asked the question in a way for which I am unprepared and uncited and I give an answer which is correct in as far as it goes, then I think the hon Member might be willing, in one of his moments of greater generosity, to give me the benefit of the doubt as to the third option. In other words, it may be, if it is not more likely, that I simply did not recollect the right figure but that I knew the figure, rather than to suggest that I must have necessarily mislead one or the other or both. The answer is, one gets asked these things in a television programme, one does not have the information at ones fingertips and one gives the best answer one can, which was not inaccurate. Over £2 million includes the figure 'three'. Now, if I had remembered that it was £3,063,709.48, which is the figure I gave in the House, I would have given it. There is not a huge difference between the two amounts, for the purpose of the political point that the hon Member is making, which is as I understand it to be, that the Government have spent a considerable amount of money on the project which it has now placed in suspension. I accept and acknowledge and admit that, and the strength of his point, whatever it might be, does not turn on whether it is over £2 million or £3,023,000.40.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I just put it to him that I think he was trying to hide the real figure from the public when he was trying to announce it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The real figure was published in the Gibraltar press when I gave it openly in this House. How could I possibly be trying to conceal the figure? I had already given it publicly.

**NO. 1483 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GOVERNMENT LOTTERY**

Can Government state whether they have now decided on any changes to the structure of the lottery?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The recommendations given to Government so far do not highlight the need for any particular major change to the structure of the Lottery. No major change is therefore envisaged at the moment. The on-going discussions with the Lottery Committee, the Treasury and the Lottery Agents have however, highlighted the desirability for changes to the marketing strategy that may improve sales. A number of such measures have been agreed and are being implemented.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1483 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is the Minister willing to share these recommendations with this side of the House?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, by all means. We are talking about ideas such as initial changes to include a new logo to be displayed by all agents and sub-agents, in order to clearly identify sales outlets, or a sales drive to promote the reserving of particular numbers, is one idea that has been mooted, perhaps linked to the customer car registration numbers and advertising material to ensure that the public is aware of the sales of lottery draws, location of main agents and such like.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I am obliged to the Minister.

ORAL

**NO. 1484 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether any agreement has been reached with the Union as to the transfer of staff to the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1485 and 1486 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1485 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**VICTORIA STADIUM – NEW SPORTS HALL**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether the new Sports Hall will be fully operational by this Autumn?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1484 and 1486 of 2004.

**NO. 1486 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**VICTORIA STADIUM – HOCKEY PITCH**

Can the Minister for Sport confirm that the unresolved issues for the recruitment of adequate permanent staff is affecting the upkeep and maintenance routines of the water-based hockey pitch?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The question gives the false impression that there exist “issues” which remain unresolved. The new sports facilities will be run, serviced and maintained by employees of the Gibraltar Sports Authority. In any case, the upkeep and maintenance of the pitch are unaffected.

As regards the new Sports Hall, Government are aiming to open this facility as soon as possible.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1484 TO 1486 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Perhaps the Minister can be a little bit more specific when he says as soon as possible, because I recall and I have taken note of what he said during his Budget speech, when he said that the Sports Hall will be fully operational by this autumn. Can he confirm that? That is what he said in his Budget speech.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, I can confirm that but autumn is not over yet.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When he said 'this autumn' I mean this autumn, we were in autumn already. Can he confirm that this is about to open and be fully operational?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I do not think I said by the beginning of autumn, I said by the autumn, the autumn is still on.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So when does the Minister consider the autumn to be finished?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Well, I hate to give dates but I think that autumn is generally recognised as finished by 21<sup>st</sup> December I believe.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So what he is saying is that it will be fully operational by 21<sup>st</sup> December.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, that is what the hon Member is saying. I saying during the autumn, or before. I am not sure, works go on, there are minor works, one has to make sure that all these sports fittings are correctly fitted, not least for health and safety reasons, I am sure all agree, so this is on-going. We are aiming for that, but these are works and it is difficult to control some of these things. So I am saying in the autumn but the autumn is still here, it has not gone yet.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Except that I am only mentioning autumn because those were the precise words that the Minister used during his Budget speech. Therefore, I am making him accountable for what he said. Reference the other question which is related to the upkeep and the maintenance routine of the water-based pitch, could the Minister please confirm whether he is aware of public announcements that have been made to the effect that the new hockey pitch is being used regularly and unsolved issues such as the recruitment of adequate permanent staff are affecting the upkeep and maintenance routines. This has led to concern for some sportsmen and sportswomen. Does he agree with that statement?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I heard, I suspect she was listening but she has not heard my answer. In any case the upkeep and maintenance of the pitch are unaffected.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That is precisely why I have actually what has come out publicly, because he says they are unaffected, and what is being said publicly is that it is being affected. Can the Minister confirm when do the Government intend to recruit staff for facilities like for example, the water-based pitch and also the Sports Hall, which we hope will be open by 20<sup>th</sup> December, whether by then they will have recruited permanent staff for the running of these facilities?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

We expect to have staff in place by then. The Government are talking to the Unions about the conditions of employment and so on and this is the situation at the moment.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, but does the Minister not understand that we are talking about facilities, especially the water-based pitch and also the Sports Hall for which the Government have had ample time to employ people within the Gibraltar Sports Authority, and in fact it was the Chief Minister who said the following : *'the Sports Authority exists. The Government will proceed with the new facilities as soon as they are all ready in the Sports Authority with the new staff and that is not something that will be negotiated with the existing staff or anybody else'*. So therefore, what I am saying is, it appears that what the hon Member is saying is in conflict with what the Chief Minister said that the Government do not have to have the Authority, or the permission of the Government to employ people within the new facilities.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I have explained to the hon Lady on several occasions before, there are two exercises going on. One is the completion of the works in the new facilities, and they are still on-going, the administration block is still on-going, it has not been finished yet, part of them have been finished, the water-based pitch and the hall is more or less finished, although one end of it is a building site. All those facilities when they are ready will be run by the Gibraltar Sports Authority with new employees recruited directly by the Gibraltar Sports Authority. She is right in saying that that recruitment of staff has not yet commenced and I believe it is imminent. I think I recently saw papers that suggested that the job specifications and all that had now been agreed and the recruitment process for that is imminent. The second and separate issue which is where the negotiations with the Unions come in, is the question whether the existing staff and the existing facilities that they run are going to be injected into the Authority as well or not. Now, there is a slight connection between the two, even though I have just said that they are



unconnected, and that is that if the staff decides to join, if the second issue is positive. In other words, if existing staff and respectively the existing facilities are to join the Authority, that gives the Union an opportunity to influence the terms and conditions of employment of the Authority for the new employees, because it will obviously affect their transferring members if I could call it that. If they do not decide to go down that road, then there is nothing to negotiate with the Union. It is a new employer recruiting new employees and that new employer will decide for itself what the terms and conditions of employment are. We have been holding back the recruitment for the Authority employees, because if the existing staff are to join, then we need to make sure that the terms and conditions that are coordinated. Now, it is true that we could have proceeded with the recruitment of the Authority employees some time ago. We have held back because whether or not the existing staff join or do not join affects the nature of the process of the terms and conditions that we offer the new employees. In other words, if they join they have got to be agreed with the Union and that will affect the new employees as well. If they are not going to join then there is no need to negotiate terms for new employees with the Union. That is why we have been holding up, to see which of the two ways we needed to go. I hope that clarifies the situation. The hon Lady is factually correct but it is not through idleness that the facts are as she describes them.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Just one more supplementary. Then that means that from now until the end of autumn the process will have to be accelerated.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We cannot hold back any longer to see whether the others join. We think we can wrap up the negotiations quite quickly with the others, so that in fact it is not going to affect, but because the project is now really complete, we need to get on with recruiting staff and therefore, we will now proceed whether or not we agree with the Union. I reckon if in two weeks from now we have not agreed with the Unions we may have to proceed anyway. Let me say that the terms and conditions are not unfamiliar to the Unions. They are terms and conditions which the Union have seen in other Authorities, so it is not a new process, but yes I agree with the hon Lady, as does my Colleague, that we cannot hold back any longer the recruitment for the Authority, it cannot be held up any longer by considerations whether the existing staff want to join. We have taken it to the wire basically.

ORAL

**NO. 1487 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH CONFERENCE CENTRE**

Will Government state how many functions have taken place at the Youth Conference Centre 2003 and 2004 and what were the nature of these functions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1488 to 1493 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1488 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH CLUBS**

Will Government state how many functions have taken place in Youth Clubs in 2003 and 2004 giving a breakdown by Youth club and what were the nature of these functions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1487 to 1493 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1489 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state how many Youth Programmes of a general nature are currently being run by the Youth Service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1487 to 1493 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1490 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state how many Educational Programmes are currently being run by the Youth Service?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1487 to 1493 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1491 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state how many young people are taking part in Educational Programmes currently being run by the Youth Service giving a breakdown by programme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1487 to 1493 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1492 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state how many Educational youth trips have been organised by the Youth Service in 2003 and 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1487 to 1493 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1493 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Can Government state what are the ages of the young people participating in Youth Programmes provided by the Youth Service giving a breakdown by programme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

the Youth Service and its Youth clubs organise and run a series of programmes, functions, activities and trips which are primarily of an educational nature and are deemed by the users to be of interest and value whilst also being generally fun and entertaining. These programmes consist of a combination of these elements, that is to say, of educational and general interest.

I now hand the hon Member schedules with the statistical information he is requesting.



**Answer to Question No. 1493 of 2004**

Answer to Question Nos. 1487, 1488 and 1489 of 2004

**USE OF YOUTH CONFERENCE CENTRE**

In 2003 the Youth Conference Centre was used as follows:

Mondays to Fridays 9am to 1pm - St Theresa's nursery (Excl school & Public holidays)

-----

**Evenings and Weekends**

|                                        |            |                                           |
|----------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------------|
| By Government youth clubs              | 9 times    | Members meetings and project work         |
| By Cheshire Home groups                | 4 times    | Group work and preparatory meetings       |
| By Youth Service staff                 | 7 times    | Induction and training sessions           |
| By other Government department         | 2          | Training, informative, induction          |
| By Community groups                    | 23         | Committee and public meetings             |
| By Sports Associations                 | 9          | Committee, training and general           |
| By Counselling groups                  | 9          | Training, information and general         |
| By Cultural, drama and interest Groups | 34         | Rehearsals, information and general       |
| By Mother Theresa's group (on-going)   | 44         | Educational, handicrafts and occupational |
| Total                                  | <u>141</u> | Sessions                                  |

Until the end of September 2004, the Youth Conference Centre was used as follows:

Mondays to Fridays 9am to 1pm - St Theresa's nursery (Excl school & Public holidays)

**Evenings and Weekends**

|                                        |            |                                           |
|----------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------------|
| By Government youth clubs              | 9 times    | Members meetings and project work         |
| By Cheshire Home groups                | 4 times    | Group work and preparatory meetings       |
| By Youth Service staff                 | 4 times    | Induction and training sessions           |
| By other Government departments        | 15         | Training, informative, induction.         |
| By Community groups                    | 6          | Committee, training and general           |
| By Sports Associations                 | 9          | Committee, training and general           |
| By Counselling groups                  | 21         | Training, information and general         |
| By Cultural, drama and interest Groups | 29         | Rehearsals, information and general       |
| By Mother Theresa's group (on-going)   | 27         | Educational, handicrafts and occupational |
| Total                                  | <u>141</u> | Sessions                                  |

Cont.....

**YOUTH SERVICE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES, FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES –  
2003/2004**

**Dolphins Youth Club 2003**

Trip to Sierra Nevada – Club Graffiti project – Fun day – Visit Lower St Michael's Cave – Cable-skiing – Ride in Police Launch – Visit local places of worship – Ten pin bowling – Fund-raising raffle – GBC open day.

**Dolphins Youth Club 2004**

Barcelona project – Indoor club redecoration project – Aqua park/Tivoli world – Cable skiing  
(Club closed during summer months for complete refurbishment, new "safety" net for patio)

Note: The Youth Worker based at Dolphins youth club has also been instrumental in developing two summer projects involving under 12's.

In 2003 Jungle Jam – recycling of waste products to create a Jungle full of animals

In 2004, Recycle the Rock – using used paper to create a model of "The Rock".

There were also a number of meetings with the neighbouring Tenants Associations, user groups who were given access to the club patio for supervised play and sports.

The full time Youth Worker was responsible for the Women's Issues group. (Cyprus)

**Youth Centre 2003**

Three kings floats – St Valentine's Disco – Planning of trip to Sierra Nevada – Hosted a group from Sweden

Fund raised for Cancer – Women in need awareness campaign – Beauty and health programme

Regular discos – Planning for trip to Aqua Park/Tivoli – Verbena for elderly people – Christmas preparations.

**Youth Centre 2004**

Three kings floats – On-going discos – Darts competition with local association – Computer and I.T link – Cooking programme – Planning trip to Aqua park/Tivoli – Foam parties – Verbena for elderly people – Club BBQ –

(Club was closed for one month for some refurbishment)

The full time Youth Worker was responsible for Rock Solid Conference.

**Laguna Youth Club 2003**

Planning for trip to Sierra Nevada – Regular discos – Club fishing outing – Club BBQ –  
Trip to Aqua park/Tivoli  
Participation in Election '03 Programme – Visit to Lower St Michael's Cave

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1493 of 2004**

**Laguna Youth Club 2004**

Cooking project – Outdoor refurbishment programme of ball playing area – Graffiti project – Collage – Planning for trip to Sierra Nevada – Club members disco – Planning for club outing to Tarifa & Cinecity – Computer and Internet link – Election '03 Project.

**Plater Youth Club 2003**

Anti-bullying programme – Planning for trip to Sierra Nevada – Parental involvement – Cooking project  
Collecting for charity – Fishing outing – Club BBQ – General knowledge treasure hunt  
Residential “La Jarandilla” – Election '03 – Member participation

**Plater Youth Club 2004**

Trip to St Michael's Cave – Football tournament – Planning for trip to Aqua park/Tivoli – Fishing outing – UNICEF project – Visit by British Forces Youth Club – Parental involvement – Member participation

-----

The whole Youth Service was involved in the running of the Youth Pavilion at the fair and the Rock Solid Conference programmes

-----

At all the clubs it is normal for sessions also to include facilities which are made use of as part of the above programmes, activities and functions, to provide for the educational but also fun elements of these. Generally these are demand led by the users themselves. On occasions, therefore, games sessions are programmed. These could be sporting or related to music, the internet et cetera; for which facilities are made available and trained staff supervision is provided.

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1493 of 2004**

**Answer to Question Nos. 1490 and 1491/2004**

|                                                    |           |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Barcelona programme and visit                      | 4 youths  |
| Womens issues programmes and trip to Cyprus        | 5 youths  |
| Active Citizenship Programme and visit to Brussels | 10 youths |

**Answer to Question No. 1492/2004**

**2003**

Trip to Sierra Nevada  
Visit to Barcelona  
Active Citizenship Programme and visit to Brussels  
La Jarandilla  
Womans Issues Programme

**Answer to Question No. 1493/2004**

The ages of the regular users of each of the four youth clubs participating in the programmes vary but are all within the 12 to 18 year age group.

|                          |   |      |                                        |
|--------------------------|---|------|----------------------------------------|
| Plater youth programme   | - | (33) | 18 girls and 15 boys aged 13 to 18 yrs |
| Dolphins youth programme | - | (26) | 14 girls and 12 boys aged 13 to 18 yrs |
| Laguna youth programme   | - | (48) | 24 girls and 24 boys aged 12 to 18 yrs |
| Youth Centre programme   | - | (20) | 9 girls and 11 boys aged 12 to 17 yrs  |

These figures do not reflect occasional users and those young people who attend/participate in events such as discos, fund-raising or outings.

**NO. 1494 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE**

Will Government state how much money has gone missing within the Youth Service this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

As a result of two burglaries a total of £5,584 were stolen from the Youth Service. The matter is under police investigation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1494 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

When was it the Youth Workers realised that there was money missing, because you have stated that there was a break-in, and my subsequent question which I will put together was, I was going to say whether there had been a break-in and whether the premises had gone through substantial damage because of the break-in?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member I am sure will understand that both of those issues touch upon things that may arise in the police investigation, and it really would not be appropriate. I think the hon Member might be willing to exchange views with him on that issue privately to give whatever information he knows but I do not think it would be appropriate to answer those two questions, both of which may become relevant in an investigation.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I accept that answer.

ORAL

**NO. 1495 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**MUSIC CENTRE**

Can Government state who is currently running the Music Centre at Straits Vision House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1476 and 1495 of 2004.

**NO. 1496 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**MUSIC CENTRE**

Can Government state who are the trustees of the Music Centre at Straits Vision House and when were they appointed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

A total of £53,000 has been allocated towards renovation and refurbishment works for the Gibraltar Music Centre at the former BFBS Building.

The Gibraltar Music Centre is run by its Trustees. This Trust, which was set up in September 2002, is a charitable one (not one appointed by Government).

I hand the hon Member the current composition of the Trust.

The composition of the Trust is as follows:

Mrs Lynn Griffith – Chairperson  
His Lordship the Bishop the Right Reverend Monsigneur Caruana  
Mr Solomon Levy  
Mr David Dumas  
Mr Jason Bellilo  
Mr Eric Ellul  
Mr Oliver Reed  
Mr Wayne Smith

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 476, 1495 AND 1496 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I appreciate the answer from the Minister. He has stated the amount allocated, he has stated the fact that there are Trustees, he has given me the list of Trustees, but one question which I think has been omitted is the fact that who is currently running it. Is it



the actual Trustees that run it or is it a person that the Trustees have contracted to manage?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Trustees.

**NO. 1497 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**WORLD HERITAGE STATUS**

On what date was the Government advised of Spanish objections to Gibraltar's bid for World Heritage Status and what is the current position on this application?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Government was informed of Spanish objections on 27 July 2000.

The current status of the bid is that the Gibraltar Government are continuing to develop their conservation programme and management plan for the long term protection of their important heritage assets. This is being done both as a requirement of the World Heritage Bid and also as a means of ensuring the long term protection of our Heritage. When the Gibraltar Government feel ready to proceed on this basis they will inform the United Kingdom Government accordingly and seek a slot for nomination. In the meantime, the Gibraltar Government will continue to liaise closely with the Gibraltar Heritage Trust in all matters of mutual interest.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1497 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does that mean the application then has been withdrawn and is not there at the moment?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The application is still there. I think the hon Member refers to the in principle agreement that exists with the State Party, the United Kingdom in this case, to nominate Gibraltar. There is an in principle agreement but no date has been finalised. We are working on specifications of the property to be nominated and the site management plan. This is the situation at the moment.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister clarify then what exactly Spain object to?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is no application as such. It is just that this precedes the hon Member's responsibilities for these matters. The United Kingdom has a prospective list of sites, and under current rules is allowed to put up one site from its prospective list by way of formal application per year, one site per year. So the question is at what stage do they give Gibraltar the berth. We are on that prospective list, we are on the UK prospective list. The question is in which year do we allow or ask the UK to allow Gibraltar to occupy its slot from its list. That is the issue that we have not yet finally made a decision on. The United Kingdom is willing to use one of its slots for Gibraltar. This is not one of the cases where because of the Spanish concern the United Kingdom is resigning from its willingness. Actually, we have a slight concern that if we allow Gibraltar to be nominated as a whole, the whole of Gibraltar as opposed to individual sites in Gibraltar, I have a concern which I have asked for a satisfaction on, on whether this might affect future development, both commercial and housing developments. In other words, what burdens, what restrictions does designating the whole of Gibraltar as a heritage site place on future development projects as opposed to just designated. For example, the King's Bastion or Moorish Castle which may have restrictions in relation to developments affecting the character of that site. Well, it seems to me that there is a big difference between agreeing to curtail your development possibilities around a particular site than restricting the development potential about the whole of Gibraltar because if one cannot alter the character of a designated site, and the designated site is the whole of Gibraltar, then technically anything that one does is capable of being argued and the question then still is open whether we go ahead with Gibraltar as a whole site, or whether rather instead of that go to a system whereby several sites in Gibraltar are designated, rather than Gibraltar as a whole. We are very anxious, not for insufficient gain, to curtail the liberty and the freedom of future governments, indeed the future freedom of this Government and also the freedom of future governments, to ensure Gibraltar's economic development through infrastructure and physical developments.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am grateful to the Chief Minister for the explanation that he has given, but my supplementary was what exactly did Spain object to then? Was it to our inclusion in the UK list?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, the Minister for Art at the time Alan Howarth, in a letter to Keith Azopardi in July 2000, stated and I quote "*I can confirm that the Spanish Ambassador at UNESCO has expressed his Government's concerns at the inclusion of the Fortress of Gibraltar in the UK's tentative list of prospective sites for their British counterpart David Stanton*".

**NO. 1498 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ART ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government state how many times the Art Advisory Council has met in 2003 and 2004 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Art Advisory Council met once in 2003 and a meeting has for some time now been scheduled to take place in mid October 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1498 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

As a clarification, could the Minister please answer the second part 2004? He said once in 2003.....

**HON C BELTRAN:**

A meeting has for some time now been scheduled to take place in mid October 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1499 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What is the cost to date, with a breakdown by event, of the Tercentenary events that have taken place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

It has not been possible to collate the very considerable statistical information required to answer this question. I shall endeavour to provide it to the hon Member within seven days.

ORAL

**NO. 1500 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What is the total amount donated by private companies towards the Tercentenary events?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 1501 of 2004.

**NO. 1501 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NATIONAL DAY**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the Elton John concert held on National Day this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The total amount donated by private companies is £360,000.

The cost to Government of the Elton John Concert has been a contribution of \$600,000 and £34,000 apart from that, for the covering of the Stadium pitch. These costs have been almost totally covered by the donations or sponsorship of private companies. Everything else was covered by the promoters.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1500 AND 1501 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the two questions, the £360,000 donated by private companies, is the Minister saying that that was for the Elton John event, that donation?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, not necessarily. It is a general account for events.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether the \$600,000 were paid to the promoter, or were they paid to the artist?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government insisted that its contribution had to be used to make a payment directly to the artist so that if the concert did not take place for any reason that was the fault of the promoter, the monies would not have been in jeopardy.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Therefore, how did the promoter make any money from this event? Was it from the sale of tickets?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I assume, given that the concert was such a success, that he did make money. If the hon Member is asking the question mechanically, in other words, how did he make money? He made money from the proceeds of sale of tickets. It cost much more than this to lay on that concert and the proceeds of the sale of tickets were for the promoter. This was a Government contribution over and above ticket sale revenues.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Was it the case then that there was only one promoter for this event, or one company that was interested in being a promoter?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, only one promoter.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just to clarify, only one promoter was interested in bringing Elton John, or only one promoter was interested in bidding for the Tercentenary concert to be held on National Day?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Tercentenary concert did not go out to tender, proposals were put by different promoters as to who they thought they could bring to Gibraltar, and the Government chose that the artist rather than the promoter. In other words, the Government, I cannot remember the names now by my children know all of these things, an Irish girls group the name of which I now do not recall, and there was another chap called Bryan Adams and Elton John, and the Government took the view that Elton John had the biggest chance of appealing to the widest cross section of age groups and therefore we chose the promoter that was offering Elton John, because the other promoters could not have delivered the other artists.



ORAL

**NO. 1502 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY – COSTS**

Who was the successful tenderer in respect of Tercentenary promotional material, for what items and at what cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1503 and 1504 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1503 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY – COSTS**

How many parties submitted tenders for the supply of Tercentenary promotional material, who were they, what were the terms involved and what was the cost per item?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1502 and 1504 of 2004.

**NO. 1504 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY – COSTS**

How many parties submitted a tender for the organisation, production and staging of a local talent variety show and other entertainment on the eve of the Tercentenary (3<sup>rd</sup> August) and what was the amount bid by the successful tenderer?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

In answer to Question Nos. 1502 and 1503 no tender was allocated.

In answer to Question No. 1504, three parties submitted a tender. The amount bid by the successful tenderer, which was the lowest, was £44,250.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1502 TO 1504 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister, given that there was no tender for promotional material, have the Government secured promotional material without going out to tender, or is it that there is no promotional material?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, there has been no promotional material.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I should say to the hon Members that the Government will publish an account of the Tercentenary expenditure showing all the items, once the last event has taken place, showing how much of it falls net to be borne by taxpayers.

ORAL

**NO. 1505 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving social assistance for each month of the second quarter of 2004, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO 1505 OF 2004

PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE SECOND QUARTER 2004

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 2<br>2004 | Apr-04 | 176   | 263     | 439   | 59    | 145   | 106   | 129   |
|               | May-04 | 176   | 264     | 440   | 69    | 145   | 103   | 123   |
|               | Jne-04 | 183   | 272     | 455   | 72    | 145   | 109   | 129   |

ORAL

**NO. 1506 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state what is the criteria used to determine the eligibility of a disabled person to receive a disability allowance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 1507 of 2004.

**NO. 1507 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a disability allowance under the social assistance arrangements for each month of the second quarter of 2004, giving a breakdown of their sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1506**

As I have previously explained in reply to similar questions in this House, under the Social Assistance arrangements, a person is eligible to a disability allowance if that person has been permanently and severely disabled by a mental or physical disability from birth. However, the Director of Social Security has discretion to approve payment of this allowance, even if the applicant has not been severely and permanently disabled from birth. Each case is judged on its own merit.

**Answer to Question No. 1507**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Question 1507/2004**

**PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE 2ND QUARTER OF 2004**

| Months | 0-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 41-50 | 51-60 | 61-70 | Total | Male | Female |
|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|
| Apr-04 | 26   | 28    | 20    | 11    | 17    | 10    | 0     | 112   | 78   | 34     |
| May-04 | 27   | 28    | 20    | 11    | 17    | 10    | 0     | 113   | 78   | 35     |
| Jun-04 | 30   | 23    | 19    | 11    | 21    | 9     | 0     | 113   | 80   | 33     |



ORAL

**NO. 1508 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of the second quarter of 2004 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners showing the number of Gibraltar/UK Nationals, Moroccans and other nationalities for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No. 1508/2004**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from April 2004 – June 2004.

|                                         | <b>APR-04</b> | <b>MAY-04</b> | <b>JUN-04</b> |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</b>      | 6554          | 6536          | 6515          |
| <b>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</b> | 4890          | 4885          | 4897          |
| <b>Moroccan Pensioners</b>              | 1492          | 1501          | 1515          |
| <b>Other Nationalities</b>              | 404           | 407           | 411           |
| <b>Total</b>                            | <b>13340</b>  | <b>13329</b>  | <b>13338</b>  |

**NO. 1509 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month in the second quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month in the second quarter of 2004, are as follows:

|            |                   |
|------------|-------------------|
| April 2004 | £900,000          |
| May 2004   | £900,000          |
| June 2004  | £1,000,000        |
|            | <u>£2,800,000</u> |

ORAL

**NO. 1510 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the second quarter of 2004, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No. 1510/2004**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the second quarter of 2004, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish Workers and to pensioners from local funds is as follows:-

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFIT FUND**

|                                                       | <u>30-Apr-04</u>  | <u>31-May-04</u>  | <u>30-Jun-04</u>    |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account –<br/>Opening Balance</u></b>      | <u>£663,322</u>   | <u>£493,397</u>   | <u>£481,904</u>     |
| <br><b><u>“Local Account”</u></b>                     |                   |                   |                     |
| Opening Balance                                       | £18,656           | £27,798           | £28,940             |
| <br><b><u>Add</u></b>                                 |                   |                   |                     |
| Transfers from the<br>Open Long-Term<br>Benefits Fund | £900,000          | £900,000          | £1,000,000          |
| Other Receipts                                        | £2,263            | £1,960            | £2,592              |
|                                                       | <u>£920,919</u>   | <u>£929,758</u>   | <u>£1,031,532</u>   |
| <br><b><u>“Spanish Account”</u></b>                   |                   |                   |                     |
| Opening Balance                                       | £644,666          | £465,599          | £452,964            |
| <br><b><u>Add</u></b>                                 |                   |                   |                     |
| Receipts from DFID                                    | £140,000          | £180,000          | £1,170,000          |
|                                                       | <u>£784,666</u>   | <u>£645,599</u>   | <u>£1,622,964</u>   |
| <br><b><u>Less</u></b>                                |                   |                   |                     |
| Pension Payments                                      | <u>(£319,067)</u> | <u>(£192,635)</u> | <u>(£1,006,073)</u> |
| Closing Balance                                       | £465,599          | £452,964          | £616,891            |
| <hr/>                                                 |                   |                   |                     |
| <b><u>Fund Account<br/>Closing Balance</u></b>        | <u>£493,397</u>   | <u>£481,904</u>   | <u>£667,576</u>     |

ORAL

**NO. 1511 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the second quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No. 1511/2004**

**The Hon the Minister for Social and Civic Affairs**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the second quarter of 2004 is as follows:-

**OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

|                                                  | <b><u>30-Apr-04</u></b>   | <b><u>31-May-04</u></b>   | <b><u>30-Jun-04</u></b>   |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account –<br/>Opening Balance</u></b> | £11,726,379               | £11,528,904               | £11,220,084               |
| <u>Add</u>                                       |                           |                           |                           |
| Receipts                                         | £783,568                  | £689,511                  | £658,211                  |
|                                                  | £12,509,947               | £12,218,415               | £11,878,295               |
| Payments                                         | (£981,043)                | (£998,331)                | (£1,089,527)              |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>                    | <b><u>£11,528,904</u></b> | <b><u>£11,220,084</u></b> | <b><u>£10,788,768</u></b> |

ORAL

**NO. 1512 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the second quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information requested.



**Answer to Question No. 1512/2004**

**The Hon the Minister for Social and Civic Affairs**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Social Insurance (Short-Term Benefits) Fund in respect of each month of the second quarter of 2004, is as follows:-

**SOCIAL INSURANCE (SHORT-TERM BENEFITS) FUND**

|                                                  | <u>30-Apr-04</u> | <u>31-May-04</u> | <u>30-Jun-04</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account –<br/>Opening Balance</u></b> | £6,146,447       | £6,112,077       | £6,089,676       |
| <u>Add</u>                                       |                  |                  |                  |
| Receipts                                         | £43,727          | £40,254          | £38,942          |
|                                                  | <hr/> £6,190,174 | <hr/> £6,152,331 | <hr/> £6,128,618 |
| <u>Less</u>                                      |                  |                  |                  |
| Payments                                         | (£78,097)        | (£62,655)        | (£71,261)        |
|                                                  | <hr/> (£78,097)  | <hr/> (£62,655)  | <hr/> (£71,261)  |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>                    | <hr/> £6,112,077 | <hr/> £6,089,676 | <hr/> £6,057,357 |

**NO. 1513 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

How many elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

There are 94 elderly citizens awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia. 33 are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1513 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As I always go and look back at answers to questions, I have noticed that at the beginning of the year in answer to Question No. 56 of 2004, the Minister said and I quote "*the breakdown of months, age and sex by the hon Member will be forwarded to her as soon as the information has been completed*". I must be honest that I did not ask for that information but seeing that the Minister was so kind to say that she would provide it, is she still in a position to provide it as she said in answer to Question No. 56 of January 2004?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

As far as I am concerned and I can recall she did ask that specific question and it was provided. I am pretty sure it was but I will double check for her.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have looked at the question is exactly the same as the one which I have just asked, and I did not ask any supplementaries because I have checked, we already have

Hansard. Anyway, if she checks and goes back and sees that she has very kindly offered to provide it, will she provide it?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Certainly, but I am sure we did.

ORAL

**NO. 1514 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government state what part of the contract of the Elderly Care Agency with ADA Ltd stipulates a condition that all of ADA Ltd's employees must be qualified and what qualifications are required?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1515 to 1517 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1515 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

What is the experience that employees of ADA Ltd must have to meet the condition that if they are not qualified they must have "experience"?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1514 and 1516 to 1517 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1516 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government state when ADA Ltd opened the vacancies for carers with the ETB and which qualifications were required from prospective applicants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1514, 1515 and 1517 of 2004.

**NO. 1517 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Can Government explain whether the payment to ADA Company Limited by the Elderly Care Agency is for an hourly rate per carer provided and if so what was the hourly rate in 2003/2004 and what is it currently?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1514**

Clause 3 of the contract with ADA Ltd states: "All care workers will be expected to have qualifications or recognised experience in care of the elderly". The qualifications required are: Certificate of achievement in geriatric nurse auxiliary or clinic nurse auxiliary.

**Answer to Question No. 1515**

Recognised experience means that a care worker must have worked in a Care Home, Hospice or Hospital and this must be confirmed by the previous employer together with a reference.

**Answer to Question No. 1516**

ADA first opened vacancies with the ETB in February 2002. More vacancies have been opened to date, the last one being on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2004. The answer to the latter part of this question has already been provided in Question No. 1514 of 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 1517**

ADA is not paid on an hourly rate basis. There is a contract sum to provide a certain number of hours a year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1514 TO 1517 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably the contract sum for a certain number of hours a year is on a rate per hour?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, not necessarily.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister then tell me how many hours they are required to pay for the £160,000 we have got in the estimates and then I will work it out myself?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I will certainly do that. The contract provides 44 hours of care per day plus seven and a half hours daily on weekdays, that is a total of 18,010 hours per annum. But the hon Member must bear in mind that hourly rates differ, for example, if the carers work during the weekends.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

During the weekends it is seven and a half hours, is it?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, it is an extra seven and a half hours weekdays.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In relation to the qualifications we have been told that the Certificate of achievement or geriatric care or nursing auxiliaries. Given that most of the people who obtained employment with ADA were from Spain, what is the equivalent recognised qualification from Spain, given that so many of the employees hail from that territory?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I do not know the exact name of the equivalent, but I am aware that it is not possessed by anybody, at least any Gibraltarian who has applied for the post within ADA.



**HON F R PICARDO:**

Do the Spanish employees of ADA who have managed to obtain employment have that equivalent Spanish qualification or do they only have equivalent experience?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Actually the qualification is a Spanish qualification and for the purpose of the question we have translated it as best we can into English.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What is the English qualification which the Gibraltarians do not have then?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

That is what I have just said, that I am not aware of the qualification is or, indeed, whether it exists in Gibraltar or not.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact what we are being told is that in giving out this contract the Government put as a condition that they had to employ people who could only be Spanish because Gibraltarians do not have the certificate that was being asked for. It sound like that.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, it was the ECA not the Government, who sub-contracted to a company, albeit a Spanish one which was the only one who applied who had the requirements, and it is they who stipulated in the contract that they had to have either relevant qualifications or recognised experience, which I must say some Gibraltarians do have.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know it is the Elderly Care Agency which is a Statutory body of which the Minister is the Chairman, so it is not good giving the impression that we are talking about a third party which she has nothing to do with. What I am asking is if in fact it is either experience or a certificate and we are being told that nobody in Gibraltar can have that certificate because it is a certificate one obtains in Spain, and people with Gibraltarian qualifications or UK qualifications would not have it, and that it is for the benefit of the House that we have been given an English translation. In fact, when the vacancies were opened in February 2002, presumably none of the people who were registered unemployed could possibly apply for those vacancies other than they had some experience which presumably they were unlikely to have in Gibraltar if this was a new thing.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I have said that I am not aware if there is any sort of equivalent qualification in Gibraltar. It might be the case that there is. At this moment in time I am not aware, I can find out for the hon Member.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister know whether when the vacancies were opened in February 2002, ADA followed what seems to be the practice of 90 per cent of the employers which open vacancies, which is that they already had the people to fill the vacancies at the same time?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I would not know the answer to that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the purpose of the question is to see what opportunities for local employment have been created through this, would the Minister find out and let us know?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

What I can say is that when ADA first opened vacancies, as I say in the ETB in February 2002, they opened vacancies for carers for the company. It does not necessarily mean that those carers were used under the contract with ECA. ADA provides a service to the community at large, both privately and under contract with ECA. It might be that these particular vacancies were not for carers for the ECA.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. So in fact, then some of the people that are working for the Elderly Care Agency could have been in the employment of ADA when ADA was given the contract. Is that what the Minister is saying? They did not take people on to fulfil the contract necessarily.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, maybe ADA already had carers who were already registered in the ETB and I assume that when these vacancies came up, I do not believe that ADA already had sort of sufficient carers on the sidelines waiting for someone to take them on. I assume that vacancies were opened at that precise time as well.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes but given that we were told in a previous answer to a question from my hon Colleague that all the employees are Spanish, and that they residents in Spain, the Spanish residents in Spain to my knowledge are not normally registered with the ETB as unemployed in Gibraltar. If they are registered anywhere they would be registered on the other side, so they would not be able to find out about the vacancies of ADA in the ETB, because that is not where they go looking for work. So my question is, in fact, if the vacancies were opened for the purpose of registering the workers, is it that in fact they had the workers already and then they registered the vacancy and registered the contract, which is something a lot of employers do?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I can find out, I do not know the answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just on the question of this qualification. Is the Minister telling us that the contract between ADA and the ECA states only that workers, who work under that contract for the ECA through ADA, must have a qualification or recognised experience but that the contract does not actually itself provide what that qualification is, and that subsequently therefore, by agreement I suppose between the company and ECA, the qualification sought is this certificate of achievement, whatever it is in Spanish that has been kindly translated? That is the position?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes. The contract does not actually state what qualifications are required. It is ADA who stipulates the level of qualification that it requires for its employees.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

If the contract is with the ECA, what does the ECA want in respect of the people who are providing care to its clients so to speak?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

The proper qualifications or recognised experience.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Given that the ECA is a Gibraltarian body, what qualification of the United Kingdom or of Gibraltar does the Minister wish to see those individuals who work for her having, in order to take care of her clients, if I may call them that?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Whatever equivalent qualification exists in Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Equivalent to what?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Equivalent qualification to the standard that is provided by the employees of ADA, or required by them.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the standard being laid down by ADA or by the ECA?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

By ADA.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Can I just clarify? The contract is between ADA and the ECA. Now the domiciliary care is run by a Domiciliary Care Committee, who double check and are on top of every single carer. In fact they have the right, and they do, to check every single vacancy that comes out and to see the people that have applied whether they are up to scratch. That is something that they do, they are on top of all the carers that are employed by ADA.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If we ask the Government what is the requirement laid down by the Elderly Care Agency?, and we are told that the requirement laid down by the Elderly Care Agency is that people must have the qualification laid down by ADA. Is that the answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The position is that the Government have a contract with this company to provide the service, and that contract says in Clause 3 that all care workers will be expected to have qualifications or recognised experience in care for the elderly. ADA has decided what qualifications it is going to ask from its employees in order to satisfy that Clause, the qualifications part of it anyway. If what the hon Member is saying, as I understood him but I think I have already answered him off microphone, if he is getting at 'has the Elderly Care Agency itself sat down to define what qualifications it wants to enforce against ADA

under Clause 3', the answer is that I think it has not done that, but I think that it has just demanded qualifications and the contractor has in effect decided what the qualification is and the Elderly Care Agency appears to be content with that, but it is not their decision. One of the vacuums that there has historically been in Gibraltar is a failure to have specific qualifications in relation to social care of this sort. I suppose that will have to be looked at, but as far as we are aware, the Elderly Care Agency has not said to ADA, we require this, this or that qualification. The phrase 'or recognised experience' is precisely to allow, not to exclude Gibraltarians from access to ADA jobs, because Gibraltarians may have experience in care for the elderly even though they may not have qualifications.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Then the net result is that ADA might simply have come up with the qualification that their employees already happen to have, and said that is the standard that we want. So would it not be a good idea for the Elderly Care Agency itself to come to a view, as the customer, as to what it might want?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I think the position is that the Elderly Care Agency appears to be content with the standard of labour and qualifications, so I suppose it is just dedicating its management resources to other things, given that it is content with that, but that does not preclude them and I agree that with him should not preclude them, from exercising their own judgement as to what the correct qualifications are. These people may be over qualified or under qualified, I agree with him. I think the Chairman of the Elderly Care Agency, I am sure, will take our views into account.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Minister come back to this House at the next Question Time, or at any other time convenient perhaps write to us, to tell us what the determinations of the Elderly Care Agency are in that respect, to put our minds at rest?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister, the Chairman of the Elderly Care Agency, accounts to me not to the hon Opposition Member. If the hon Opposition Members wants to ask her a question in future to see whether the hon Lady has taken steps or has not taken steps, he is of course free to do that, but there is not question of the Minister committing herself to come back to report to this House. For a start there is no procedure of this House that enables her to do that. I suppose she could make a formal statement in the House but there is not really a Parliamentary procedure in response to this Question and Answer Session. I think that the hon Member should just remember to make a note at the next Question Time to ask as question that gets to the same point.

**NO. 1518 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can Government explain, if £500,000 had been spent on payment of the minimum income guarantee by December 2003, how is it that the cost for 12 months to March 2004 is £490,000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

It appears that in a supplementary question arising from Question No. 93 of 2004, the hon Member was given the erroneous impression that the figure of £500,000 was the cost until the end of December 2003. The figure was actually the estimated expenditure until the end of the financial year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1518 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was given the erroneous impression because I actually asked whether it was a projection or whether that was the money that was being spent, and I was told it was the money that had been spent. It was just that it was a mistake, is that it?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Well, I will rephrase. The hon Member was given an incorrect answer.

ORAL

**NO. 1519 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government provide a breakdown for the return of social insurance schedules as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004, in respect of each quarter since quarter 1/01, giving the number of employees in the private and official sectors and the self-employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 1520 of 2004.

**NO. 1520 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government provide a breakdown for the return of social insurance schedules as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004, in respect of each quarter since quarter 1/01, giving the numbers of employees in the private and official sectors and the self-employed, for persons entering insured employment in each such quarter?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1519**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No. 1520**

At present the DSS computer system cannot provide the information requested.



Answer to Question 1520

Answer to Question No 1519 of 2004

Social Insurance Returns as at 30 September 2004

| Qtr.      | All                           |         |            | Private |                                    |         | Official   |         |         | Self Employed |         |         |            |         |
|-----------|-------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|------------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|
|           | Number of<br>Employers<br>all | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Number of<br>Employers<br>returned | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Returns | Non-Return    | Pending | Returns | Non-Return | Pending |
| Qtr. 1/01 | 1252                          | 14738   | 784        | 482     | 1062                               | 9938    | 670        | 348     | 4241    | 85            | 38      | 559     | 29         | 96      |
| Qtr. 2/01 | 1262                          | 15121   | 892        | 485     | 1068                               | 10269   | 771        | 350     | 4291    | 84            | 38      | 561     | 37         | 97      |
| Qtr. 3/01 | 1277                          | 15253   | 1160       | 486     | 1068                               | 10431   | 981        | 344     | 4266    | 124           | 45      | 556     | 55         | 97      |
| Qtr. 4/01 | 1286                          | 15026   | 1269       | 488     | 1061                               | 10199   | 1105       | 345     | 4281    | 91            | 46      | 546     | 73         | 97      |
| Qtr. 1/02 | 1309                          | 15491   | 981        | 814     | 1066                               | 10571   | 895        | 615     | 4363    | 56            | 57      | 557     | 30         | 142     |
| Qtr. 2/02 | 1329                          | 15579   | 1098       | 797     | 1066                               | 10658   | 962        | 598     | 4362    | 98            | 57      | 559     | 38         | 142     |
| Qtr. 3/02 | 1345                          | 15705   | 1346       | 796     | 1074                               | 10780   | 1168       | 597     | 4357    | 131           | 57      | 568     | 47         | 142     |
| Qtr. 4/02 | 1356                          | 15505   | 1406       | 790     | 1066                               | 10517   | 1219       | 591     | 4426    | 118           | 57      | 562     | 69         | 142     |

"cont..."

Contd Answer to Question 1520

"Contd Answer to Question 1519 of 2004"

| Qtr.      | All                     |         |            | Private |                              |         | Official   |         |         | Self Employed |         |         |            |         |
|-----------|-------------------------|---------|------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------|---------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|
|           | Number of Employers all | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Number of Employers returned | Returns | Non-Return | Pending | Returns | Non-Return    | Pending | Returns | Non-Return | Pending |
| Qtr. 1/03 | 1384                    | 15158   | 1212       | 1690    | 1055                         | 10283   | 1115       | 1197    | 4358    | 67            | 257     | 517     | 30         | 236     |
| Qtr. 2/03 | 1411                    | 15405   | 1569       | 1668    | 1048                         | 10430   | 1430       | 1175    | 4458    | 101           | 257     | 517     | 38         | 236     |
| Qtr. 3/03 | 1428                    | 14900   | 2617       | 1655    | 1017                         | 9896    | 2429       | 1166    | 4488    | 134           | 253     | 516     | 54         | 236     |
| Qtr. 4/03 | 1441                    | 14617   | 2722       | 1651    | 1011                         | 9664    | 2480       | 1165    | 4462    | 160           | 252     | 491     | 82         | 234     |
| Qtr. 1/04 | 1469                    | 11838   | 1903       | 5769    | 921                          | 8292    | 1592       | 3896    | 3044    | 300           | 1572    | 502     | 11         | 301     |
| Qtr. 2/04 | 1478                    | 8353    | 5672       | 5751    | 793                          | 5844    | 4285       | 3880    | 2088    | 1280          | 1570    | 421     | 107        | 301     |

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2001

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1519 AND 1520 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it that they cannot provide it going back to the beginning of this system of schedules? Would they be able to provide it, say, for the last quarter in September or does the Minister not know?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, I believe that the program has to be modified in order to be able to provide that information from the outset.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it possible to do it for the most recent quarter? Or is it possible to do it, for example, from the current date on?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I suspect the problem is for persons entering insured employment in each such quarter. In other words, the reporting qualification is not programmed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the old days, it was possible for the hon Members to provide the insurance card issued new in each quarter or in each month, which is effectively the people who were entering the labour market and entering insured employment. I am surprised that a more sophisticated system is not able to do something that could be done with bits of paper and stamps stuck on it.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Well, it is possible to do it and as I say the DSS is looking at the possibility, the viability of having the program modified to be able to produce that information in the future.

ORAL

**NO. 1521 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government explain why the provision of £160,000 for the Domiciliary Care Service in 2003/2004 was not all spent by the Elderly Care Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question No. 1524 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1522 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can Government give a breakdown for the number of pensioners in receipt of the minimum income guarantee showing the number receiving the single and married rates in bands of £5 up to the full amount as at December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Question No. 89 of January 2004 posed an identical question to which the answer was provided in schedule form.

**NO. 1523 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – INSURED PERSONS**

Can Government confirm that in the distribution of insured persons as at the end of each calendar year since 1996, the numbers include persons who may have only worked and been insured for only one week in each year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I confirm that those persons who may have only worked and been insured for only one week are not included in the distribution of insured persons, unless they were in insurable employment during the last week of each calendar year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1523 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, the count then is made up of the people who are at the end of December, and people who come in and out of the labour market during the year are not included in that total?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

That is correct.

**NO. 1524 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DOMICILIARY CARE SERVICE**

Can Government state how many of the 12 people that were waiting to be assessed for Domiciliary Care as at the end of March 2004, identified in answer to Question No. 927/2004, are now receiving Domiciliary Care?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1521**

When a policy decision was reached to provide funds for Domiciliary Care, the ECA was provided with £160,000 for this purpose. When the ECA decided to put the service out to contract the expression of interest received was for a sum which fell short of £160,000. The ECA at that stage increased contract hours to an additional seven and a half hours of care on weekdays in order to maximise on the approved budget without overspending. In other words, without going over the £160,000 which had been approved. In addition, the full provision of the service was not given from the outset. This was phased in as and when referrals and assessments were made.

**Answer to Question No. 1524**

The 12 domiciliary care assessments were carried out after March 2004. None of these applicants have to date received domiciliary care.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1521 AND 1524 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can the Minister confirm whether or not the people who are not waiting to be assessed but actually on the list already assessed and considered to qualify for domiciliary care, are these people receiving domiciliary care? Obviously there is a list of people that have been assessed and considered to qualify.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, there is still a waiting list for domiciliary care, but what I can say is that since the last question on the subject, some more people have received domiciliary care but there is still a waiting list.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the fact that the amount spent fell short of £160,000, can I ask whether the £160,000 is the amount that is estimated in a full year would be required to obtain the 18,010 hours that the Minister gave me in answer to Question No. 1517 of 2004?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I assume so. Obviously not all that number of hours were covered, that is why the expenditure was less than £160,000 for reasons that I have just explained.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That was not my question. My question was, can the Minister confirm that in a full year the £160,000 would buy 18,010 hours?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say, in fact, by how many hours short of 18,010 the service was provided in the financial year 2003/2004?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I would need notice of that question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that that is the answer she has told me to the original question, which was to explain why the whole of the money was not spent, when she said that less hours were delivered than budgeted for because the matter was phased in, she does not know how much less it was?



**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

No, I know how much less it was in sort of cost but not in number of hours.

ORAL

**NO. 1525 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – CHILDREN IN CARE**

Can Government confirm that there are still five flats being used for children in care as a replacement for the Residential Home as indicated to this House in answer to Question No. 930/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1526 to 1528 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1526 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – CHILDREN IN CARE**

Can Government state if the two flats currently being used for children in care in Merlot House, Vineyards, are included in the five mentioned in answer to Question No. 930/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1525, 1527 and 1528 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1527 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – CHILDREN IN CARE**

Can Government state when they intend to move the service users in the flats in Merlot House, Vineyards, to their new Home?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1525, 1526 and 1528 of 2004.

**NO. 1528 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**DR GIRALDI HOME**

Can Government state if a decision on the future use of the respite unit at the Dr Giraldi Home has now been reached?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

**Answer to Question No. 1525**

No. There are now six flats being used for children in care.

**Answer to Question No. 1526**

No flats at Merlot House are currently being used for children in care. The five flats mentioned in answer to Question No. 930/2004 did not include any Merlot House flats.

**Answer to Question No. 1527**

One of the service users housed at a flat in Merlot House, Vineyards, will move by the 18<sup>th</sup> October 2004. The Agency is trying to acquire a suitable flat in another location for the other service user currently living in Merlot House.

**Answer to Question No. 1528**

The respite service will revert back to Dr Giraldi Home very shortly after modification works to the unit are completed.

ORAL

**NO. 1529 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health provide details of the new arrangements between the GHA and the Department of Health, regarding the payments for our Sponsored Patients' treatment in the UK, which now involve a sum of money rather than the number of patients treated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 1530 of 2004.

**NO. 1530 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – HEALTH CARE RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT**

Can the Minister now confirm what is the total amount of money which has been credited by the UK Department of Health to the Gibraltar Health Authority, as a result of the new arrangements for the Health Care Reciprocal Agreement giving a breakdown of the years the amounts relate to?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1529**

As the hon Member may recall, the quota number was arrived at by dividing the total value to be credited to the Authority by the average cost to the UK of quota patients for the year of the account. The new system allows for the full cash value to be credited to the Authority without the application of any further formulae. This cash value is deposited by the UK Department of Health with Lambeth Primary Care Trust (PCT). This can be topped up as necessary from our own funds in the same way as we have been operating over the last few years. Lambeth PCT continue to act as our paymasters and pay the hospitals for the cost of the relevant treatment.

**Answer to Question No. 1530**

This year the UK Department of Health has credited us with £2.75 million. This allocation was based on agreed figures up to 2000/2001 and part payment on estimates and projections to March 2005. The breakdown in respect of the allocations for the period April 1993 to March 2001 is set out in the schedule that I now hand to her.

**Answer to Question No. 1530 of 2004**

| <b>YEAR</b>  | <b>,000</b> |
|--------------|-------------|
| 1993/94      | (£61)       |
| 1994/95      | (£8)        |
| 1995/96      | (£4)        |
| 1996/97      | £263        |
| 1997/98      | £3          |
| 1998/99      | £25         |
| 1999/00      | £328        |
| 2000/01      | £402        |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>£948</b> |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1529 AND 1530 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When we are talking about a total of £948,000 we are going back to the year 1993/1994, am I correct? This is the schedule which the Minister has handed to me.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is what the schedule says.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Now, in that case, can the Minister confirm whether the monies that have been provided in the Estimates for the Gibraltar Health Authority as regards sponsored patients takes into account the total of the figures from 1993/1994 to the year 2002 and 2001? Can he confirm, therefore, is that the reason why the actual for sponsored patients was £4 million and now the estimate for this financial year is £2.3 million?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not sure I understand the hon Member's supplementary. The system has changed with effect from a certain date. The figure that I have provided is up to the period 2001. We have agreed a figure of £2.75 million. That figure will be updated as and when further figures are available. Whatever other figure the hon Member has in front of her from previous questions, she should now update with this information.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes but what I am asking the Minister is whether in fact, and I think this is what he answered in the last meeting of the House when we expressed our concerns during the Committee Stage of the Budget, if he looks at the Estimates for the Gibraltar Health Authority on sponsored patients there is a figure there for this financial year of £2.3 million, and the actual figure for the year 2002/2003 was £4.1 million. In that figure, the enormous difference, is he taking into account these figures that he has provided me with, which is related to the sponsored patients estimate for this financial year?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Of course we are. This information I gave to the hon Member at Budget time. I explained that the figure for sponsored patients this year was abnormally lower than that for previous years, and I explained to her then that this was due to the fact that this new arrangement provides a cash credit which allows us not to spend so much money out of our own pocket as it were in this current year. Of course it takes it into account and of course one balances with the other.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will it mean therefore, the next financial year the figure will also be lower than the £4.1 million?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, it means nothing of the kind. It means that for the next financial year I will give her an explanation on the figures that appear in the Estimates, as and when they are provided to me and as and when I know the answers to whatever questions she asks me then. I cannot speculate on what the figures are going to be then or what her questions are going to be.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But the Minister can say that, for example, the figures that he has given me come up to the year 200 and 2001. When he receives the figure for 2002/2003, he will use that figure to actually decrease the estimate for the sponsored patients?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes of course we will. The principle will remain the same.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are these arrangements in fact affected by the consortium arrangement that the Health Authority has made with Jersey and Guernsey? If so, how?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, it depends what the hon Member means by affected. They have come about as a result of the consortium arrangements and better cooperation with the other island territories and with Lambeth PCT. Essentially, nothing has changed except the calculation and the fact that financially we are marginally better off. In the past the system has been one where there has been a balancing of the books, UK has paid us for the patients we have treated in Gibraltar, we have paid UK for the patients we had treated there. Now the formula for calculating it can only have been worked out by an accountant with a view to saving the UK money, because if hon Members analyse what I said in the first paragraph of my answer, the system used to be one where the total value, in other words the total cost of dealing with our patients in the UK was divided by the average cost of quota patients. Now if one divides by the average cost of a patient, because some patients travel to the UK more than once, one is obviously dividing by a higher figure and the number that is then created is not a figure in pounds but a numerical figure and that is the number that we were entitled to patients for the following year. So in fact, we were getting a quota in numbers lower than it would have been if it would have been worked out in figures. The new arrangement is completely simpler.

The new arrangement is the amount that we are entitled to in pounds is the amount that we are paid without any fiddling. Fiddling implies malpractice, without any further mathematical adjustments. So I am satisfied that the new system is an improvement on the old system, it has been brought about because of the new consortium arrangements and we stand to get more money as the figures are adjusted. It takes them I do not know how many years to produce the figures, as the hon Member is well aware, and eventually the quota number will disappear completely and it will be just a straightforward balancing of figures in amounts of money.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But if in fact it is a question of an amount of money being credited, then is it not that the number of people that we send for that money dependant on how much we get charged by the hospitals or institutions that our patients get treated at? Is that independent of this formula and decided by the institution actually carrying out the treatment?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, I trust the hon Member is not confusing the way the system works. This amount of money is not a cap on the amount of patients we can send to the UK. This amount of money is the UK's contribution. If we need to send more people, then again as I have said in the answer, the amount gets topped up as necessary, the amount held by Lambeth PCT and which they pay to the hospitals. If Lambeth run out of money in any given year on our behalf, we top it up from our own funds and hence the lower number in the sponsorship vote for this year. The amount to which we are entitled to does not in any way cap our ability to send people to the UK.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know, the ability to send people depends on the amount of money that we have and nothing else, but it does cut the amount that they pay for presumably. If the United Kingdom under the old system said, 'we will pay for the first 50', what I am saying now is the £2.7 million or whatever might turn out to be more than 50 or less than 50 depending on what we get charged by different institutions. Is that the case or not?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If one did the whole exercise in the way it was done before and applied the mathematical figure, yes, it is bound to be different. Which way it would work out to be different I could not say.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was under the impression from the answers given previously, that the Minister was telling the House that this was more beneficial and that we end up getting more patients treated for our money than under the previous system. That is why my supplementary

says does that not depend on what the recipient institution that handles the patient charges us.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It depends on that if one applies the previous years figures on which the calculations were done, to this years lot of patients, but if one works out on an apples for apples basis last years figures with last years patients, then we are better off. The hon Member is right, if working on last years figures we are entitled to 50 patients for the coming year, and in the coming year the hospitals put up their charges by 50 per cent, then yes it would work against us. If we look at the year in which the calculation was made then it has to work out to a slightly advantageous system for us. On a pure mathematical basis.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the arrangement does not do anything about what we can be charged, we get charged whatever is the market rate, is that correct?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is correct. Again, let me stress the market rate is the NHS rate in this particular case, and we have in this process, in this association with the consortium, we have come across cases in some leading hospitals where we were not being charged what the hon Member has called the market rate. We were being over charged and that is also now being corrected, but that goes back about a year or so.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say, are these arrangements, I always understood that ours were as a result of the reciprocal arrangements that we had in order to give each other EU rights, going back to 1973, is it that Jersey and Guernsey had similar arrangements with the UK?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not know the answer to that question. Well, it depends what the question is. If the question is whether they have similar arrangements of sending sponsored patients to the UK, well yes, then the answer is yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In our case it started with our membership of the EU, that is the point that I am making. Since their arrangements in the EU are not quite like ours, I wondered if they had a similar historical background to this.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They do not have an EU relationship with the UK for these purposes. The Channel Islands are only part of the EU for the purposes of the Single Market in goods.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just to clarify one of the things that the hon Gentleman has said in reply. He said when we run out of money in that pot we top it up ourselves. Rather, when the allocation of the amounts credited to us in the UK run out, we top that up ourselves. In the context of the new arrangements for Jersey/Guernsey and us, the 'we' in the hon Gentleman's reply relates only to Gibraltar or to the consortium?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, only to Gibraltar. The 'we' in consortium terms is purely to give us greater clout with the hospitals and the other institutions and bilaterally they are done by the consortium in certain cases on our behalf, but it is not a joint arrangement.

ORAL

**NO. 1531 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many patients have been given a choice of being treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as Sponsored Patients and have elected to go to Spain since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 to the end of September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1532 and 1544 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1532 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm what arrangements are in place for the payment by the Gibraltar Health Authority regarding our Sponsored Patients being treated in Spanish Medical Institutions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1531 and 1544 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1533 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government state how many medical practitioners are on contract with the Gibraltar Health Authority, specifying their specialities and the period of time of their contracts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.



**Answer to Question No. 1533 of 2004**

The number of medical practitioners on contract is as follows:-

|                                  |                        |                       |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Dr. Jose Antonio Ferrera de Lara | - General Practitioner | - 01.07.03 - 31.01.05 |
| Dr. Andy Gupta                   | - General Practitioner | - 09.06.03 - 31.01.05 |
| Dr. Francisco Mena               | - General Practitioner | - 26.01.04 - 25.01.05 |
| Dr. Ricardo Pinto Ocaña          | - General Practitioner | - 04.03.02 - 03.03.05 |
| Dr. Ma Luisa Poyatos             | - General Practitioner | - 19.05.03 - 31.01.05 |
| Dr. Chimene Taylor               | - General Practitioner | - 26.01.04 - 25.01.05 |
| Dr. Joseph Thoppil-Antony        | - General Practitioner | - 23.04.03 - 31.01.05 |
| Dr. Marguerite Vassallo          | - General Practitioner | - 01.12.88 - 31.03.04 |

|                                   |                           |                       |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Dr. Javier Angel Aparicio Ledesma | - Cons. Psychiatrist      | - 19.04.04 - 18.04.07 |
| Dr. Tadeusz Biedryzcki            | - Cons. Pathologist       | - 01.03.01 - 28.02.07 |
| Mr. Alan Brooks                   | - Cons. Gynaecologist     | - 02.07.01 - 01.07.04 |
| Dr. Macbool Haroon                | - Cons. Ophthalmologist   | - 08.06.95 - 07.06.08 |
| Dr. Stephen Higgs                 | - Cons. Paediatrician     | - 01.02.03 - 31.01.06 |
| Dr. Richard Roberts               | - Cons. Anaesthetist      | - 27.05.03 - 26.05.04 |
| Mr David White                    | - Cons. Gynaecologist     | - 02.02.04 - 01.02.07 |
| Dr. Vijay Kumar                   | - Cons. Dir Public Health | - 02.02.98 - 01.02.11 |

|                              |       |                       |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| Dr. Melinda Brecknell        | - SHO | - 21.03.01 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Muhammad Hashmi           | - SHO | - 05.02.03 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Fareed Malik              | - SHO | - 06.08.03 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Francisco Moya            | - SHO | - 05.02.03 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Mohamed Pervez            | - SHO | - 28.01.02 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Humberto Rodriguez        | - SHO | - 03.08.04 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Iqbal Sayed               | - SHO | - 05.02.97 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Sohaid Yasin              | - SHO | - 14.12.98 - 31.10.04 |
| Dr Paul Martin               | - SHO | - 04.08.05 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Peinado Romero            | - SHO | - 04.08.04 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Jose Maria Merida         | - SHO | - 05.02.01 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Karina Janse Van Rensburg | - SHO | - 27.09.04 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Philip Fortgens           | - SHO | - 04.08.04 - 01.02.05 |
| Dr Nadeem Shuja              | - SHO | - 25.02.97 - 01.02.05 |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1533 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have noticed that this is a very long list which I will have to study but I have just noticed that there are GPs with contracts for a year. Can the Minister explain why because I have always understood contracts to run for three years?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have not made any changes to the practice of the length of contracts or how there are signed in the time that I have been Minister for Health, so the hon Member has asked me how many practitioners are on contract and that is the list, and whatever the policy has been in the past remains the same. There has been a slight change to that, as I speak on my feet I am remembering something, in that a number of contracts were due to end at various periods during the current year and they have been grouped to end on the same or similar dates in January 2005, so that GHA can be better placed to make selection for continuation of services. In terms of the length of the period of contract, no change has been imposed by me since I have been Minister.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Then I am correct in saying that when I was Minister the contracts used to run for three years. Can the Minister confirm whether the General Practitioners that have a contract for a year, whether they form part of the actual complement of GPs?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes of course they do, the only medical practitioners we have are the General Practitioners and the more I think about it the more I think the answer to her question must be that they are still on three year contracts, but because some of these contracts were due to end during the course of this year, and because of all the changes that have taken place in the GHA, we have extended their contracts so that they end all more or less together so that GHA are in a better position to consider who should have their contracts renewed.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I do not think so because I do not like mentioning names but I can see that there is a doctor here, a General Practitioner who was not on contract. He was engaged as a Locum, and now I see that he has a contract for a year. This particular doctor I was told previously by the Government, that he was engaged as a Locum, he did not have a contract. I am referring to two of them which are here on the list.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The question was, 'how many practitioners are on contract specifying their speciality and the period of time of their contracts?'. That is the answer that has been supplied. If the hon Member wants other information then I suggest she ask me either during Question Time or writes to me.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, because I am telling the Minister, there is a discrepancy here with the information I was given previously as regards two General Practitioners. Perhaps the Minister was not Minister for Health but there are two in particular that I was told in this House by the previous Minister for Health, that they did not have contracts, they were engaged as Locums, and therefore I will write to the Minister.....

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

But with respect to the hon Member, she does not seem to realise that time moves on. That answer may well have been correct when it was given and they may well have been Locums, and since then they may well have been.... If they are here on this list it is because they are now on contract. The situation has obviously changed.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore, if they are here on the list as having a contract for a year, it seems peculiar that everybody else is not there for a year, that was my original supplementary. Why? Is it that they form part of the overall complement, or is it that the post that they are occupying is not part of the complement? Seeing that I am not getting a reply I will write to the Minister and will ask him for the information in writing if that is acceptable to him.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Of course it is acceptable, but for the sake of clarity I will repeat what I said. I am aware that we made certain decisions during the course of the year linked to the review, linked to changes in the Health Service and linked to the fact that something like five contracts were ending in the last three or four months of this year, and because of that some contracts were given for a shorter period, others were slightly extended and if she looks on the list she will find that many of them, in fact all except two, end at the end of January 2005. That is not a coincidence, that is a deliberate extension adjustment of dates so that at that date GHA is better placed to decide which contracts to renew and how to renew them and the terms of the contract.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So we are being told in fact, that in the case of doctors, the arguments that have been used in respect of other grades in the Health Service that there was our legal

requirement under EU law to treat them as permanent employees once they had a series of short term renewable contracts does not apply?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The point is this. The hon Members will have noticed, perhaps they have not, that there are substantial changes afoot in the Health Authority. Included in those changes are the terms and conditions of employment of Consultants and General Practitioners. One cannot re-negotiate contracts easily if everybody has different termination dates, because otherwise there is not a date in which one can change everybody. That is why there has been a sort of tidying up exercise so that they all end up ending on one date. So from that date, the Government are able to all of them to say these are the new terms of the contract. That negotiation is at a very advanced stage with the Consultants. I am not sure whether it is advanced or just starting with the General Practitioners. There are indeed two General Practitioners, as the hon Lady says, Doctor M and Doctor T, who were given one year contracts, and they were given one year contracts and that one year contract has not yet expired. They are still in their one year contract, that is why they are different. They were given one year contracts at the time and they are still in that one year. That is why they are different, this is the answer to her, this is the point that she was going to write about. There is no need to her to write about it. Those two are engaged, following a difficult recruitment process, they were both given one year contracts if she will remember back to those circumstances.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just ask in relation to the party whose contract seems to have expired in March of this year, what is the position? Given that she would no longer appear to be on contract, has that contract also been extended to that date in the early part of next year?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not know the answer to that question, is the short answer. I do not want to say things where I might be wrong but I think there is a possibility that the person concerned might be on maternity leave, but I do not say that with any degree of certainty. I am not aware why that contract appears not to have been renewed.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have looked at the list now in a little bit more detail and I have seen that there are two more General Practitioners whose contracts have already expired. We have one who is a Consultant Anaesthetist, whose contract expired on 26<sup>th</sup> May, and then we have another one who is a Consultant Gynaecologist whose contract here is shown as having expired on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2004.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

All those contracts are under negotiation with all the Consultants.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So are they in that case, are they holding over until.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I suppose so, I suppose that the personnel people would not have wanted to renew the contract on terms that were being re-negotiated, but we are at a very advanced stage in those negotiations and all the Consultants would end up with the same form of contract, which is not the position they are in today.

ORAL

**NO. 1534 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS UNIT**

Can the Government confirm that the negotiations with the Medical Staff at the Dialysis Unit in La Linea for the provision of medical cover and nursing cover have now been completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1535 to 1538 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1535 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS UNIT**

Can Government state whether any recommendations have been accepted by them from the report they commissioned, in relation to Dialysis Facilities in Gibraltar, which was carried out by Professor Terry Feast?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1534 and 1536 to 1538 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1536 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS UNIT**

Can the Government confirm whether they know how much they will be paying the Dialysis Unit in La Linea for the provision of Dialysis facilities at the Europort Hospital by their Medical and Nursing staff?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1534, 1535 and 1537 to 1538 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1537 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS UNIT**

Can the Government confirm whether they have finished the negotiations with the Medical Staff at the Dialysis Unit in La Linea for the provision of nursing cover with the option of provision of training for local nurses included in the package?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1534 to 1536 and 1538 of 2004.

**NO. 1538 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS UNIT**

Can the Government confirm whether they have finalised the negotiations with the medical staff at the Dialysis Unit in La Linea for the provision of Medical Cover regarding the Dialysis facilities in the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1535**

Professor Terry Feast thought very highly of the dialysis facilities at La Linea and recommended that we should continue using that facility. However, Government are committed to provide the treatment to our patients in a local facility and have not accepted the recommendations contained in the report.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1534 and 1536**

The Gibraltar Health Authority has reached agreement in principle with the dialysis unit in La Linea for the provision of these services locally. No agreements have yet been signed and the financial details are therefore considered confidential at this stage.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1537 and 1538**

However, I can confirm that the arrangements being entered into include the provision of training of local nurses, all nephrological medical cover, including out-patient clinics and ward visits as well as the dialysis itself.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1534 TO 1538 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether the Gibraltar Health Authority is looking at a situation where at some stage our local personnel will be able to man the dialysis unit at the Europort Building?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We are not in a position to say that. We are crossing one bridge when we come to it. At the moment the objective is that the existing service, which is provided physically in La Linea by the La Linea Clinic, will be in future provided physically in Gibraltar by the La Linea Clinic, on our machines, in our hospital. Now, whether that in future develops to the ability of the Gibraltar Health Authority directly employed staff to deliver the whole range of the service, depends on whether local medical people acquire the necessary skills or whether they do not. Some of the facilities may be able to be localised in that sense, others not. It is a desirable objective but whether it realistically will be achieved is something which is hypothetical and speculative at this stage. I suspect that it is going to be easier to sort of localise the nursing aspects rather than the medical aspects, where one could only re-do it by employing a Consultant nephrologist. That is really quite a way down the line, considering we have got just between twelve and twenty patients usually. So, as the Minister has said in his answer, it does include the provision of local training to nurses with a view to, as much as possible of the package, in future being provided in Gibraltar by Gibraltar staff rather.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well I mentioned it because I got an answer in the previous meeting of the House, where the Minister actually said '*with the option of provision of training for local nurses included in the package*', that is why I asked the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He has just said the same today.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

What I am saying is, that the Chief Minister is saying that it is hypothetical and it is this and the other, and all I am saying is that I put the question in because I got the reply from the Minister for Health in the last meeting of the House, when he actually said '*the dialysis unit in La Linea with the provision of nursing cover and we have the option of provision for training for local nurses included in the package*'.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What is hypothetical is not the question about the provision of local nurse training, she has now had the answer twice to tell her that there is local nurse training provided. What is hypothetical is her supplementary this afternoon in which she asked whether this was all done with a view to in future the whole package being provided locally, not nursing, the whole package she asked. *'Does this mean that in future the whole package is going to be provided locally?'*

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I did not say the whole package. Can the Minister say whether the negotiations are at a stage where the Government hope that they will be in place when the new hospital opens?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Negotiations are at a very advanced stage and it is really the question of drafting legal papers that is holding us up.

**NO. 1539 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm, since he stated during this year's budget session, that the treadmill machine donated last year to the Primary Care Centre would be updated to a stress machine for use at the Europort Hospital, who will be operating it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government can confirm that the treadmill donated last year will be upgraded and used at the new facility for stress testing if prior authorisation is given by those who donated the equipment. Such authorisation has been sought but has not yet been given. Staff in the Medical Investigation Unit at the New Hospital will be responsible for its operation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1539 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Again I thank the Minister for changing his mind to when I first raised the issue, when he said that the Government were not prepared to buy the additional gadgets, but again, he has now changed his mind and I am thanking him.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I am not sure how much the hon Member understands of this stress machine and the background to it, and how much she does not know about. What I said on the last occasion was that a treadmill had been donated, that it was not a stress machine which was the subject of her question, and that the Government were not prepared to buy the necessary software to convert it into a stress machine to be operated in the Primary Health Care Unit. If, given the right circumstances and following the medical advice we would be prepared to operate it in the right environment, and in those circumstances either the original donors can upgrade the equipment, or we will upgrade it and use it as a stress machine in its proper environment, which is the Hospital and not the Primary Care Unit.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That means that when it is in the Hospital then we are talking that there will be two stress machines.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If by that she means the one that is there now and the new one, then the answer is yes.

**NO. 1540 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DENTAL SERVICE**

Can Government confirm whether Private Practice continues at the Dental Service of the Primary Care Centre?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Yes Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1540 OF 2004**

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is the hon Member reading the question?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes. Can Government confirm whether private practice will continue at the Dental Service of the Primary Care Centre?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that is not the question of which we have had notice.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is not the question which I have in front of me. It is just continues.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They are wholly different questions.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

This is how I phrased it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot see what she wrote, I can tell what has reached us. Can the Government confirm whether private practice continues..... The hon Member should just clarify which she means to us, that is all so that we know which question we are answering.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will continue.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Let me answer both her questions. To the question in front of me which was as it is written in my Order Paper, '*can Government confirm whether private practice continues at the Dental Service at the Primary Care Centre?*' the answer would have been Yes, Sir, because it does continue at this moment in time. In answer to her re-phrased question as if it had come in a supplementary, the answer to whether it will continue, that is a completely different question and the answer to that is No Sir.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Just a point of clarification. We knew that it existed because I got an answer from the previous Minister for Health in answer to Question No. 302 of 2001 when he confirmed that there was private practice at the Dental Clinic at the Health Service, that is why. I just wanted to know whether it would continue. Thank you. So the answer is no it will not continue.



**NO. 1541 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DENTAL SERVICE**

In view that the Minister for Health in answer to Question No. 829 of 2004 stated that the Healthcare Development Team had highlighted Dental Service staffing and waiting times for patients as being inadequate, whether it is still the GHA's intention to recruit additional staff?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Gibraltar Health Authority is conducting a full review of Dental Services to determine the appropriate mix of staff and distribution of resources between the Primary Care Centre and the new hospital. Any bid for additional resources will be considered as part of the 2005/2006 Estimates. That is the end of my written answer but I have just noticed something that I missed when the answer was being drafted. That is the word 'inadequate' as part of the question which is attributed to me in answer to Question No. 829. I have my answer to Question No. 829 in front of me and nowhere in that answer do I use the word 'inadequate'.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1541 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, I think it was the Healthcare Development Team that made reference to the situation at the Clinic. In any case, the answer that I got from the Minister in answer to Question No. 827 of 2004, he did say that several attempts were made in recent months to recruit additional staff in order to meet the increased demand that has arisen from the expansion and the development of the Dental Services, and it has proved unsuccessful. That is why I put the question in.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is correct. It had proved unsuccessful. If I remember rightly we were recruiting a Locum as well and that proved unsuccessful as well.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But they will continue with their efforts.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have already given the answer, that we are looking at the situation and we will decide with a view to the next financial year.

**NO. 1542 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – E111 ARRANGEMENTS**

Can the Government confirm whether they will be replacing the E111 arrangements for emergency treatment, in view of the new system which has been implemented in other EU Member States?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Yes Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1542 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister give an indication of when this will occur?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Well, we are currently starting an interim period which has been granted to a number of countries including the UK, to proceed with what has been called an interim E111, which in effect is the same or very similar form and it will be a paper E111. The main exception is that we need to issue one per member of the family instead of using one per family group. This interim system is valid until the end of December next year and the interim system will come into being some time between now and then. In fact, we are to a certain extent soft-peddling because we have been asked by the UK, who are not ready to bring in the new card themselves, to delay the introduction of our new E111 to coincide with theirs, but I suspect all things being equal we will see it happening towards the end of next year.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I suppose that these arrangements will form part of the overall negotiations we are talking about between the UK and Gibraltar.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No it is beyond that. These are EU Directives which have now been formulated and the Commission has issued very specific instructions on the format of the card. It includes the cover of the fields, the shading effects, the font type to be used, the size of it, it is extremely detailed and we are now at the stage of actually having cards printed. We have equipment for it, it is moving on a common front across the EU.

**NO. 1543 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – A & E DEPARTMENT**

In view of the statement made during this year's budget session by the Minister for Health, can he now confirm when there will be s Senior House Officer permanently based from 5.00 pm to 9.00 am at the Accident & Emergency Department at the Europort Hospital, a recommendation made by the Nursing Review Team in 1997?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government have commissioned reviews by the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Team of medical staff provision which includes appropriate staffing levels for Accident & Emergency services. Following receipt and consideration of these reports, Government will make decisions on future staffing levels for Accident & Emergency Services. Can I also add this to the end of my prepared text? But similar to my previous question, I again just noticed that I am attributed to have made a statement to the effect of changes in the question, and I have looked through my budget session statement and I find nothing there of my having made any statement to that effect.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1543 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, I think that nobody has accused the Minister of changing the question.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, the hon Member misunderstands. The first line of this question, says '*in view of the statement made during this year's budget session by the Minister for Health*'. I am saying that I have my budget statement here and I have looked through it seriously and I find no mention of Senior House Officers of A&E or of the Europort Hospital in that context.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I understand that and I know why, because when I was delivering my budget speech he intervened and he said '*yes, we will have it at the Europort Building*'. That is why.

**NO. 1544 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government confirm whether they accept that they should provide the necessary financial assistance to those of our patients who require transplants when these can be obtained in Spanish Medical Institutions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1531**

As the hon Member is by now well aware, all patients are given the choice to be treated in Spain as opposed to the UK at the time of referral when considered appropriate by the referring Consultant. 168 patients out of 622 have elected to go to Spain during the period 1 April 2004 to end of September 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 1532**

This administration has not made any changes to the arrangements for payment to Spanish Medical institutions. The arrangements have been in place for many years and conform to the provisions of EU Regulations 1407/71 and 574/73. That is to say, the relevant EU form, usually the E112, is issued to the receiving institution in the name of the patient concerned. The costs are then settled with the UK in the normal manner. For diagnostic investigations where the receiving institutions are private, the expenses are settled directly by the GHA.

**Answer to Question No. 1544**

Patients who are sponsored for organ transplants receive the same level of maintenance that apply to them under the policy. This is regardless of whether the patients are referred to the UK or to Spain.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1531, 1532 AND 1544 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Minister refers that these arrangements for payment are done in the normal manner, is he referring to the reciprocal agreements with the UK?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It is done on the basis of the EU form through the Spanish institution which finds its way to the UK and back to Gibraltar, yes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Then what happens?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Payments are settled between the UK and us. Spain reclaim from the UK and the UK reclaims from us.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not that the normal manner used to be that this was what financed these reciprocal arrangements for sponsored patients before? Does the Minister not know that in the agreement between the United Kingdom and Gibraltar, the offsetting element on the sponsored patients was in fact the use that we made of services in Spain, which was then shunted back through London as if we were tourists in the Costa Del Sol, and then the bill sent to us and offset against the patients we sent to the UK. So, if the system for sponsored patients in the UK has changed, how has that affected the arrangements for payment, which was previously offset against the sponsored patients?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not aware of what the hon Member is saying. The arrangements as he has described them have not changed. Using his words "shunted through Spain onto the UK and back to us". Those may indeed have been part of the reciprocal arrangements. If they were, they still are, I have stressed we have made no changes, but this is an area where the hon Member, I hope, will not press me too much but I would be happy to give him further information privately, I am quite happy to answer any of his questions but it is an area where it is not in our interests to discuss too much publicly.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am interested in the extent to which the new arrangements which were the subject matter of a previous question, with this pot of money being provided. Given that in the arrangements that have existed until now, until this new system was put in place, the quota was the result of the netting of the amount that we had to pay the UK which the UK had to pay to Spain, which then depended on the netting between UK visitors and Spain and Spanish visitors in the UK being ill. In that exercise there was a plus or a minus either in the direction of the UK or in the direction of Spain, and then a subsequent plus or minus as between us and the UK, in which if I remember correctly, we also included a figure for the number of visitors from Spain across the land frontier that were given treatment by us here, which would then be offset in the opposite direction. Now what I am asking is if all that was part of the formula for arriving at the quota of patients for which we did not have to pay, and there is no longer a quota of patients for which we do not have to pay, how does that fit with the pot of money that the Department of Health in the United Kingdom put at the disposal of the Government of Gibraltar having scrapped the formula?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, the arrangements that have existed as the hon Member has described, continue to exist and have not changed. In as much as they formed the basis of the mathematical formula for calculating the quota, which as the hon Member knows is a number of patients, that basis of financial information remains, that exercise of gathering information remains the same, that has not changed. The only thing that has changed is that instead of telling us 'next year you are entitled to 50 patients free of charge', as from now, as from last year they are telling us 'next year you are entitled to £x for the treatment of patients', as opposed to a number of patients. That is what has changed. The process of reaching either the quota or the amount of money has not changed and remains the same.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact what the Minister is saying is that the amount of money that is available each year is still the result of the exercise that used to be done to produce the quota which was number of patients as opposed to amount of pounds.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is correct.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I would just like to thank the Minister for a letter I received recently regarding a patient who requires a transplant, I honestly mean it, but I think that with a little push in the position wonders can also be achieved. I would like to congratulate the Minister for a

letter I received recently, reference a patient in Gibraltar who requires a transplant in Spain, and he wrote to me about it and it is a matter that goes back to February when the patient came to see me. I am writing to the Minister and I am thanking him but I am also saying at the same time that with a little push from the Opposition, I think that wonders can be achieved as well.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a lot of the injuries of life that the hon Member has to take, because when the Minister responds to a protest from the hon Member subsequently we are going to be exposed to the accusation that it is only through her intervention, then the temptation for the Minister not to put himself in that position again may become irresistible. I would just have left it at the thank you which would have conveyed all the necessary points.

ORAL

**NO. 1545 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health state how much money was spent by the Gibraltar health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for Scans in April, May, June, July, August and September of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The financial information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question No. 1545 of 2004**

|              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| April        | £564.12         |
| May          | £1205.58        |
| June         | £1345.72        |
| July         | -               |
| August       | £2578.25        |
| September    | £284.66         |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>£5978.33</b> |

ORAL

**NO. 1546 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ROUTINE OPERATIONS**

Can Government confirm how many routine operations were cancelled at St Bernard's Hospital due to the non-availability of beds for April, May, June, July, August and September of 2004, giving a breakdown for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1582 to 1584 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1547 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE**

Can Government confirm what has been the total Revenue and Expenditure of the Gibraltar Health Authority for the current financial year as at the end of August 2004, giving a breakdown by head?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I now hand to her.

**Answer to Question No. 1547 of 2004**

| <b>SCHEDULE</b>                                    |  |  |  |  |                      |
|----------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|----------------------|
| <b>GIBRALTAR HEALTH AUTHORITY</b>                  |  |  |  |  |                      |
| <b>Receipts</b>                                    |  |  |  |  |                      |
| Contribution from S A F                            |  |  |  |  | 1,458,333.00         |
| G P M S                                            |  |  |  |  | 7,924,858.00         |
| Contribution from Consolidated Fund                |  |  |  |  | 9,375,000.00         |
| Contribution from I & D F                          |  |  |  |  | 200,000.00           |
| Other Receipts                                     |  |  |  |  | 148,641.00           |
| <b>Total</b>                                       |  |  |  |  | <b>19,106,832.00</b> |
| <b>Payments</b>                                    |  |  |  |  |                      |
| <b>Personal Emoluments</b>                         |  |  |  |  |                      |
| Salaries                                           |  |  |  |  | £5,398,109.00        |
| Overtime                                           |  |  |  |  | £739,179.00          |
| Allowances                                         |  |  |  |  | £1,135,006.00        |
| Gratuities                                         |  |  |  |  | £383,839.00          |
| <b>Total</b>                                       |  |  |  |  | <b>£7,656,133.00</b> |
| <b>Industrial Wages</b>                            |  |  |  |  |                      |
| Basic                                              |  |  |  |  | £407,057.00          |
| Overtime                                           |  |  |  |  | £190,818.00          |
| Allowances                                         |  |  |  |  | £4,302.00            |
| <b>Total</b>                                       |  |  |  |  | <b>£602,177.00</b>   |
| <b>Other Personnel</b>                             |  |  |  |  |                      |
| Relief Cover                                       |  |  |  |  | £777,517.15          |
| Visiting Consultants Fees and Expenses             |  |  |  |  | £46,994.45           |
| Recruitment Contractual Expenses and Accommodation |  |  |  |  | £295,879.24          |
| <b>Total</b>                                       |  |  |  |  | <b>£1,120,390.84</b> |
| <b>Employer's Contributions</b>                    |  |  |  |  |                      |
| Social Insurance                                   |  |  |  |  | £275,231.47          |
| <b>Recurrent Expenditure</b>                       |  |  |  |  |                      |
| <b>Prescribed Drugs and Pharmaceuticals:</b>       |  |  |  |  |                      |
| GPMS Prescriptions                                 |  |  |  |  | £3,840,146.90        |
| Drugs and Pharmaceuticals                          |  |  |  |  | £708,769.40          |
| <b>Total</b>                                       |  |  |  |  | <b>£4,548,916.30</b> |
| <b>Equipment and Related Expenses:</b>             |  |  |  |  |                      |
| Medical Departments                                |  |  |  |  | £117,011.52          |
| Medical and Surgical Appliances                    |  |  |  |  | £269,427.33          |
| Hardware, Uniforms and Linen                       |  |  |  |  | £83,897.45           |
| Patients Appliances                                |  |  |  |  | £44,036.15           |
| <b>Total</b>                                       |  |  |  |  | <b>£514,372.45</b>   |
| Dressings, Medical Gases and Tests                 |  |  |  |  | £656,292.09          |
| Provisions                                         |  |  |  |  | £132,147.05          |
|                                                    |  |  |  |  |                      |
|                                                    |  |  |  |  |                      |

Cont'd.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1547 of 2004**

|                                   |  |  |  |  |                |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|----------------|
| <b>Laundry and Cleaning:</b>      |  |  |  |  |                |
| Laundry Expenses                  |  |  |  |  | £186,640.40    |
| Cleaning Expenses                 |  |  |  |  | £46,943.71     |
| Total                             |  |  |  |  | £233,584.11    |
| ICC Health Centre                 |  |  |  |  | £95,485.22     |
| Motor Vehicle and Fuel Expenses   |  |  |  |  | £24,047.74     |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |                |
| <b>Office Expenses:</b>           |  |  |  |  |                |
| General Expenses                  |  |  |  |  | £31,020.64     |
| Electricity and Water             |  |  |  |  | £133,855.26    |
| Telephone Service                 |  |  |  |  | £139,010.51    |
| Records, Printing and Stationery  |  |  |  |  | £15,364.85     |
| Total                             |  |  |  |  | £319,251.26    |
| Legal Fees                        |  |  |  |  | £39,750.85     |
| Official Travel Abroad            |  |  |  |  | £6,689.99      |
| School of Health Studies Expenses |  |  |  |  | £87,112.07     |
| Insurances and Claims             |  |  |  |  | £763,234.80    |
| <b>Sponsored Patients</b>         |  |  |  |  | £988,691.77    |
| <b>Miscellaneous Expenses:</b>    |  |  |  |  |                |
| General                           |  |  |  |  | £111,284.68    |
| Contingencies                     |  |  |  |  | £0.00          |
| Total                             |  |  |  |  | £111,284.68    |
| Ambulance Service                 |  |  |  |  | £509,851.00    |
| Registration Board                |  |  |  |  | £55.00         |
| Repairs and Maintenance           |  |  |  |  | £54,857.52     |
| Disposal of Clinical Waste        |  |  |  |  | £50,631.00     |
| Ex Gratia                         |  |  |  |  | £1,785.69      |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |                |
| <b>New Hospital Development:</b>  |  |  |  |  |                |
| Rental                            |  |  |  |  | £2,123,680.00  |
| Running Expenses                  |  |  |  |  | £16,484.50     |
| Total                             |  |  |  |  | £2,140,164.50  |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |                |
| <b><u>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</u></b> |  |  |  |  |                |
| Equipment                         |  |  |  |  | £7,088.04      |
| Computerisation                   |  |  |  |  | £16,926.82     |
| Capital Works                     |  |  |  |  | £608.00        |
| Total                             |  |  |  |  | £24,622.86     |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                      |  |  |  |  | £20,956,760.26 |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |                |
|                                   |  |  |  |  |                |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1547 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether the Government are expecting another deficit?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What does the hon Member mean by another deficit?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are they going to go over the budget, are they expecting that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is another matter. The Health Authority necessarily function to a deficit. The question is do the Government expect the Government subvention to need to be higher? It would be unusual if it were not the case, although we try to curtail but a lot of the Health Authority expenditure is demand-led and cannot be controlled. For example, the amount consumed in prescriptions or the amount of demand on the Sponsored Patient Scheme, and therefore the Government cannot say with any certainty whether or not there is going to be a higher degree of subvention.

ORAL

**NO. 1548 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Can Government confirm what will be the staff composition within the Pain Clinic of the Gibraltar Health Authority once St Bernard's Hospital is transferred to the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 1549 of 2004

**NO. 1549 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Can Government confirm whether the Pain Clinic of the Gibraltar Health Authority will be transferred to the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1548**

As part of the on-going work of the Healthcare Development Team there have been reviews of the Clinical Services but not all of these have yet been presented to the Government. Government are therefore not currently in a position to confirm the exact staffing composition after transfer to the new hospital.

**Answer to Question No. 1549**

The Government are pleased to confirm that facilities have been made available in the new Europort Building to accommodate the Pain Clinic, which will transfer with other clinical services to the new hospital.

**NO. 1550 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for health confirm whether he has now been able to find out why there are different statistics given for the same periods, in the Government Abstract of Statistics, the Healthcare Development Team Report of 2003 and in this House, something I pointed out to him during the meeting of 30<sup>th</sup> April 2004, when he requested me to write to him with the relevant information, to which I have not yet received a reply?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

I can confirm that the errors pointed out by the hon Member have been due to administrative errors. I can further confirm that an exhaustive recount of the data in question has provided the figures shown in the schedule which I hand to the hon Member. These figures, I am told, are now accurate.

### **Answer to Question No. 1550 of 2004**

Question No. 782 of 2004 relates to GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre. The figures for 2000, 2001 and 2002 are 86619, 104951 and 91615 respectively.

Question No. 781 of 2004 relates to the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre. The figure for 2000 is 130810.

Question No. 818 of 2004 relates to the total number of in-patient admissions at St Bernard's Hospital. The figures for 2000, 2001 and 2002 are as follows –

2000

| Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 555 | 528 | 559 | 485 | 616 | 491 | 576 | 527 | 529 | 561 | 550 | 519 | 6496  |

2001

| Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 551 | 581 | 532 | 517 | 574 | 553 | 528 | 517 | 493 | 557 | 553 | 418 | 6374  |

2002

| Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 514 | 522 | 473 | 513 | 522 | 447 | 526 | 485 | 484 | 477 | 425 | 486 | 5874  |

Question No. 820 of 2004 relates to the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital. I can inform the hon Member that in this particular case, the Statistics Office omitted to include part of the figures in their reports as these are made up of Casualty Attendances and Out-Patient Clinic Attendances. I can confirm that the figures for 2000 are as follows –

Casualty Attendances

| Jan  | Feb  | Mar  | Apr  | May  | Jun  | Jul  | Aug  | Sep  | Oct  | Nov  | Dec  | Total |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| 1603 | 1631 | 1783 | 1590 | 2456 | 1733 | 1896 | 2023 | 1859 | 1747 | 1528 | 1529 | 21378 |

Out-Patient Clinics

| Jan  | Feb  | Mar  | Apr  | May  | Jun  | Jul  | Aug  | Sep  | Oct  | Nov  | Dec | Total |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-------|
| 1011 | 1239 | 1252 | 1075 | 1369 | 1229 | 1255 | 1332 | 1369 | 1235 | 1431 | 939 | 14736 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1550 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will need time to check them and then I will see whether they are correct.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Well, let me clarify to avoid.....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I know what the Minister is saying, that whatever has been given before is wrong. This is correct, is that what he is saying?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Well, yes, but more than that. The hon Member drew a distinction and highlighted the differences between the figures provided by the Healthcare Development Team, by the Statistical Office of the Government and by information provided in answer to questions. I can only respond for the accuracy of information which is provided in answer to questions, and even that has been proved to be partly wrong in the exercise that we have now given. To save her the trouble, these figures we believe are now accurate. They will show some minor differences between what I am giving her now and the information I have given in the House previously, and they will also show differences with what has been given by the Healthcare Development Team and by the Statistics Office. I cannot answer for that but I am told that they have now looked at the data exhaustively and that this is the accurate figure. I wish I could stand here confidently and say that if the whole exercise was repeated the numbers would turn out to be exactly the same. I think one has to put that comment in context because I do not want it to sound flippant either, and that is that this information is invariably compiled in the short period available to get the answers ready in time for the House of Assembly. It is usually done by people who are not statisticians, who are diverted from doing other jobs which in many cases are professionally medical jobs in order to provide this information. Therefore, the hon Members should understand that although we try very hard to be accurate in the figures that we provide, that it is not beyond the limits possible for errors to be made.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore the Minister was trying to suggest that we were not being accurate and what he has now said is completely the opposite. In fact, it took me about two weeks to seek the information, and when I informed the Minister he was trying to suggest in the letters and the debate that we had in the House, that we were not being accurate but he did not understand that he had to sort of compare apple with apple. In fact since he talks so

much about apples with apples, I am now eating apples more than ever before. An apple a day keeps the doctor away.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, I remember making the clarification that when the hon Member pointed to three sets of figures, I said they were different, I said that we could not take that at face value and one had to look at the questions that were asked or the information that we had been provided in each of those sets of figures, to make sure that we were comparing one particular fruit with the same fruit, in order to see whether they were accurate or not accurate. I asked her to pinpoint exactly what the information was. She did. We have now looked into it and it is obvious that errors had been made and that has been admitted today.

ORAL

**NO. 1551 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 to the end of September 2004, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1552 and 1559 to 1562 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1552 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 to end of September 2004, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1551 and 1559 to 1562 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1553 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 to the end of September 2004, specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1554, 1557 and 1588 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1554 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF HOUSE CALLS**

Can Government state how many house calls were attended to by Health Centre doctors from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 to end of September 2004 specifying each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1553, 1557 and 1588 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1555 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Psycho-Geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV from 1<sup>st</sup> April to the end of September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Sixteen Psycho-Geriatric patients were admitted into KGV from 1<sup>st</sup> April to 30 September 2004.

**NO. 1556 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – LABORATORY SERVICES**

Since the Government, in answer to Question No. 828 of 2004, confirmed that there has been an increase in demand for most Laboratory Services, whether they intend to increase resources in this department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The Government have commissioned clinical reviews of all of their speciality services including Pathology. These reports are under consideration and Government will determine in due course whether additional staffing is needed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1556 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Minister talks of commissioning a report, is he referring to the Clinical Governance Audit?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The same review that is being undertaken at the moment?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, within the overall review, clinical reviews of all specialities are being carried out.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Obviously the Minister is aware that the extra demand sought is actually highlighted by the Team itself.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes. It is also true that new equipment as it comes on line is able to provide more sophisticated tests, and in some cases more work can be done, greater output provided with fewer human resources. So increased demand for tests does not necessarily equate to increased human resources in each particular case.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Just out of curiosity, I remember that the previous Minister for Health, the Hon Dr Bernard Linares, said that tests were being sent to a clinic in Barcelona. Is that still being done today?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If it was being done then and there was a need for it over and above somewhere else, presumably it is still being done now. I would not be able to answer that.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Except I remember the previous Minister saying that they were doing it as an interim arrangement and they were not sure how it would work, because the actual samples had to be transported by aeroplane and therefore, the GHA would be monitoring the situation and that is why I was interested in whether it was still being carried out or not, whether it had been found to be successful.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I remember that the GHA was concerned that some of these tests, because of the lapse of time, could actually lose the quality and therefore it was necessary to have a speedy testing of these samples. They had found that Barcelona could offer that but I cannot remember the details of what exactly the types of tests were. Certainly there was an element of testing in a laboratory in Barcelona. The hon Member is right.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this further study that is being done of the service, being done by the same people that are in the Clinical Governance Team, or by somebody else?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The team have brought in their own consultants to look at each particular speciality. For example, representatives from the Royal College of Surgeons would have been looking after the surgical speciality, and so on across the specialities, but the overall umbrella is that of the Health Care Development Team.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the study on the Laboratory services still going on, or is it finished and they have made recommendations?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Recommendations have not been presented to the Government yet. I am not aware whether they have finished or it is still on-going.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the service now operating at the full manning level or are there staff shortages currently, as compared to the complement that existed already?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I need notice of a question like that. I do not micro manage the laboratory of the hospital.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think there is an issue amongst the staff there, that they feel that the volume of work has risen exponentially and that they feel that there is a case for additional staff. I have certainly seen papers to that effect. So, certainly if one asked the Consultant Pathologist and his staff members, they would undoubtedly argue that there is a need for more staff, and we are just having that view assessed by the Health Care Development Team before the Government form a view on that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I believe that indeed the Health Authority Report that puts the number of tests done by the Laboratory, does show a significant increase.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is no doubt about it. The volume of laboratory work has grown very considerably over the years and the staff has not grown with it. What needs to be established is whether the improved technology has absorbed the additional volume or whether there is need for additional staff as well as the new technology.



ORAL

**NO. 1557 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can Government state what was the total number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre from January 2004 to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1553, 1554 and 1588 of 2004.

**NO. 1558 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can Government confirm what has been the expenditure for Study Leave, up to the end of August 2004, which is included in sub-head 30, School of Health Studies, and what amount was budgeted by the Gibraltar Health Authority for the full year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The expenditure for Study Leave to the end of August is £50,856.53. The amount budgeted for the year was £150,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1558 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Am I correct, if my memory serves me right, that the amount that has been budgeted is about double what was budgeted last year?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is what I said a moment ago. The amount budgeted for the year was £150,000.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Then I asked the Minister to confirm whether it was just about double of what had been budgeted for the previous year. It has trebled since, not doubled because I have found the answer to the question. Does that mean that more doctors are being sent this year, because less were sent last year? Does the Minister know what the reason is for the trebling of the amount?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The amount budgeted is in direct proportion to the amount of Study Leave available to doctors to take up, which they need to do to keep up their continuing professional development. So according to the number of doctors it equates to a number of days of Study Leave which then equates to a figure in pounds. I think also in this figure this year, there has been, I am almost certain they have included in there, there is a provision in the National Nursing Conference that was held last month. I am almost certain that is so but I cannot guarantee that, which makes plain the difference as well, because the budget was of the order of £50,000 for the Conference. As I say, the amount budgeted for Study Leave is in direct proportion to the number of doctors and the number of days that they are supposed to take up, but this is something that they have to take up but they do not always take up if work does not allow them to. That is why the account is not fully overspent at the moment. Not fully spent.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Am I correct in understanding what the Minister has just said, that they have included in this figure the £52,000, the International Nursing Conference?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I said that the budgeted figure may include the Nursing Conference which was a study period in itself, but I am not sure.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see. Could he confirm that then in writing? If we are talking about a sub-head which is traditionally taken by doctors and not by nurses, and the sub-head is included within the School of Health Studies, it may be that the Minister is referring to the figure of the School of Health Studies and not the figure for the doctors.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It could be.

ORAL

**NO. 1559 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm how many non-entitled patients have been admitted at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1551, 1552 and 1560 to 1562 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1560 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state how many Private Patients were seen to or treated at St Bernard's Hospital (a) as out-patients and (b) as in-patients during the month of April, May, June, July, August and September of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1551, 1552, 1559, 1561 and 1562 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1561 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELECTIVE SURGERY**

Can Government state how many persons there are presently waiting for Elective Surgery in each speciality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1551, 1552, 1559, 1560 and 1562 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1562 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – WAITING LISTS**

Can Government provide the latest comparable waiting lists for public and private patients covering all specialities, giving a breakdown of each, for both out-patients and in-patients, which also includes those who require surgical interventions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedules attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1562 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1551**

The total number of In-Patients admissions and the average number of patients per day during the period in question were:-

|                         | <b>In-Patient Admissions</b> | <b>Average No of patients per day</b> |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| April 2004              | 482                          | 154                                   |
| May 2004                | 491                          | 153                                   |
| June 2004               | 527                          | 156                                   |
| July 2004               | 531                          | 150                                   |
| August 2004             | 446                          | 144                                   |
| September 2004          | 410                          | 143                                   |
| <b>TOTAL FOR PERIOD</b> | <b>2887</b>                  | <b>900</b>                            |

**Answer to Question No. 1552**

|               | <b>Clinics</b> | <b>A &amp; E Clinic</b> | <b>A &amp; E Dressing</b> | <b>Physiotherapy</b> |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| April         | 1610           | 1612                    | 544                       | 597                  |
| May           | 1500           | 1840                    | 586                       | 631                  |
| June          | 1609           | 1899                    | 644                       | 569                  |
| July          | 1632           | 2070                    | 702                       | 599                  |
| August        | 1352           | 1902                    | 759                       | 513                  |
| September     | 1495           | 1855                    | 677                       | 525                  |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>9198</b>    | <b>11178</b>            | <b>3912</b>               | <b>3434</b>          |

**Answer to Question No. 1559 of 2004**

Non-entitled patients admitted at St Bernard's.

|                |    |
|----------------|----|
| April 2004     | 8  |
| May 2004       | 4  |
| June 2004      | 7  |
| July 2004      | 6  |
| August 2004    | 6  |
| September 2004 | 15 |

Cont.....



**Answer to Question No. 1562 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1560**

The number of private in-patients seen to or treated during the period in question were:-

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| April     | 21 |
| May       | 9  |
| June      | 19 |
| July      | 12 |
| August    | 11 |
| September | 18 |
| TOTAL     | 90 |

Out patient figures are not available.

**Answer to Question No. 1561 of 2004**

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| Ophthalmic          | 89  |
| Orthopaedic         | 418 |
| Gynaecology         | 47  |
| Otorhinolaryngology | 135 |
| General Surgery     | 121 |

Cont.....

Answer to Question 1562 of 2004

Answer to Question 1562 of 2004

OUTPATIENT PUBLIC & PRIVATE WAITING TIMES  
AS AT SEPTEMBER 2004

| SPECIALITY          | PUBLIC CLINIC                                                                                     | PRIVATE CLINIC                                                          | PUBLIC SURGERY                                                                                                                                                                              | PRIVATE SURGERY                                                       |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY | Adults 6 Weeks<br>Children 8 weeks.                                                               | 1 Weeks.                                                                | Adults 24 Months.<br>Children 12 Months.                                                                                                                                                    | No Waiting Time.<br>Private surgery is rarely done in this specialty. |
| GENERAL SURGERY     | 20 Weeks.                                                                                         | 1 Week.                                                                 | Up to 1 Year depending on procedure.                                                                                                                                                        | 3 Weeks.                                                              |
| GENERAL MEDICINE    | 7 to 9 Weeks.                                                                                     | 2 Weeks.                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                       |
| PAEDIATRICS         | 3 Weeks.                                                                                          | No Waiting Time.                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                       |
| OPHTHALMOLOGY       | 6 Weeks.                                                                                          | No Waiting Time.                                                        | Routine Surgery 2 Months.<br>Cataract Surgery 6 Weeks.                                                                                                                                      | No Waiting Time.                                                      |
| ELDEROLOGY          | 1 Weeks.                                                                                          | No Waiting Time.<br>No Private Patients seen during period in question. |                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                       |
| PAIN CLINIC         | 1 Week.                                                                                           | No Waiting Time.                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                       |
| PSYCHIATRY          | 1 to 3 Weeks.                                                                                     | No Waiting Time.                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                       |
| GYNAECOLOGY         | Urgent cases 1 Day<br>1 Week for cases requiring attention soon.<br>4 Weeks for routine cases.    | No waiting time.                                                        | 1 week for urgent<br>3 weeks for cases requiring attention soon<br>12 weeks. for routine surgery                                                                                            | No Private Surgery is done.                                           |
| ORTHOPAEDICS        | Urgent cases 1 day.<br>2 Weeks for cases requiring attention soon.<br>4 months for routine cases. | 3 Weeks.                                                                | Waiting time for public surgery varies from 2 Weeks to Years depending on intervention. Waiting time for Private Surgery is 4 weeks for minor surgery. Major surgery is not done privately. |                                                                       |

There is no waiting time for emergencies. The Gibraltar Health Authority has been able to obtain private patients waiting time under the Private Practice Agreement whereby Consultants are committed to provide information on private patients when requested.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1551, 1552 AND 1559 TO 1562 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I note that in three specialities the waiting lists have gone up. In answer to Question No. 831 I was given ophthalmic as 55 and we have 89, orthopaedics has gone up to 418, gynaecology has come down, ENT has come down and general surgery has come up. So the situation has not improved that much. I beg your pardon if I delay the House, because I have something like eight questions that have been asked and I need to look at each one of them. I will be looking at the figures, as I always do, but I would like to take the opportunity of advising the Minister for Health that here again I have found another discrepancy as regards the answers that I have been receiving in this House in relation to the out-patient attendances at St Bernard's, and I put him on notice that I will be writing to him because I have done my homework and I realise that they do not coincide neither with the Abstract of Statistics, and neither with the Healthcare Development Team Report. Even though the Chief Minister says '*que soy pesa*', I think that he should congratulate me on being able to identify the discrepancies that there are in the figures. When we talk about the non-entitled patients in the hospital, can the Government confirm whether non-entitled patients refer mainly to patients who come in ships and are moored here in Gibraltar, or can they say that non-entitled patients are also being seen to from the hinterland?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

A non-entitled patient is one who is not entitled to treatment in St Bernard's Hospital by virtue of being a contributor to the GPMS Scheme, whatever the source.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But if he comes in with a form from the hinterland surely he is entitled?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If he comes in with a form then he is not a non-entitled patient, he is entitled.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether entitled patients are being seen in Gibraltar from the hinterland?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, let me correct what I said before. All the jargon about GPMS plus the entitled patients from the EU, and if they come in bearing a valid E111 or E112, or whatever the forms are, then the answer is yes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

On the E111 I should clarify, a new E111 is not a passport to health tourism. In other words, one cannot come in to get treatment with an E111. One is only entitled to rely on an E111 if one is in Gibraltar and the need for the treatment arises whilst one is here. If one is a resident in Spain one cannot just come in for medical treatment saying 'here is my E111, give me a kidney transplant' or something like that.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will there be private patients being seen at the Europort Hospital when it is fully functional?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I think that question is the subject of another question on the order paper from the hon Member. The Government are looking at the whole question of private patients and I am not in a position yet to make a statement to that effect.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Government confirm, as they did in the last meeting of the House, that there will be private beds at Europort?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady has got to be in this area very careful to choose the right language in the right times. If she means private beds, private beds are different to private practice, see private beds could be occupied by non-entitled patients. The fact that they are non-entitled patients accessing a private bed does not necessarily mean in future that they will be regarded as private patients paying fees for the benefit of practitioners. See what I mean. Private practice is one thing and delivery of medical services to non-entitled patients is another thing. Now in the past non-entitled patients have often been seen as private patients by practitioners charging them private patients fees. That will end. In future, non-entitled patients who are charged fees will be charged fees by the Health Authority and there will be no private practice in that area.

ORAL

**NO. 1563 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ENROLLED NURSES**

Can Government state how many Enrolled Nurses have now applied to be able to train up to the level of Staff Nurse?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1564 to 1566 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1564 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government state what was the number of nurses in post as at the end of September 2004 with a breakdown by grade, giving the full-time equivalent of each grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 1563 and 1565 to 1566 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1565 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT NURSES**

Can the Government confirm how many contract nurses are employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority, at the end of September 2004, listing the speciality in which they are employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1563, 1564 and 1566 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1566 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NURSES TRAINING IN UK**

Can the Minister for health confirm how many of our local nurses are presently in the UK for Specialist training to enable contract nurses to be replaced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule attached.



**Answer to Question No. 1566 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1563 of 2004**

9 Enrolled Nurses applied for the Conversion course.

**Answer to Question No. 1564 of 2004**

|                                       |        |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| Director of Nursing Services:-        | Vacant |
| Deputy Director of Nursing Services:- | 1      |
| Clinical Nurse Manager:-              | 6      |
| Education Development Officer:-       | 1      |
| Senior Nurse Tutor:-                  | 1      |
| Nurse Tutor:-                         | 1      |
| Nurse Practitioner:-                  | 1      |
| Charge Nurse/Nursing Sister:-         | 30     |
| Registered General Nurses:-           | 99½    |
| Midwives:-                            | 13     |
| Operating Department Practitioner:-   | 1      |
| Senior Enrolled Nurses:-              | 5      |
| Enrolled Nurse:-                      | 87     |
| Nursing Auxiliary:-                   | 11     |
| Nursing Assistant:-                   | 91     |

**Answer to Question No. 1565 of 2004**

The number of contract nurses employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority is as follows:-

|                                     |    |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Clinical Nurse Manager:-            | 1  |
| Education Development Officer:-     | 1  |
| Nurse Tutor:-                       | 1  |
| Nurse Practitioner:-                | 1  |
| Registered General Nurse:-          | 15 |
| Registered Mental Nurse:-           | 4  |
| Registered Sick Children's Nurse:-  | 3  |
| Theatre Nurse:-                     | 2  |
| Staff Midwives:-                    | 12 |
| Operating Department Practitioner:- | 1  |
| Enrolled Nurse:-                    | 8  |

**Answer to Question No. 1566 of 2004**

There are currently four local nurses presently in the UK undergoing specialist training.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1563 TO 1566 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I note that the figure of the Enrolled Nurses that have applied to train up to the level of Staff Nurse is still nine. Can the Minister give a reason why so few have taken up the offer? It just does not make sense to us that there are so many enrolled nurses and only nine have applied.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I asked the same question myself, both of enrolled nurses themselves and also of the people responsible for running the course, and the answer was from the people running the course that it could be because of the level of difficulty offered by the course, and from nurses themselves, the feedback that comes to me is that they do not seem to be interested in doing, from all accounts, a long and difficult course. The facts are as they are, only nine have wanted to apply. We are in the process of trawling again, not for this course but for a future course, but if people are not interested they are not interested.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Except that will the Minister take on board the feedback that we have, that enrolled nurses come to us and they tell us that they are dissuaded from taking up the training because they are put off pay and they are given a grant, therefore their earnings come down.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not aware of that but I shall certainly take on board what she has just said.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will write to the Minister to remind him because these nurses come to us and they all seem to coincide that they lose money in the process.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I thank the hon Member. No one has brought that to my attention from within the GHA.

ORAL

**NO. 1567 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CT SCAN**

Can the Government confirm whether the Radiographer sent to the UK for Specialist Training in relation to the CT Scan in the Europort Building has now finalised the course?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO. 1568 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE**

Can the Minister for Health confirm who are the new top people the GHA will be recruiting, and for what posts, in the closing months of this year and into 2005, something he stated during an interview with GBC on 16<sup>th</sup> August 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1595 to 1597 of 2004.

**NO. 1569 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE**

Since the Minister for Health stated in an interview with GBC on 16<sup>th</sup> August 2004 that there are many parts of the services on which he hears complaints on a continuing basis, can he also confirm whether he is aware that there are many patients who complain that the GHA cannot find their records?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government are aware that there has been a historical problem with regards to the tracking of patient records which persists to this day.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1569 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister has really not answered the question because I said is he aware that there are many patients who complain, and he has replied that this has been a historical problem. Well, we now have more patients than ever complaining that their records cannot be found. Can the Minister say why this is the case, and whether the Government intend to do anything about it?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

There are several assumptions in that supplementary which I do not accept. One, that there are ever increasing numbers, this is hypothetical as far as I am concerned so I cannot address a hypothetical situation which the hon Member is giving with no authority, other than what she thinks is the case. Secondly, neither do I accept that there are any more records being lost, or any less records being lost than when she was Minister for Health. As far as I am concerned the situation is of the same scale, of the same order because it is the same system, the same records are being run in the same way and there are no great differences to indicate that things are much worse or much better, but they will be better in the future.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, I was Minister for Health and I can assure the Minister that I had my office within the buildings of the Health Authority and very rarely did we have as many complaints as there are today. When the Minister says that the problem will not be as it is today, can he say what it is that the Government intend to do in order for the problem to be eliminated?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Before I do that, let me say that I am getting increasingly bored with hearing the hon Member plug the line '*in my day everything was tickety-boo and everything has gone wrong since the GSD came into power*'. All she needs to do is ask outside in the public and she will be dissuaded from this point of view. People know that everything was not 100 per cent when she was there and I do not want to raise the past but please, can we stop boring us with this statement '*when I was there everything was okay*'. What are we going to do for the future?, if the hon Member is interested, we are currently evaluating a new system, an electronic system for tracing records, which would replace the present system or non-system, which is one of manual tracking. In effect one tags the file and the system will tell where the file is, anywhere within the GHA premises, electronically, and will tell if the file leaves the premises and who was the last person to have possession of the file. Obviously it is more complex than that, but that is the overall picture.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have taken note of everything the Minister has said, but when he says that he is tired of listening to me going back to the past, I would remind the Minister that it was he who started going to the past and not me.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just ask the Minister, that tagging system will I assume relate to a physical document file, is that right? We are still going to have paper files with patient records in them?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That tagging system to which I have referred is as applicable to physical paper files. Further down the line and do not expect me to put a date to it, but we are looking at electronic patient records as well but that is on the wish list at the moment rather than a likely development.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I take it from that and from his answers that despite the politicking in both his answers, that in fact the hon Gentleman shares our concerns that records should go missing? Whether they went missing before 1996 or not, and after 1996, because this can cause serious problems for the patients involved. I know for example, that some friends of mine recently had that problem, involving a very young child, where the child was tested on a number of occasions. When a decision was to be made as to treatment, the records of the tests had been lost and the child had to go through the tests again, which for a child is very uncomfortable. Does the Minister share our concerns that whoever's fault it is, however historical it may be, these things are happening and they have to be resolved?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Of course I share the concerns, I would prefer to be advised by management that no record has been lost in the last year or whatever, and that the situation should continue. Of course I share the concern like any sensible person would do. The politicking which he refers to aside, which starts with the question, if he cares to read the original question again, but let us leave that for the moment. As I have stated in my answer, of course we are aware that there is a problem and of course we are seeking to resolve it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is the Minister referring to the new electronic system just to St Bernard's or Europort, or will it also include the Primary Care Centre?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I think we are but hon Members must realise that we are looking at things that are being researched at the moment, not things that are being tested and about to be implemented. So I urge the hon Member not to ask me at the next Question Session in two months time '*and when is the Minister going to implement the electronic system that he said at Question Time two months ago he was about to implement?*'. I am not saying that. I am saying we are evaluating the introduction of it. I know the hon Member too well, and I know that that is exactly what she will do at the next Question Time and she will phrase her question, '*in view of the statement made by the Minister at Question Time that a new patient system is about to be introduced, why is he taking so long to introduce it?*'. So to answer her question, it is being evaluated in the context of the new hospital and with a view to extending it to Primary Care, but it will be tested in the new hospital.

ORAL

**NO. 1570 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – AMOUNTS PAID TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the Pharmacists as dispensing fees during the present financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1571 to 1581 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1571 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – AMOUNTS PAID TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government update the figure, which was given as incomplete in answer to Question No. 794 of 2004, for the financial year 2003/2004, as to how much has been paid to Pharmacists as a result of the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570 and 1572 to 1581 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1572 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – AMOUNTS PAID TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government confirm how much has been paid to Pharmacists during this financial year 2004/2005, as a result of the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570, 1571 and 1573 to 1581 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1573 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – AMOUNTS PAID TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to Pharmacists for the months of April, May, June, July, August and September of 2004 and the comparable figure for the same months in the previous year in respect of £1.80 per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570 to 1572 and 1574 to 1581 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1574 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting periods 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of 2004, in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to the dispensing pharmacists?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570 to 1573 and 1575 to 1581 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1575 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government now state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting periods 11 and 12 of 2003/2004, in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to dispensing pharmacists, which was not given in answer to Question No. 790 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 12570 to 1574 and 1576 to 1581 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1576 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570 to 1575 and 1577 to 1581 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1577 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods 11 and 12 of 2003/2004 as these were given as incomplete in answer to Question No. 791 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570 to 1576 and 1578 to 1581 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1578 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50, for the accounting periods 11 and 12 of 2003/2004 as these were given as incomplete in answer to Question No. 792 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570 to 1577 and 1579 to 1581 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1579 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of 2004 as a result of their having increased prescription charges from £1.20 to £2.50?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570 to 1578 and 1580 to 1581 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1580 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods 11 and 12 of 2004 as a result of their having increased prescription charges from £1.20 to £2.50, which were given as incomplete in answer to Question No. 793 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1570 to 1579 and 1581 of 2004.

**NO. 1581 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50 for the accounting periods 13, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedules that I hand to her. The information provided is in respect of complete periods only and in future, similar questions where periods are not complete, the answers will be held over for the next Question Time.

I would also ask the hon Member to note that the information she has requested in Question No. 1576 in respect of periods 1-6 of 2003/2004 has already been provided at an earlier meeting of this House. However, it has been assumed that the information that the hon Member is actually seeking relates to 2004/2005, and that information has been provided in the schedule.

**Answer to Question No. 1581 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1570**

£339,802.20 has been paid to the Pharmacists as dispensing fees from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 to 18<sup>th</sup> July 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 1571**

The 15 per cent of the cost of medicines paid to Pharmacists towards transportation costs for the financial year 2003/2004 was £911,643.52.

**Answer to Question No. 1572**

The 15 per cent of the cost of medicines paid to the Pharmacists towards transportation costs for the periods 1-4 for the year 2004/2005 was £288,934.60.

**Answer to Question No. 1573**

2004  
April – July 18<sup>th</sup>

2003  
April – July 20<sup>th</sup>

|                 |            |                 |            |
|-----------------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| <b>Period 1</b> | £83,118.60 | <b>Period 1</b> | £76,104.00 |
| <b>Period 2</b> | £84,344.40 | <b>Period 2</b> | £76,316.40 |
| <b>Period 3</b> | £83,417.40 | <b>Period 3</b> | £77,274.00 |
| <b>Period 4</b> | £88,921.80 | <b>Period 4</b> | £77,943.60 |

The above information is in respect of completed periods only.

**Answer to Question No. 1574**

**Year 2003/2004**

| <b>PERIOD</b> | <b>PRESCRIPTIONS</b> | <b>ITEMS</b> | <b>COST</b> |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 13            | 5583                 | 14011        | £183,908.13 |

**Year 2004/2005**

| <b>PERIOD</b> | <b>PRESCRIPTIONS</b> | <b>ITEMS</b> | <b>COST</b> |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1             | 5621                 | 14449        | £183,986.16 |
| 2             | 5718                 | 14526        | £189,863.20 |
| 3             | 5681                 | 14514        | £187,535.77 |
| 4             | 6050                 | 15338        | £207,346.15 |

The above information is in respect of completed periods only.

Cont.....

**Answer to Question No. 1581 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1575**

|                  | <b>PRESCRIPTIONS</b> | <b>ITEMS</b> | <b>COST</b> |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| <b>Period 11</b> | 6212                 | 15410        | £199,650.91 |
| <b>Period 12</b> | 5958                 | 14989        | £189,226.71 |

**Answer to Question No. 1576**

| <b>PERIOD</b> | <b>PRESCRIPTIONS</b> | <b>ITEMS</b> | <b>COST</b> |
|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| (2003/2004)   |                      |              |             |
| 13            | 12549                | 44196        | £513,053.08 |
|               |                      |              |             |
| (2004/2005)   |                      |              |             |
| 1             | 12756                | 46177        | £544,501.56 |
| 2             | 13010                | 46858        | £543,248.33 |
| 3             | 12807                | 46343        | £538,030.25 |
| 4             | 13634                | 49401        | £589,385.15 |

**Answer to Question No. 1577**

|                  | <b>PRESCRIPTIONS</b> | <b>ITEMS</b> | <b>COST</b> |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| <b>Period 11</b> | 13930                | 49262        | £575,599.89 |
| <b>Period 12</b> | 12912                | 45338        | £526,508.92 |

**Answer to Question No. 1578**

|           | <b>ITEM</b> |
|-----------|-------------|
| Period 11 | 3436        |
| Period 12 | 3460        |

**Answer to Question Nos. 1579 and 1580**

When the prescription charges were amended, the Government made all medicines free for pensioners and additionally, after charging only for the first three items on the prescription, supplies all further medicines completely free of charge.

It is not possible to calculate the extra revenue raised within any degree of accuracy but it is estimated to be in the region of:

- a) £30,000 for periods 13 of ¾ and periods 1-4 of 04/05.  
Periods 5 & 6 are incomplete.
- b) £14,000 for periods 11 & 12 of 03/04.  
This updates Question No. 793 of 2004.

Cont.....

**Answer to Question No. 1581 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1581**

2003/2004

|           |      |
|-----------|------|
| Period 13 | 3248 |
|-----------|------|

2004/2005

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Period 1 | 3409 |
|----------|------|

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Period 2 | 3406 |
|----------|------|

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Period 3 | 3470 |
|----------|------|

|          |      |
|----------|------|
| Period 4 | 3708 |
|----------|------|

Some pharmacists still have to submit accounts for periods 5 & 6 and therefore these are not complete.

## SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1570 TO 1581 OF 2004

### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

All I can say is that I have something like sixteen questions here and it will be impossible for me to actually look at the figures at this moment in time, so I will be taking them with me and studying them more carefully. Can I just ask the Minister for some information as regards the dispensing fees on which I am still not 100 per cent sure? I remember that when the Hon Dr B Linares was Minister for Health, he did say that as regards the dispensing fee there was a maximum of £750,000 being paid to the pharmacists, and I think that the present Minister for Health has also confirmed that. Can he explain whether the £750,000 is shared equally with all the pharmacies, or are they given different fees, or is it shared equally? That is a question that I have always asked and I have not been given a reply.

### **HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would need notice of that question. I can confirm that there is a cap of £750,000, how it is shared out I would need to research. Maybe my Colleague can give that information.

### **HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, it is not a cake that is shared out in equal pieces. Obviously they are paid according to the number of dispensations, if I may call them that, each pharmacist has issued. Therefore some have dispensed many more items and prescriptions than others and therefore they will be paid accordingly. So it is not shared equally but then they all have to add up whatever they have received in dispensing fees and then it is where the capping of £750,000 comes into effect.

### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am not sure I have understood the answer. Perhaps I will write to the Minister and then he will be able to provide me with the information if he has not got it with him, because it seems to me an unfair system that if say a pharmacy actually dispenses more medicines than another one, is the Minister saying that he could get less than the other pharmacy?

### **HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, what I understand my hon Colleague to have said is that the dispensing fee is in direct relation to the number of prescriptions dispensed. Therefore if one has a notional pharmacy that only dispenses ten prescriptions during the period, and another one that dispenses 100,000, then obviously the pharmacy that dispenses 100,000 will get 100,000 times the dispensing fee and the other one will only get ten times the dispensing fees. But overall, all the pharmacies, have a cap of £750,000.

ORAL

**NO. 1582 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SHORTAGES OF BEDS**

Can Government confirm whether there still continues to be shortages of beds at St Bernard's Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1546, 1583 and 1584 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1583 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Long Stay Elderly Care Patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital in April, May, June, July, August and September of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1546, 1582 and 1584 of 2004.

**NO. 1584 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the months of April, May, June, July, August and September of 2004, of the beds occupied by Elderly persons who have been formally discharged, how many fell into each of the three categories identified by the Government:

- 1) Elderly persons living alone;
- 2) Elderly persons needing support;
- 3) Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1582**

There continues to be periodic difficulty in finding beds for newly admitted patients at St Bernard's Hospital. Much of the problem is caused by the occupation of a significant number of medical beds by patients who have been deemed fit for discharge.

**Answer to Question No. 1546**

As a consequence some elective operations have been cancelled. Four were cancelled in April, seven in June and four in September.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1583 and 1584**

The additional statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedules enclosed.

**Answer to Question No. 1584 of 2004**

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1583**

The number of long stay elderly patients are as follows:-

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| April     | 60 |
| May       | 62 |
| June      | 59 |
| July      | 59 |
| August    | 57 |
| September | 55 |

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1584 of 2004**

**SCHEDULE TO QUESTION NO. 1584 OF 2004**

|                       |    |
|-----------------------|----|
| <b>APRIL 2004</b>     | 10 |
| <b>MAY 2004</b>       | 10 |
| <b>JUNE 2004</b>      | 10 |
| <b>JULY 2004</b>      | 10 |
| <b>AUGUST 2004</b>    | 10 |
| <b>SEPTEMBER 2004</b> | 11 |

Of these the number of elderly persons living alone was as follows:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>APRIL 2004</b>     | 4 |
| <b>MAY 2004</b>       | 4 |
| <b>JUNE 2004</b>      | 4 |
| <b>JULY 2004</b>      | 4 |
| <b>AUGUST 2004</b>    | 4 |
| <b>SEPTEMBER 2004</b> | 5 |

All elderly patients require some sort of support be it physical, emotional or social.

All patients who have been officially discharged are able to be looked after.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1546 AND 1582 TO 1584 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister said in a statement that I have actually got here with me, that he would stick his neck out that the problem of the shortages of beds would be solved, is his head still on the chopping block?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I find difficulty in identifying that supplementary in line with what has been asked in the main questions.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is relevant to the question of shortages of beds, on which he was interviewed, I have got it here with me, and he said '*I will stick my neck out and that the problem will be solved by the end of the year*'.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will have an explanation. The difference between putting ones neck out and putting it on the block, they are different acts. The hon Lady asked whether the neck was still on the block not whether the neck was still out.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

We will wait until the end of the year.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Would the problem not be eased substantially if Mount Alvernia were to be completed? There are two floors still at Mount Alvernia not being used. I know I think it is nearly ready, maybe the hon Lady will confirm this. She told me in the House a few months ago that it would be ready in September and I can confirm that substantial progress has been made but there are still two floors that are not being used, and logically, if the two floors were completed quickly then some of the elderly people in the Hospital could move to Mount Alvernia.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The problem would be temporarily eased by that. The hon Member knows that a very substantial investment has been made in Mount Alvernia to increase its capacity

substantially, and that one of the things that the Government are planning to do, as the hon Lady gave in a previous answer, I think it was 33 elderly people occupying beds in Hospital are earmarked or are waiting to move to Mount Alvernia. That by itself would be a very temporary solution because the numbers would soon build up again, of elderly people in hospital. We might get rid of 33 or 40 but then elderly people would start going into hospital again and staying there. So by itself the extension of Mount Alvernia is not enough, it has to be accompanied by a variety of parallel action. One is the possibility of providing more residential care facilities, not just Mount Alvernia. The other is extending the provision of domiciliary care so that elderly people can stay in their homes for longer and not feel that they have to take refuge in hospital when they are actually not ill. A further plank of the Government's policy in that respect is to build more Bishop Canilla style housing, which has an element of shelter in the sense that there are wardens, resident wardens and all of that. All of these things, domiciliary care, further residential care, further sheltered accommodation, all these are ways of making it less likely that people have to be abandoned by their families in hospital, as a means of providing them with effectively, elderly residential care facilities which hospitals are not for. That does not mean the facility should be provided somewhere else. Unless we do all those things, which the hon Member knows are well in hand, simply providing an extra 50 beds in Mount Alvernia, which is about to happen, would accommodate the 30 or 40 that are presently blocking beds, if we could call them that, but they would soon be replaced by another 40 patients in St Bernard's Hospital if that is all that was done. That is why it is important to do much more than just that.

ORAL

**NO. 1585 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Have Government now decided which employees will be re-generating the meals on each of the floors at the Europort Hospital after they are transported from the old wine factory area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 1586 of 2004.

**NO. 1586 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Can Government now confirm whether they have finalised the arrangements that will come into place for meals to be provided to patients in the Europort Hospital when it becomes operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1586**

The arrangements for the provision of meals to patients at the new hospital will be on the basis of a plated menu service.

**Answer to Question No. 1585**

There will be no re-generation of food required. Meals will be delivered straight from the kitchen to the wards and will be served on individualised trays.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1585 AND 1586 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When we talk about the meals that will be cooked in the old wine factory area, have the Government already made arrangements who will be providing it and who will be transporting it to the Europort building?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It depends what the hon Member means by having made the arrangements. The overall plan is there and is being implemented as and when things come on stream. If the hon Member is now going to ask me whether it is the existing staff in St Bernard's Hospital, the answer is yes as well.



**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The existing staff will remain as members of the Gibraltar Health Authority, with the same contracts and conditions they have now?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So when the meals are transported to the Europort Hospital it will be done by a private entity, am I correct?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No. It will be a GHA operation by GHA employees using GHA assets. May I correct that for the avoidance of doubt. For GHA read Government, because the facility may be expanded to provide food in other directions as well.

**NO. 1587 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Can the Government confirm whether there will still be Private Ward facilities at the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Yes, the design of the new hospital makes provision for 10 beds in private ward facilities.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1587 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So I suppose these will be used for non-entitled patients?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, but not necessarily exclusively. There is a difference between the bed and the medical service delivered. An entitled patient may choose to rent a very expensive bed and pay for it. It will not entitle him to any quicker medical service but he might find the bed more comfortable.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does that mean that the private bed, being so much more expensive means that it is more luxurious than the others?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I recall, beds in the private corridor never were more comfortable. Why people chose to lie in them as opposed to in a ward bed is a matter of very peculiar personal preference, but there are some people who attach importance to it and if they want it the

facilities are there. That said, no decision has yet been made as to whether that will operate in that way or how it will operate. The answer is that the facility exists. If the Government want to operate a private ward facility it is there. No final decision has been made about whether it is going to be operational from the beginning, of course it has got to be staffed, and there are issues of that sort still for consideration but the facility is there in the design of the hospital.

**NO. 1588 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can Government confirm whether there have been any changes implemented to the appointments system which was introduced at the Primary Care Centre in the summer of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1588**

At the beginning of August 2004, a new computerised appointment system was introduced. This software (Frontdesk) is specifically tailored for appointments in a Primary Care setting and was chosen amongst others by the Primary Care Co-ordinator, Administration and IT officer. This system allows the Gibraltar Health Authority to keep a record of statistics as well as strict control on advanced bookings.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1553, 1554 and 1557**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member in Question Nos. 1553, 1554 and 1557 are set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1588 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1553**

**Out-patient Attendances 01/04/04 to 30/09/04**

| <b>DEPARTMENT</b>  | <b>APR</b>    | <b>MAY</b>    | <b>JUN</b>    | <b>JUL</b>    | <b>AUG</b>    | <b>SEPT</b>   | <b>TOTAL</b>   |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| AUDIOLOGY          | 121           | 373           | 280           | 213           | 0             | 198           | 1,185          |
| DIETICIAN          | 80            | 64            | 70            | 70            | 95            | 94            | 473            |
| CLINIC SISTER      | 1,264         | 1,243         | 1,165         | 1,247         | 1,224         | 1,597         | 7,740          |
| SCHOOL HEALTH      | 377           | 876           | 326           | 357           | 224           | 323           | 2,483          |
| SPEECH & LANGUAGE  | 271           | 174           | 152           | 67            | 120           | 196           | 980            |
| MENTAL WELFARE     | 238           | 286           | 292           | 277           | 259           | 257           | 1,609          |
| GP CLINIC          | 7,355         | 8,009         | 8,158         | 8,495         | 7,795         | 9,100         | 48,912         |
| HOUSE CALLS        | 478           | 613           | 442           | 565           | 378           | 549           | 3,025          |
| DENTAL             | 1,358         | 1,029         | 1,629         | 1,114         | 1,073         | 1,674         | 7,877          |
| CHILD WELFARE      | 735           | 775           | 812           | 648           | 636           | 807           | 4,413          |
| MIDWIFE            | 19            | 40            | 23            | 23            | 33            | 3             | 141            |
| NURSE PRACTITIONER | 178           | 230           | 333           | 236           | 222           | 345           | 1,544          |
| DERMATOLOGIST      | 22            | 23            | 19            | 16            | 0             | 19            | 99             |
| PHYSIO             | 81            | 93            | 95            | 105           | 378           | NFA           | 752            |
| OT                 | 114           | 63            | 117           | 64            | 76            | 74            | 508            |
| ORTHOPIST          | 80            | 87            | 145           | 110           | 64            | 122           | 608            |
| OPTOMETRIST        | 170           | 123           | 115           | 162           | 83            | 105           | 758            |
| DISTRICT           | 5,040         | 4,777         | 1,943         | 4,652         | 3,506         | 4,593         | 24,511         |
|                    |               |               |               |               |               |               |                |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       | <b>17,981</b> | <b>18,878</b> | <b>16,116</b> | <b>18,421</b> | <b>16,166</b> | <b>20,056</b> | <b>107,618</b> |

NFA: No figures available

**Answer to Question No. 1588 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1554**

House-calls attended by GP's 01/04/04 – 30/09/04

|           |                    |
|-----------|--------------------|
| April     | 478                |
| May       | 613                |
| June      | 442                |
| July      | 565                |
| August    | 378                |
| September | 549                |
|           | <b><u>3025</u></b> |

NOTE: Calls received during working hours are recorded until 4pm. Night calls do not form part of these statistics.

**Answer to Question No. 1588 of 2004**

**Schedule to Question No. 1557**

The total number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre from January 2004 to September 2004 was 71,430.

| <b>DEPT</b> | <b>JAN</b> | <b>FEB</b> | <b>MAR</b> | <b>APR</b> | <b>MAY</b> | <b>JUN</b> | <b>JUL</b> | <b>AUG</b> | <b>SEPT</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> |
|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| GP Clinic   | 7998       | 7397       | 9229       | 7355       | 8009       | 7215       | 8495       | 7795       | 7937        | 71,430       |

**NO. 1589 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can the Government confirm, in view of the reply given by the Minister for Health in answer to Question No. 826 of 2004, that they do not agree with the comments made by the Healthcare Development Team in their report of September 2003, that District Community Services are under resourced and therefore are not well provided for?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The answer remains the same as given in answer to Question No. 826 of 2004. The Government do not have to agree or disagree with comments made by the Healthcare Development Team in their Diagnostic Report.

The Gibraltar Healthcare Development Team uses international comparisons when looking at service provision. This is not the same thing as making formal recommendations for change but simply adds to the debate on the most appropriate form of provision for Gibraltar.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1589 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So of course there will be instances where the Government agree with the recommendations and there will be instances where they do not agree with certain recommendations.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, I think we have been down this route before. The hon Member seems not to yet have grasped the purpose of the Diagnostic Report and the work streams that have flowed from it.



ORAL

**NO. 1590 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT**

Can Government confirm what type of accommodation is provided to members of the Clinical Governance Audit when they are in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1591 to 1594 and 1598 to 1600 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1591 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MEDICAL REVIEW TEAM**

Can the Government confirm since they announced in their Press Release of 27 July 2004, that they have accepted the third recommendation of the Medical Review Team which relates to scheduling surgery, that scheduling surgery in Gynaecology will commence as planned for this October?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1590, 1592 to 1594 and 1598 to 1600 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1592 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT**

Can the Government confirm how much money they have spent up to date on the Clinical Governance Audit they commissioned with regard to our Health Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1590, 1591, 1593, 1594 and 1598 to 1600 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1593 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can the Government confirm that once all the recommendations of the Healthcare Development Team are finally received by them, they will be made public in the form of a full report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1590 to 1592, 1594 and 1598 to 1600 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1594 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT**

Can Government confirm whether any member of the National Clinical and Governance Audit Team they have commissioned for our Health Services, have the Authority to issue instructions to staff members of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1590 to 1593 and 1598 to 1600 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1595 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – POST OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Can Government give details of the salary of the new Chief Executive post of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1568, 1596 and 1597 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1596 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIRECTOR OF NURSING SERVICES**

Can Government confirm what is the salary of the post of Director of Nursing Services of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1568, 1595 and 1597 of 2004.

**NO. 1597 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR**

Can the Government give details of the salary of the post of Director of Human Resources for the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The new Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority will be Dr David McCutcheon and he will be taking post on 20<sup>th</sup> October. The Director of Nursing Services and Patient Management will be Ms Karen Parsley and the Human Resources Director will be Mr Chris Wilson. They start work on 1<sup>st</sup> December. Three year contracts have been awarded with salaries of £106,000, £66,758 and £60,758 respectively. The post of Director of Nursing Services in GHA has been vacant for two years. The salary level of the post with its present duties and responsibilities is £40,595.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1568 AND 1595 TO 1597 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether I heard him correctly, did he say £106,000 or £160,000?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

£106,000.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Apart from the salary, are there any additional perks?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What is a perk?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, accommodation, things like that.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, the usual conditions of contract officers. Accommodation in the same sort of accommodation and the usual conditions of a contract officer.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I suppose that the salary will be taxed locally.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, subject to local tax.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether it will be Category 3?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am glad that we have this information because in the interview the Minister said the details of the salaries, not something which is normally discussed for this area of employment. So I am glad that he has provided the information.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

At that stage we had not yet interviewed applicants. It would have been a little bit silly to advertise the level of salaries that we were or were not prepared to give, prior to those applications being received and the interviews taking place.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Government confirm whether that salary will now be the salary for future Chief Executives?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Clearly not. These are not established posts. The Gibraltar Health Authority will always have these posts but this is people that the Government bring in to move Gibraltar quantitatively and qualitatively forward in the context of health development. We are paying for the importation of skills and expertise and it should not be assumed that these are the established salaries of these posts if they are re-provided in a different way in the future. Certainly not.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Government confirm whether the salary that the Minister has just provided us with for the Director of Nursing Services, £66,000, can he say whether that salary is the same one that was there previously for that post?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, this is a new post. The old post was Director of Nursing Services. The post, as it has been advertised and filled, is for Director of Nursing Services and Patient Management, and it has a completely new job description to what the old post had.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will that salary remain for that post for the future, or will it be on the basis of the answer that I got for the Chief Executive?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The question is entirely hypothetical. The Government will pay what people doing the job is worth. This is the Gibraltar Health Authority, these people are being contracted to the Gibraltar Health Authority and the Government will make decisions, in the future, when these jobs need to be replaced, what needs to be paid to a future new recruit, perhaps we might have to pay more. We may be able to pay less, it is not a question of the Government now committing themselves to make this the salary. That would be absurd. The labour market place for people of these skills is competitive and it depends on how much demand there is for the services of people with these skills. Now, if she were to ask me 'do the Government hope that these posts can be re-localised at some stage in the not too distant future?'. The answer is that I sincerely hope that that is true and I hope that people make a career in Health Care management, go off and acquire skills and qualifications and come back so that the day is upon at some stage when we do not have to import this expertise. Certainly the position of the Government, and I

know the Opposition Members have a different view to which they are entitled, but our view is that health care management is a discipline that has moved on a long time, it has moved beyond the stage where it could just be done as another form of clerical and administrative function, and until Gibraltar has the sort of expertise available to it to do these things in a way that ensures that people get the best possible health service that our money can buy, we think it is right to bring these facilities in from abroad. I cannot tell the hon Member how much would be paid to these post holders in the future when they come to be replaced. These are three year contracts with these incumbents. After three years, it may be more or less, it is unlikely to be less but certainly the Government are not saying that these are now the going rates for these posts.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will the post holders be entitled to an ex-gratia payment on termination of their contracts?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the Minister said that it was on usual Crown contract terms, and that is one of them.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can Government state the level of the ex-gratia payment? Is it a percentage of salary, or is it just a negotiated sum?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it is the usual Government contract rate, which I think is 25 per cent.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Twenty five per cent of one year's salary or twenty five per cent of the value of the contract? That is three times £106,000.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is 25 per cent of annual salary, whether one pays annually or at the end of three years, it is 25 per cent of everything that one has earned.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Twenty five per cent of everything that person will have earned will be 25 per cent of £318,000. Is it that or is it 25 per cent of one year's salary, £106,000?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Members I am sure know, the standard terms for Crown contract officers is 25 per cent per annum of salary. So, basically, one adds up the total salary and in effect it is 25 per cent of the total one has earned. That is what all Government contract officers have always earned and in fact, it is quite good value compared to the cost of providing a pension for a permanent and pensionable officer, for which it is generally thought that the provision that would have to be made for a funded scheme, is more than 25 per cent per annum of salary, in order to provide a final salary scheme pension. Twenty five per cent is thought to be less than it would cost to provide an equivalent public sector type pension. Some public officers get it paid annually by concession but actually the contract stipulates that one gets it all on termination.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the hon Gentleman confirm whether that amount is tax free?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He is now stretching my memory. I have a suspicion that it is tax free because it is the equivalent of a pension. I believe that it is but I would have to re-check that. I think the standard terms are 25 per cent tax free but I would prefer that he did not rely on my memory. If he is interested I will confirm it to him. I think it is tax free.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So in effect the total remuneration for the new Chief Executive at the end of the three years will be in the region of £400,000.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If he has done the sums I am impressed. Yes it is this increased by a factor of 25 per cent. If that adds up multiplied by three, if that is the figure that he has mentioned yes. The hon Members now begin to realise what is the hidden cost of public sector occupational pension schemes. It actually costs much more than that.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So really, we are talking about a situation that this gentleman will be the highest paid officer in the whole of the Government.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Probably not. I cannot remember what the salary package is of the Finance Centre Director but it cannot be far off this and has been in this order for many years already, I think. There or thereabouts.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is my recollection that the Finance Centre Director earns in the region of £80,000 or used to.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well that might have been, I believe that has not been his position for some time. Perhaps he can ask the question next time round about the Finance Centre Director's salary. In any case, that is not the point. The Government do not look at these things in terms of , there is a rate in the market for people with these skills and this expertise. In Gibraltar, either we want to carry on having our Health Service run the way it has historically been run over the last many years, or we want our Health Service run in accordance for a period of time, whilst it reforms itself, run in accordance with modern healthcare management techniques and we have made a policy decision that that is worth paying the market rate for those services. Frankly, in this day and age, it is not that huge a salary.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can Government confirm that Dr McCutcheon will be seconded from another health authority?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not see where the hon Member has had that impression from. There is nothing certainly that the Government have said, or the GHA have said that should give him that impression. The short answer to his question is no. He is on contract to the Government.

-----  
**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Mr Speaker with your leave I would like to clarify some information I gave in answer to supplementaries earlier on in this Session. In answer to Question No. 1595 on the salary of the new Chief Executive of the Health Authority, in supplementaries we had some discussion on the percentage of the gratuity due to the Chief Executive at the end of the three year term. Although I qualified that I was not certain but we talked about a percentage of salary and whether it was total salary of the three years or whether it was

per year. The correct information, I have checked the contract, the correct information is that we have agreed a lump sum of £35,000 payable at the end of the three years. It is a one-off payment and it is not tied to any percentage.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask the Minister, does that apply to just one of the officers, the statement that he has just made?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That applies to the Chief Executive about whom we had the discussion.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The other contract officers then get what the 25 per cent of their three year salary?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

We did not discuss the other contracts, we discussed only that one. The information is on that particular one.

ORAL

**NO. 1598 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can Government confirm how many recommendations they have received from the Healthcare Development Team to date for implementation in our Health Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1590 to 1594 and 1599 and 1600 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1599 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can Government confirm what are the recommendations they have implemented from the Healthcare Development Team and which are those they have not accepted to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1590 to 1594 and 1598, 1600 of 2004.



**NO. 1600 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

In view of the Government's announcement that there will be a number of phases involved as to the recommendations made by the Healthcare Development Team, by which date do they expect all the recommendations to have been received?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 1590**

Members of the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Team are provided with the same accommodation as contract officers and locums employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority.

**Answer to Question No. 1592**

The Government have paid a total of £972,209.01 to date in respect of fees for the Healthcare Development Review.

**Answer to Question No. 1594**

Mr John Langan has been seconded to the GHA by the UK's Modernisation Agency as Joint Chief Executive and exercises the same powers and responsibilities as Mr Ernest Lima. This is a common arrangement in the UK for interim health service management.

Mr Frank McGurrin, who is not a member of the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Team, also exercises the same powers and responsibilities as Mr Joe Catania.

**Answer to Question No. 1598**

To date the Government have received nine reports from the Healthcare Development Team. A further six reports are scheduled to be delivered over the next three months.

### **Answer to Question No. 1593**

Following acceptance by the Government of recommendations contained in a work stream report, the report itself is published amongst key GHA staff and union representatives for consultation. Following the consultation period the report is officially launched and information contained in the report is made public. Both the Complaints and the Scheduling reports have been subjected to this procedure, and a similar procedure will apply to the other reports.

### **Answer to Question No. 1591**

Implementation of a work stream report is made up of a number of phases. The first phase is pre-implementation planning which involves a number of key tasks to ensure the successful launch of a new way of working. These tasks include the agreement of the new process, identification of new staff roles and communication with patients.

### **Answer to Question No. 1599**

To date the Government, in consultation with the Healthcare Development Team, have accepted in principle all of the recommendations contained in the completed Phase II work stream reports which Government have received. The following work streams have been implemented:

1. Management Arrangements
2. Complaints

The following are in the pre-implementation phase:

1. Scheduling
2. Primary Care Appointments
3. Staff Appraisal and Training Needs Analysis
4. Redefinition of the Relationship with the Civil Service

The following works are undergoing further development work by the Healthcare Development Team:

1. Medical Staffing
2. Patient Re-Registration
3. Discharge

### **Answer to Question No. 1600**

The Government expect to have received all of the recommendation reports from the Healthcare Development Team before the end of December 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1590 TO 1594 AND 1598 TO 1600 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister confirm how much Mr McGurrin is being paid and how much Mr Langan is being paid?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Both Mr Langan and Mr McGurrin are seconded by the Healthcare Development Team, by the Modernisation Agency and therefore are not on contract to the Government or being paid directly by the Government. They are part of the fees of the Healthcare Development Team.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As I have so many questions being answered at the same time, I am not too sure whether the Minister mentioned anything in relation to scheduling surgery.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there any special tax treatment in the case of these two gentlemen or are they paying normal tax as any other employee?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

They are not salaried employees.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well they are working in Gibraltar.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

But they are not salaried employees.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Somebody is paying them to work, no? Is that the advice the Government have, that the Tax Ordinance does not apply to them?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

As far as I am concerned they are seconded to me by the Healthcare Development Team.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it that the Government do not know whether they have got taxable emoluments in Gibraltar?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are paying a fee to an external agency to deliver health reform advice. Part of that advice includes implementation advice and support. My understanding is that they are not in a relationship of employment in Gibraltar and that they are probably not paying tax personally in Gibraltar. Be aware they are not employed, they are deployed in Gibraltar by an organisation that is being paid a fee for the delivery of services by that organisation in Gibraltar. Rather like visiting consultants, not medical consultants. Rather like visiting engineering consultants, or architectural consultants or things of that sort. What the correct treatment of such people is under the Income Tax Ordinance I do not know, but that is the structure of the way the service is being delivered. Whether they are subject to taxation is not a matter that I am personally aware of.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would imagine that the tax treatment of the persons that are working here for the company that is selling its services to the Government, will have been factored into the fee the Government is charged. Presumably the other gentleman who is getting £106,000 was not given the category whatever, he would have demanded a higher salary gross. Therefore one assumes that whatever they are getting paid by the agency must take into account the tax treatment, but it seems to me that if they are in fact working alongside, sharing a post in the Health Service alongside somebody else, Mr Catania or Mr Lima, every day of the week, all the year round, well they are more like detached workers than some other category. Detached workers, my understanding is, are made to pay tax in Gibraltar.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I was returning to answer the first part of the question that the Hon Miss Mari Montegriffo asked me in terms of scheduling. Her question in Question No. 1591 was that scheduling surgery in gynaecology will commence as planned in October, is that right?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes that is right.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I said that scheduling was in the pre-implementation stage and I defined for her the pre-implementation stage. The first phase is pre-implementation planning, which involves a number of key tasks to ensure the successful launch of a new way of working. These tasks include the agreement of new processes, identification of new staff roles and communication with patients. That is where scheduling in gynaecology is at the moment. It is being implemented and it is in the pre-planning stage.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Except that as I read the Press Release further, the Minister said the new scheduling service for surgery will commence in gynaecology in October. It will be introduced in other surgical specialities. So I took it that it was starting already within gynaecology. Except that when he goes on to mention the other surgical specialities, ophthalmology, general surgery, urology, orthopaedics and ENT, these will start in early 2005 after the backlogs have been eliminated, and that is the question that I am putting to the Minister. Now, is he saying, because the Minister in answer to Question No. 1561 a little while ago, gave me the list of the people who are waiting for elective surgery. Therefore, it appears to me that if there are 418 people waiting in orthopaedics, and then he says in his Press Release that the scheduling surgery will commence after the backlogs have been eliminated, is he saying that it will start once the 418 are off the list?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, the intention is to eliminate those long waiting lists and once we are down to manageable figures, then to introduce scheduling in the particular speciality. Scheduling will not cure the waiting lists.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I know that, but if I am correct then, this is an exercise that would take quite a few number of months, because if we had a situation in April and in May where the waiting lists were lower in most specialities that I have been given, then the backlog will surely take much longer than what the Minister is saying. Is he saying early 2005? That is what he said in his Press Release.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is scheduling and there is waiting lists elimination. They are linked but not the same thing. The process of elimination of backlog, elimination of waiting lists, relies on two factors in addition to the scheduling process. One is the arrival on stream once we move into the new hospital, of a much larger amount of operating theatre resources, so that there will be more operating theatre resources available and therefore each speciality will get access to more operating theatre time than they get at the moment. Secondly, it has to be read in conjunction with the proposals in relation to the increase in the number of consultants, which means that there will be more people to perform the operations and provide the service. So, there are some disciplines in which the scheduling system can start to work already, in their existing facilities at St Bernard's Hospital and I think gynaecology has probably already been providing a degree of scheduling service, probably now for one or two months, but the main hospital based scheduling service will not come in with a vengeance until we are in the new hospital and the rate at which operations can be carried out in each discipline, will hugely increase because of (a) the availability of more operating theatre resources, (b) the availability of more keyhole surgery techniques, and (c) the availability of more surgeons and consultants to carry out these services with part of the scheme, involves increasing from single-handed consultants to double-handed consultants et cetera. None of that can take place in St Bernard's because there are not the additional operating theatres available, nor additional staff recruited.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are the Government saying that scheduling surgery is being offered to new patients or to the patients that I have been told are on the list?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is a different issue. Scheduling simply means that the patient has a say in choosing a date convenient to the patient for doing the operation. It has got to be by appointment. It is not just a question of being told to come on 15<sup>th</sup> October or 2<sup>nd</sup> January and one may be on ones holiday and if one misses the slot, that is what scheduling means. Scheduling does not in itself provide additional resources to deliver more medical care. It is just a way of delivering whatever the amount of resource one has in a way that is convenient to the client in terms of the choice of date and (b) obliges the Health Authority to make sure that all the required back-up services are in place for the delivery of a particular choice. So for example, if the hon Lady and the Health Authority management schedule an elective, obviously this does not apply to emergency surgery which is immediate, we are talking about elective surgery. If the hon Lady schedules an operation for her to be done on 3<sup>rd</sup> March and the Health Authority confirm the 3<sup>rd</sup> March to her, then the Health Authority will make sure that all the resources that she needs, both before the operation, during her stay, for example a bed, and post operation, for example therapy and all of that, that all of that is already lined up and teed up to be delivered to her consistent with the date for the operation which has been given to her. That sort of coordination, which is really internal coordination within the Health Authority, has actually never been available before, and that is what scheduling means. This is not just about her date, it is about lining up behind the scenes all the

resources necessary to make sure that she will not be pushed around from pillar to post, from one department to the other, one is ready and the other is not. That by itself does not eliminate backlog. One can only eliminate backlog by having more surgeons and more operating theatre time, and that is how the backlog will be dealt with.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I posed the question because I was confused, because the Press Release says that it will be introduced after the backlogs have been eliminated. Therefore, I thought that the hon Members obviously were saying, well if the backlogs are to be eliminated we are talking about the backlogs of the people who are on the list for elective surgery. Secondly, in that same Press Release, it does say as the Minister's statement that he is excited about visible real improvements to the quality of our health care and so on and so forth, he says secondly by the elimination of all backlogs of waiting lists. That is why I posed the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, and that press statement remains correct in the sense that one cannot offer people the choice of dates whilst one has a waiting list still on ones plate. In other words, dates will simply not be available for her to choose as a new patient, if the system is still clogged up with people waiting. So, the scheduling system will not actually operate properly until the backlog is fully removed. Now, not to say that it will not operate at all but it will not operate as it is intended to work until there is no backlog. The whole basis of the reform is that waiting lists will disappear. They will become a thing of the past. Now, when the new hospital arrives and the new staff that has to be recruited is recruited, the advice that we have is that the backlog can be eliminated very quickly and that the fully fledged scheduling process will actually start to operate quite quickly in the full sense, without prejudice to the fact that in the meantime there will be a degree of scheduling available. She is right in that it will not operate in accordance with the basis that the model is intended to deliver in the longer term, until the backlogs have been eliminated and that is a matter of weeks and a few months, we are not talking about years to eliminate the backlog. The procedure for the elimination of backlog that has been worked out talks about weeks and a handful of months and no longer than that. So that is the situation and we think the system will work very well but that there will be launching issues and there will be transitional issues and that we do not expect the system to work from day one, as it will eventually work when the backlogs have been ironed out of the system.

ORAL

**NO. 1601 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the months of April to September 2004 were registered with the Employment Agency as unemployed giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1602 to 1607 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1602 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency in the months of April to September 2004 were registered as looking for part-time jobs giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1601 and 1603 to 1607 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1603 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – MOROCCAN NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many Moroccan nationals employed in the months of April to September 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1601, 1602 and 1604 to 1607 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1604 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – OTHER BRITISH**

Can Government state of the “Other British” employed in the months of April to September 2004 how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1601 to 1603 and 1605 to 1607 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1605 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state of the Spanish nationals employed in the months of April to September 2004 how many were new entrants to the local labour market by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1601 to 1604 and 1606 to 1607 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1606 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state what was the total number of employment contracts for Spanish nationals registered with the Employment Agency in April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1601 to 1605 and 1607 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1607 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NON-EEC NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals in the months of April to September 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1607 of 2004**

Number of Gibraltarians employed in the months of April to September 2004 and who were registered with the Employment Service.

| April       | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 3    | 4      | 7     |
| 18-24       | 11   | 5      | 16    |
| 25 and over | 12   | 13     | 25    |
| Total       | 26   | 22     | 48    |

| May         | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 0    | 2      | 2     |
| 18-24       | 5    | 5      | 10    |
| 25 and over | 9    | 9      | 18    |
| Total       | 14   | 16     | 30    |

| June        | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 1    | 4      | 5     |
| 18-24       | 16   | 6      | 22    |
| 25 and over | 11   | 6      | 17    |
| Total       | 28   | 16     | 44    |

| July        | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 1    | 1      | 2     |
| 18-24       | 8    | 8      | 16    |
| 25 and over | 15   | 5      | 20    |
| Total       | 24   | 14     | 38    |

| August      | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 1    | 1      | 2     |
| 18-24       | 11   | 7      | 18    |
| 25 and over | 13   | 4      | 17    |
| Total       | 25   | 12     | 37    |

| September   | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 3    | 4      | 7     |
| 18-24       | 11   | 15     | 26    |
| 25 and over | 14   | 13     | 27    |
| Total       | 28   | 32     | 60    |

cont..

Contd Answer to Question 1607 of 2004

Number of Gibraltarians registered as unemployed with the Employment Service in the months of April to September 2004, looking for part-time employment:

| April       | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 18-24       | 0    | 1      | 1     |
| 25 and over | 0    | 15     | 15    |
| Total       | 0    | 16     | 16    |

| May         | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 18-24       | 0    | 1      | 1     |
| 25 and over | 0    | 13     | 13    |
| Total       | 0    | 14     | 14    |

| June        | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 18-24       | 1    | 0      | 1     |
| 25 and over | 0    | 10     | 10    |
| Total       | 1    | 10     | 11    |

| July        | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 18-24       | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 25 and over | 0    | 9      | 9     |
| Total       | 0    | 9      | 9     |

| August      | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 18-24       | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 25 and over | 0    | 13     | 13    |
| Total       | 0    | 13     | 13    |

| September   | Male | Female | Total |
|-------------|------|--------|-------|
| Under 18    | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 18-24       | 0    | 0      | 0     |
| 25 and over | 0    | 14     | 14    |
| Total       | 0    | 14     | 14    |

cont...



**Contd Answer to Question 1607 of 2004**

Number of Moroccan nationals who are new entrants to the Local Labour Market in the months of April to September 2004:

|                  |          |
|------------------|----------|
| <b>April</b>     | <b>0</b> |
| <b>May</b>       | <b>2</b> |
| <b>June</b>      | <b>1</b> |
| <b>July</b>      | <b>2</b> |
| <b>August</b>    | <b>1</b> |
| <b>September</b> | <b>6</b> |

Other British nationals who are new entrants to the Local Labour Market in the months of April to September 2004:

|                  | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>April</b>     | <b>29</b>    | <b>18</b>      | <b>47</b>    |
| <b>May</b>       | <b>35</b>    | <b>24</b>      | <b>59</b>    |
| <b>June</b>      | <b>31</b>    | <b>31</b>      | <b>62</b>    |
| <b>July</b>      | <b>35</b>    | <b>25</b>      | <b>60</b>    |
| <b>August</b>    | <b>30</b>    | <b>26</b>      | <b>56</b>    |
| <b>September</b> | <b>39</b>    | <b>29</b>      | <b>68</b>    |

Number of Spanish nationals employed in the months of April to September 2004, who were new entrants to the local labour market:

|                  | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>April</b>     | <b>22</b>    | <b>24</b>      | <b>46</b>    |
| <b>May</b>       | <b>33</b>    | <b>15</b>      | <b>48</b>    |
| <b>June</b>      | <b>37</b>    | <b>27</b>      | <b>64</b>    |
| <b>July</b>      | <b>22</b>    | <b>26</b>      | <b>48</b>    |
| <b>August</b>    | <b>46</b>    | <b>27</b>      | <b>73</b>    |
| <b>September</b> | <b>71</b>    | <b>39</b>      | <b>110</b>   |

**cont...**

**Contd Answer to Question 1607 of 2004**

Number of Notice of Terms of Engagement for Spanish nationals registered in April to September 2004 :

|                  |      |
|------------------|------|
| <b>April</b>     | 2711 |
| <b>May</b>       | 2738 |
| <b>June</b>      | 2749 |
| <b>July</b>      | 2779 |
| <b>August</b>    | 2802 |
| <b>September</b> | 2840 |

Number of non-EEC nationals who are new entrants to the Local Labour Market in the months of April to September 2004:

| <b>April</b>      | <b>Malaysia</b> | <b>Colombian</b> | <b>Czek</b> | <b>Ukrain</b> |
|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>Manag.</b>     | 1               |                  |             |               |
| <b>Prof.</b>      |                 | 1                |             |               |
| <b>Ass. Prof.</b> |                 |                  |             |               |
| <b>Admin</b>      |                 |                  | 1           |               |
| <b>Skilled</b>    |                 |                  |             |               |
| <b>Personal</b>   |                 |                  |             |               |
| <b>Sales</b>      |                 |                  |             | 1             |
| <b>Plant</b>      |                 |                  |             |               |
| <b>Element.</b>   |                 |                  |             |               |

| <b>May</b>        | <b>Canadian</b> | <b>Indian</b> | <b>S.African</b> | <b>Israeli</b> |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Manag.</b>     |                 | 2             |                  |                |
| <b>Prof.</b>      | 2               |               | 1                |                |
| <b>Ass. Prof.</b> |                 |               |                  |                |
| <b>Admin</b>      |                 |               |                  | 1              |
| <b>Skilled</b>    |                 |               |                  |                |
| <b>Personal</b>   |                 |               |                  |                |
| <b>Sales</b>      |                 |               |                  |                |
| <b>Plant</b>      |                 |               |                  |                |
| <b>Element.</b>   | 1               |               |                  |                |

| <b>June</b>       | <b>Polish</b> | <b>Canada</b> | <b>Malaysia</b> | <b>Israeli</b> | <b>Turk</b> | <b>American</b> |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| <b>Manag.</b>     |               |               |                 |                |             |                 |
| <b>Prof.</b>      |               |               | 1               |                |             | 1               |
| <b>Ass. Prof.</b> |               |               |                 |                |             |                 |
| <b>Admin</b>      |               |               |                 |                | 2           |                 |
| <b>Skilled</b>    | 29            |               |                 | 2              |             |                 |
| <b>Personal</b>   |               | 1             |                 |                |             |                 |
| <b>Sales</b>      |               |               |                 |                |             |                 |
| <b>Plant</b>      |               |               |                 |                |             |                 |
| <b>Element.</b>   |               |               |                 |                |             |                 |

cont...

Contd Answer to Question 1607 of 2004

| July       | Romanian | Ukrain | Thai | Israeli | Russia |
|------------|----------|--------|------|---------|--------|
| Manag.     |          |        |      |         |        |
| Prof.      |          | 2      |      |         |        |
| Ass. Prof. |          |        | 1    |         |        |
| Admin      |          |        |      | 1       | 1      |
| Skilled    |          |        |      |         |        |
| Personal   |          |        |      |         |        |
| Sales      |          |        |      |         |        |
| Plant      | 1        |        |      |         |        |
| Element.   | 1        |        |      |         |        |

| August     | Australian | Indian |
|------------|------------|--------|
| Manag.     |            | 5      |
| Prof.      |            |        |
| Ass. Prof. | 1          |        |
| Admin      |            |        |
| Skilled    |            |        |
| Personal   |            |        |
| Sales      |            |        |
| Plant      |            |        |
| Element.   |            |        |

| September  | Bulg | China | Indian | Slovak | Israel | Australia | Canada | USA | Japan | Russia | Turk |
|------------|------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|-----|-------|--------|------|
| Manag.     |      |       | 1      |        | 1      | 2         |        | 1   |       |        | 1    |
| Prof.      |      |       |        | 2      |        | 3         | 5      |     |       | 1      |      |
| Ass. Prof. |      |       |        |        |        |           | 1      |     |       |        |      |
| Admin      |      |       |        |        |        |           |        |     |       |        |      |
| Skilled    |      |       |        |        |        |           |        |     |       |        |      |
| Personal   |      |       |        |        |        |           |        |     |       |        |      |
| Sales      | 1    | 2     |        |        |        | 1         |        |     | 2     |        |      |
| Plant      |      |       |        |        |        |           |        |     |       |        |      |
| Element.   |      |       |        |        |        |           |        |     |       |        |      |

**NO. 1608 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state what was the expenditure by the Employment Agency on wage subsidy in the months of April to September 2004 and the number of people and of employers involved?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The expenditure incurred by the Employment Service on wage subsidy in the months of April to September 2004 is as follows:

| <b>Year 2004</b>       | <b>April</b> | <b>May</b> | <b>June</b> | <b>July</b> | <b>August</b> | <b>September</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| <b>Expenditure (£)</b> | 2,695        | 13,288     | 8,989       | 16,474      | 6,610         | 10,068           |

| <b>Year 2004</b>          | <b>April</b> | <b>May</b> | <b>June</b> | <b>July</b> | <b>August</b> | <b>September</b> |
|---------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| <b>Total of Employers</b> | 21           | 24         | 27          | 26          | 28            | 28               |
| <b>Total of Employees</b> | 24           | 29         | 34          | 34          | 29            | 29               |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1608 OF 2004****HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister indicate why the expenditure fluctuates, as it does, when the number of employers and employees sometimes is steady? For example, in the month of July, the expenditure is in one instance £16,000 when we are dealing with 26 employers and 34 employees, and in the previous month of June the expenditure was half that when we were dealing with only one more employer and exactly the same number of employees.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The expenditure is very deceptive really because some of the bills go back on a previous entry. Different employees engaged in the scheme finish at different times in the six months. Their year of wage subsidy given to the employer ends in July or June and therefore, I think it is much more indicative in terms of the progress of the scheme to look at the number of employers and employees rather than the expenditure, which fluctuates for the reason I have just given.

ORAL

**NO. 1609 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

Can Government state how many employment contracts were registered with the Employment Agency for frontier workers in the months of April to September 2004 giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1610 and 1611 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1610 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SELF-EMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many persons were registered as self-employed with the Employment Agency in the months of April to September 2004 giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1609 and 1611 of 2004.

**NO. 1611 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

What was the number of employment contracts registered with the Employment Agency in respect of private employers excluding Government-owned and joint venture companies in the months of April to September 2004 giving a breakdown by nationality of employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

I am very pleased to be able to provide data from the Employment Service registers concerning frontier workers. This was discussed in the last meeting and I explained there were difficulties with the computer, the Profile 2000 Programme, I want to express my appreciation to the officers in the Department who have now somehow re-arranged the programme to give us at the touch of a button the data required.



**Answer to Question No. 1611 of 2004**

Frontier workers registered with the Employment Service in the months of April to September 2004 broken down by sex.

|                  | <b>M</b> | <b>F</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------|----------|----------|--------------|
| <b>April</b>     | 2098     | 1476     | 3574         |
| <b>May</b>       | 2136     | 1492     | 3628         |
| <b>June</b>      | 2167     | 1510     | 3677         |
| <b>July</b>      | 2180     | 1539     | 3719         |
| <b>August</b>    | 2223     | 1580     | 3803         |
| <b>September</b> | 2274     | 1577     | 3851         |

Self employed persons registered with the Employment Service in the months of April to September 2004 broken down by sex.

|                  | <b>M</b> | <b>F</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------|----------|----------|--------------|
| <b>April</b>     | 436      | 217      | 653          |
| <b>May</b>       | 442      | 221      | 663          |
| <b>June</b>      | 446      | 224      | 670          |
| <b>July</b>      | 452      | 227      | 679          |
| <b>August</b>    | 455      | 227      | 682          |
| <b>September</b> | 455      | 231      | 686          |

Terms of Engagements registered with the Employment Service in respect of private employers excluding Government-owned and joint venture companies in the months of April to September of 2004:

|                  | <b>Gib.</b> | <b>Other British</b> | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| <b>April</b>     | 6527        | 3089                 | 2538           | 993             | 549              | 512                  | 14208        |
| <b>May</b>       | 6560        | 3109                 | 2576           | 1005            | 553              | 511                  | 14314        |
| <b>June</b>      | 6619        | 3136                 | 2599           | 1004            | 561              | 511                  | 14430        |
| <b>July</b>      | 6697        | 3188                 | 2622           | 1003            | 566              | 490                  | 14566        |
| <b>August</b>    | 6654        | 3225                 | 2630           | 1006            | 576              | 487                  | 14578        |
| <b>September</b> | 6639        | 3258                 | 2696           | 1006            | 597              | 500                  | 14696        |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1609 TO 1611 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I thank the Minister for having written to me at the beginning of September, giving me that explanation and most of the data already requested up to the end of August, although I did not receive this set until after my Question had been filed? Can I ask him to turn his mind to the total figure of frontier workers and ask him to see whether he can in some way explain why there is a constant rise, that that curve always is going up, and whether the service has any indication why even in its constituent parts, for example, the Gibraltarians in that group, the Other British in that group are consistently going up?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The reason is that these are cumulative figures. The totals are cumulative figures and also behind it all, there is that eternal problem that I have explained before, the failure of employers very often to notify terminations, and that is why there is that increase, not terribly dramatic but certainly because of the accumulation of these registrations.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask the Minister to look into something which I imagine he cannot answer now? This is, if he looks at the figure which he has given us say for August, or for April in terms of frontier workers, and the table he provided in writing which gave us a breakdown by nationality, it shows for example that between April and August, comparing the frontier workers and the breakdown by nationality previously provided in writing, it shows that the number of Spanish nationals that are registered as foreign workers is something of the order of 300 to 400 less than the total number of Spanish nationals registered. That would suggest that there is in the order of 300 to 400 resident Spanish workers. That seems a high figure and I wonder if that could be looked at?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Resident in Gibraltar so they are no longer foreign workers.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Minister has given us in the previous answer a breakdown which shows the total, and then he has given us the frontier element, I imagine, of that total which is around 2,400 in the written answer which coincides with the component of Spanish nationals in the figure that he has given in answer now to the male/female division. In the answer he has just given, he gives us the male/female division and previously to that in writing he provided a figure of Spanish frontier workers where for example, in August it was 2,529. What I am saying is that if he looks at the figures in different months, he finds that something around 350 would appear to be by deduction the resident Spanish workers.

That seems to be a high figure compared to what I remember seeing in the past and I wondered if that could be looked at.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I certainly will because I share the hon Member's view that it seems a rather high figure of Spanish residents in Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Following from the answer that the Minister has given in relation to my first supplementary, are we therefore to expect that that curve is now going to flutter a bit. We have seen a 10 per cent increase in the first nine months of the year across the board of frontier workers. If that is because of registrations, are we going to see that figure now plateau?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It should even out after notices of terminations are demanded and eventually achieved and obtained by the Employment Service, it should be evened out, but there seems to be a pattern as I say, not just with the frontier workers but with every other cumulative totals that we have here in these tables, there is that increase. We simply, to some extent, an enlightened guess is that it is because of the terminations.

**NO. 1612 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the months of April to September 2004 receiving:-

- (a) Unemployment Benefit;
- (b) Social Assistance;
- (c) No payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1613 and 1614 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1613 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYMENT REGISTER**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during the months of April to September 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1612 and 1614 of 2004

ORAL

**NO. 1614 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the months of April to September 2004 were registered with the Employment Agency giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1614 of 2004**

Gibraltarians aged 18 and over, receiving UB or SA or no payments for months April to September 2004, broken down by sex and age.

**A. UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT**

| <b>2004</b>      | <b>MALES</b> | <b>FEMALES</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>18/25</b> | <b>25+</b> |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| <b>APRIL</b>     | 45           | 17             | 62           | 22           | 40         |
| <b>MAY</b>       | 39           | 20             | 59           | 25           | 34         |
| <b>JUNE</b>      | 38           | 27             | 65           | 22           | 43         |
| <b>JULY</b>      | 38           | 38             | 76           | 26           | 50         |
| <b>AUGUST</b>    | 45           | 40             | 85           | 31           | 54         |
| <b>SEPTEMBER</b> | 42           | 33             | 75           | 27           | 48         |

**B. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

| <b>2004</b>      | <b>MALES</b> | <b>FEMALES</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>18/25</b> | <b>25+</b> |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| <b>APRIL</b>     | 89           | 40             | 129          | 22           | 107        |
| <b>MAY</b>       | 88           | 41             | 129          | 25           | 104        |
| <b>JUNE</b>      | 93           | 47             | 140          | 26           | 114        |
| <b>JULY</b>      | 86           | 47             | 133          | 24           | 109        |
| <b>AUGUST</b>    | 90           | 50             | 140          | 25           | 115        |
| <b>SEPTEMBER</b> | 93           | 58             | 151          | 27           | 124        |

**C. NO PAYMENTS**

| <b>2004</b>      | <b>MALES</b> | <b>FEMALES</b> | <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>18/25</b> | <b>25+</b> |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| <b>APRIL</b>     | 46           | 51             | 97           | 33           | 64         |
| <b>MAY</b>       | 52           | 49             | 101          | 31           | 70         |
| <b>JUNE</b>      | 43           | 43             | 86           | 29           | 57         |
| <b>JULY</b>      | 71           | 22             | 93           | 42           | 51         |
| <b>AUGUST</b>    | 32           | 17             | 49           | 17           | 32         |
| <b>SEPTEMBER</b> | 66           | 57             | 123          | 67           | 56         |

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1614**

Number of Gibraltarians added to the unemployment register during the months of April to September of 2004, broken down by age and sex.

| <b>April</b>         | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 3           | 12            | 15           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 19          | 14            | 33           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 27          | 25            | 52           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>49</b>   | <b>51</b>     | <b>100</b>   |

| <b>May</b>           | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 3           | 8             | 11           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 24          | 15            | 39           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 26          | 25            | 51           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>53</b>   | <b>48</b>     | <b>101</b>   |

| <b>June</b>          | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 10          | 5             | 15           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 29          | 15            | 44           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 33          | 26            | 59           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>72</b>   | <b>46</b>     | <b>118</b>   |

| <b>July</b>          | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 5           | 6             | 11           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 32          | 21            | 53           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 45          | 21            | 66           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>82</b>   | <b>48</b>     | <b>130</b>   |

| <b>August</b>        | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 7           | 4             | 11           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 19          | 12            | 31           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 33          | 26            | 59           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>59</b>   | <b>42</b>     | <b>101</b>   |

| <b>September</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 9           | 15            | 24           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 44          | 43            | 87           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 44          | 40            | 84           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>97</b>   | <b>98</b>     | <b>195</b>   |

Cont.....



**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1614**

Number of Gibraltarians employed in the months of April to September 2004 and who were registered with the Employment Service.

| <b>April</b>         | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 3           | 4             | 7            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 11          | 5             | 16           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 12          | 13            | 25           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>26</b>   | <b>22</b>     | <b>48</b>    |

| <b>May</b>           | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 0           | 2             | 2            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 5           | 5             | 10           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 9           | 9             | 18           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>14</b>   | <b>16</b>     | <b>30</b>    |

| <b>June</b>          | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 1           | 4             | 5            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 16          | 6             | 22           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 11          | 6             | 17           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>28</b>   | <b>16</b>     | <b>44</b>    |

| <b>July</b>          | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 1           | 1             | 2            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 8           | 8             | 16           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 15          | 5             | 20           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>24</b>   | <b>14</b>     | <b>38</b>    |

| <b>August</b>        | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 1           | 1             | 2            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 11          | 7             | 18           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 13          | 4             | 17           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>25</b>   | <b>12</b>     | <b>37</b>    |

| <b>September</b>     | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 3           | 4             | 7            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 11          | 15            | 26           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 14          | 13            | 27           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>28</b>   | <b>32</b>     | <b>60</b>    |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1612 TO 1614 OF 2004**

### **HON F R PICARDO:**

In relation to Question No. 1612, can I just ask the Minister whether he has noted the quite dramatic increase in terms of females receiving unemployment benefit, where we have an almost 100 per cent increase, and females receiving social assistance where the increase is in the order of I think about 40 per cent or 50 per cent, whether he has analysed those figures in order to be able to understand how such sharp increases can be noted in a period of only six months?

### **HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have not analysed these figures in detail because this information actually comes to us from the Social Services Department.

### **HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to the question on the numbers of people added to the register, which is 100 in April, the number of Gibraltarians joining the register, it goes up to 195 in September, then if we compare that with the number of persons employed who were registered, how is it that the difference between these two figures is not actually reflected in an increase in the numbers still registered? What this indicates is presumably that people are stopping attending without having had a job, in almost as big numbers as those who stop attending because they have got a job. That would be the only deduction that I could make. If I may take as an example any particular month, for example, in the month of September this shows 195 people registered for the first time as unemployed and 60 people were removed because they found work, leaving 135 more than there were in August, in theory. Unless something else has happened to the 135, since in fact the unemployment figures that are published do not show such an increasing trend, it would imply that people in fact simply stop attending the ETB even without finding work.

### **HON DR B A LINARES:**

This is what we call 'the lapsed', which means that they actually stop registering in the ETB as unemployed any more. That may explain it.

### **HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that in fact the figures are quite significant, because it would appear from the September example that I have quoted, if there is no significant change in the numbers out of work in September then we are talking about the lapse of numbering the employed by a ratio of 2 : 1. If the difference between the people that become unemployed and the people that get jobs is 135, which is the 195 minus 60, and most of them then disappear because they lapse, would the Minister consider the possibility perhaps for a period of time of keeping a record of the people that are lapsed to see if it

is that they find work on their own, because they may actually be joining the workforce but not apparently coming from the unemployed, because they have actually been unemployed but they have not taken the job at the time that the ETB still had them on their books as being unemployed. It may be for example that people have lapsed according to the ETB in September when really they have taken a job and their contract has not been registered, that kind of thing. So it might be worth monitoring for a number of months what is happening with the lapsed to see if in fact they are not really disappearing but actually getting work. Would the Minister agree?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes we have of course records of the lapsed people who do not turn up any more, but what the hon Member is suggesting that we somehow investigate the outcome, the final destination of these lapsed, whether they have actually found jobs for themselves which have not gone into our employment registers, which they should have done.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

At least I am suggesting, if the Minister will consider, perhaps asking the officers at the ETB to try out for several months something like that to see if anything shows up. Given that it is surprising that twice as many people should disappear through being lapsed than disappear through finding work in a given month.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I understand the point made by the hon Member perfectly and I will put it to the officers in the Employment Service to try and follow this one up to see if they can shed any further light on these discrepancies.

ORAL

**NO. 1615 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the months of April to September 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1616, 1617 and 1618 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1616 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

Can Government give details of the number of employment contracts terminated in the months of April to September 2004, giving a breakdown by nationality and industry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1615, 1617 and 1618 of 2004.

**NO. 1617 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – VACANCIES FILLED**

Can Government state of the vacancies filled in the months of April to September 2004 how many were for part-time employment giving a breakdown by sex as follows:

- (a) Gibraltarians; and
- (b) Other nationals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1615, 1616 and 1618 of 2004.

**NO. 1618 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT**

Can Government state how many Terms of Engagements were registered with the Employment Agency in the months of April to September 2004:

- (a) including directors; and
- (b) excluding directors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1618**

Number of work permits issued in the months of April to September 2004.

| April      | Malaysia |   | Canadian |   | Ukranian |   | Czeck |   |
|------------|----------|---|----------|---|----------|---|-------|---|
|            | M        | F | M        | F | M        | F | M     | F |
| Manag.     |          |   |          |   |          |   |       |   |
| Prof.      |          |   | 1        |   |          |   |       |   |
| Ass. Prof. | 1        |   |          |   |          |   |       |   |
| Admin      |          |   |          |   |          | 1 |       | 1 |
| Skilled    |          |   |          |   |          |   |       |   |
| Personal   |          |   |          |   |          |   |       |   |
| Sales      |          |   |          |   |          |   |       |   |
| Plant      |          |   |          |   |          |   |       |   |
| Element    |          |   |          |   |          |   |       |   |

| May        | Colombian |   | Moroccan |   | Israeli |   | Polish |   |
|------------|-----------|---|----------|---|---------|---|--------|---|
|            | M         | F | M        | F | M       | F | M      | F |
| Manag.     |           |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |
| Prof.      |           |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |
| Ass. Prof. |           |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |
| Admin      |           |   |          |   | 1       |   |        |   |
| Skilled    | 1         |   |          |   |         |   | 11     |   |
| Personal   |           |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |
| Sales      |           |   | 1        |   |         |   |        |   |
| Plant      |           |   |          |   |         |   |        |   |
| Element    |           |   | 1        |   |         |   |        |   |

| June       | S.Africa |   | Polish |   | America |   | Israeli |   | Romania |   | Maroc |   | Malay |   | Turk |   |
|------------|----------|---|--------|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|-------|---|-------|---|------|---|
|            | M        | F | M      | F | M       | F | M       | F | M       | F | M     | F | M     | F | M    | F |
| Manag.     |          |   |        |   |         |   |         |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |      |   |
| Prof.      |          |   |        |   | 1       |   |         |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |      |   |
| Ass. Prof. |          |   |        |   |         |   |         |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |      |   |
| Admin      | 1        |   |        |   |         |   |         |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |      |   |
| Skilled    |          |   | 22     |   |         |   | 1       |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |      | 1 |
| Personal   |          |   |        |   |         |   |         |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |      |   |
| Sales      |          |   |        |   |         |   |         |   |         |   |       |   |       | 1 |      | 1 |
| Plant      |          |   |        |   |         |   |         |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |      |   |
| Element    |          |   |        |   |         |   |         |   | 1       |   | 1     |   |       |   |      |   |

| July       | Romanian |   | Ukranian |   | Russian |   |
|------------|----------|---|----------|---|---------|---|
|            | M        | F | M        | F | M       | F |
| Manag.     |          |   |          |   |         |   |
| Prof.      |          |   |          |   |         |   |
| Ass. Prof. |          |   |          |   |         |   |
| Admin      |          |   | 2        |   |         | 1 |
| Skilled    |          |   |          |   |         |   |
| Personal   |          |   |          |   |         |   |
| Sales      |          |   |          |   |         |   |
| Plant      |          | 1 |          |   |         |   |
| Element    |          |   |          |   |         |   |

Cont.....



**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1618**

| August     | Israeli |   | Australian |   | Mor. |   | Canadian |   | Slovak |   | Thai |   |
|------------|---------|---|------------|---|------|---|----------|---|--------|---|------|---|
|            | M       | F | M          | F | M    | F | M        | F | M      | F | M    | F |
| Manag.     |         |   | 1          |   | 1    |   |          |   |        |   |      |   |
| Prof.      |         |   |            |   |      |   | 6        |   | 1      |   |      |   |
| Ass. Prof. |         |   | 1          |   |      |   |          |   |        |   |      |   |
| Admin      | 1       |   |            |   |      |   |          |   |        |   |      |   |
| Skilled    |         |   |            |   |      |   |          |   |        |   |      |   |
| Personal   |         |   |            |   |      |   |          | 1 |        |   |      | 1 |
| Sales      |         |   | 3          |   |      |   |          |   |        |   |      |   |
| Plant      |         |   |            |   |      |   |          |   |        |   |      |   |
| Element    |         |   |            |   |      |   |          |   |        |   |      |   |

| September  | Slovak |   | Indian |   | China |   | Israeli |   | Japan |   | Moroc |   | Turkey |   | Bulgar |   | Austral |   | Russia |   |
|------------|--------|---|--------|---|-------|---|---------|---|-------|---|-------|---|--------|---|--------|---|---------|---|--------|---|
|            | M      | F | M      | F | M     | F | M       | F | M     | F | M     | F | M      | F | M      | F | M       | F | M      | F |
| Manag.     |        |   | 6      |   |       |   |         |   |       |   | 1     |   | 1      |   |        |   |         |   |        |   |
| Prof.      | 1      |   |        |   |       |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |        |   |        |   | 1       |   | 1      |   |
| Ass. Prof. |        |   |        |   |       |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |        |   |
| Admin      |        |   |        |   |       |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |        |   |
| Skilled    |        |   |        |   |       |   |         |   |       |   | 2     |   |        |   |        |   | 1       |   |        |   |
| Personal   |        |   |        |   |       |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |        |   |
| Sales      |        |   |        |   | 2     |   |         |   | 1     | 1 |       |   |        |   |        | 1 | 1       |   |        |   |
| Plant      |        |   |        |   |       |   |         |   |       |   |       |   |        |   |        |   |         |   |        |   |
| Element    |        |   |        |   |       |   |         |   |       |   |       | 1 |        |   |        |   |         |   |        |   |

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1618**

**May-2004**

| <b>Industry</b>                   | <b>Gibraltar</b> | <b>Other Brit</b> | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 10               | 1                 | 14             |                 | 1                | 1                    | 27           |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    |                  |                   | 2              | 1               |                  |                      | 3            |
| Printing & publishing             | 2                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 2            |
| M/F n.e.c. (Clothing, et cetera)  |                  |                   | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Building & Construction           | 16               | 37                | 51             |                 | 3                | 16                   | 123          |
| Electricity Supply                |                  | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Water Supply                      |                  | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Sea transport / shipping svcs     | 3                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 3            |
| Port & Services                   |                  |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |              |
| Road transport & related svc      | 3                | 2                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 6            |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 2                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 2            |
| Air transport & related svc       | 1                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 2                | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 3            |
| W/sale fuel                       |                  |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 0            |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 3                | 2                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 5            |
| Retail Food                       | 13               | 4                 | 9              |                 |                  |                      | 26           |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 1                | 1                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 3            |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         | 8                | 1                 | 2              |                 |                  |                      | 11           |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 2                | 5                 |                | 1               |                  |                      | 8            |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 4                | 5                 | 9              |                 |                  |                      | 18           |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 2                | 1                 | 4              |                 |                  |                      | 7            |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 11               | 8                 | 13             | 5               |                  | 1                    | 38           |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 1                | 6                 | 6              |                 |                  | 1                    | 14           |
| Tourist svcs n.e.c., (inc Casino) | 1                | 2                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 3            |
| Banking & finance                 | 9                | 4                 |                |                 | 2                |                      | 15           |
| Insurance & Real Estate           | 7                | 4                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 12           |
| Legal, account, oth bus. Svcs     | 5                | 11                | 10             |                 | 3                |                      | 29           |
| Public admin                      | 17               |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 17           |
| Educa Services                    | 1                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Medical/health services           | 6                | 3                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 9            |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   | 3                | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 4            |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 5                | 10                |                |                 | 3                | 1                    | 19           |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 3                | 4                 | 3              |                 |                  | 2                    | 12           |
| Police / Fire Services            | 4                | 4                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 8            |
| Defence                           | 6                | 3                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 9            |
| Sanitary Services                 |                  |                   | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 13               | 2                 | 12             |                 |                  |                      | 27           |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>164</b>       | <b>124</b>        | <b>140</b>     | <b>7</b>        | <b>12</b>        | <b>22</b>            | <b>469</b>   |

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1618**

**June-2004**

| <b>Industry</b>                   | <b>Gibraltarian</b> | <b>Other Brit</b> | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 10                  | 1                 | 13             |                 | 1                |                      | 25           |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    |                     |                   | 2              |                 |                  |                      | 2            |
| Printing & publishing             | 1                   | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 2            |
| M/F n.e.c. (Clothing, et cetera)  | 1                   |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Building & Construction           | 14                  | 23                | 59             | 2               | 4                | 22                   | 124          |
| Electricity Supply                |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 0            |
| Water Supply                      | 3                   |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |              |
| Sea transport / shipping svcs     |                     | 1                 |                | 1               |                  |                      | 2            |
| Port & Services                   |                     | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      |              |
| Road transport & related svc      | 5                   |                   | 2              | 2               |                  |                      | 9            |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 1                   |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Air transport & related svc       |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 0            |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 1                   |                   | 2              | 1               |                  |                      | 4            |
| W/sale fuel                       |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 0            |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 1                   | 1                 | 2              |                 | 1                |                      | 5            |
| Retail Food                       | 12                  | 2                 | 9              |                 |                  |                      | 23           |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 5                   |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 5            |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         |                     | 1                 | 3              |                 |                  | 1                    | 5            |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 2                   | 1                 | 3              | 1               |                  |                      | 7            |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 15                  | 6                 | 10             | 2               | 2                | 4                    | 39           |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 4                   | 1                 | 1              | 2               | 2                |                      | 10           |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 6                   | 11                | 15             | 4               |                  | 1                    | 37           |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 2                   | 7                 |                | 1               | 2                | 1                    | 13           |
| Tourist svcs n.e.c., (inc Casino) | 7                   | 1                 |                |                 | 1                |                      | 9            |
| Banking & finance                 | 9                   | 2                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 11           |
| Insurance & Real Estate           | 8                   | 3                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 11           |
| Legal, account, oth bus. Svcs     | 48                  | 21                | 6              | 1               | 5                |                      | 81           |
| Public admin                      | 19                  |                   |                | 1               |                  |                      | 20           |
| Educa Services                    | 2                   | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 3            |
| Medical/health services           | 4                   | 1                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 6            |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 0            |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 6                   | 15                |                |                 | 5                | 1                    | 27           |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 2                   | 2                 | 2              |                 |                  |                      | 6            |
| Police / Fire Services            | 7                   | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 8            |
| Defence                           | 4                   | 2                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 6            |
| Sanitary Services                 |                     | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      |              |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 18                  | 9                 | 10             | 1               | 1                | 1                    | 40           |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>217</b>          | <b>116</b>        | <b>140</b>     | <b>19</b>       | <b>24</b>        | <b>31</b>            | <b>547</b>   |

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1618**

**July-2004**

| <b>Industry</b>                   | <b>Gibraltarian</b> | <b>Other Brit</b> | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 8                   | 1                 | 15             |                 | 4                |                      |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    | 1                   |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Printing & publishing             | 2                   | 1                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      |
| M/F n.e.c. (Clothing, et cetera)  |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Building & Construction           | 20                  | 25                | 43             | 4               | 3                | 26                   |
| Electricity Supply                |                     | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Water Supply                      |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Sea transport / shipping svcs     | 6                   | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Port & Services                   |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Road transport & related svc      | 2                   |                   | 3              | 1               |                  |                      |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 5                   |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Air transport & related svc       |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 4                   |                   | 3              |                 |                  |                      |
| W/sale fuel                       |                     |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 4                   | 1                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      |
| Retail Food                       | 17                  | 8                 | 10             | 1               |                  |                      |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 4                   |                   | 1              |                 |                  |                      |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         | 4                   | 3                 | 3              |                 |                  | 1                    |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 4                   | 1                 | 2              |                 |                  |                      |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 10                  |                   | 5              | 1               |                  |                      |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 3                   | 2                 | 1              |                 | 1                |                      |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 3                   | 8                 | 18             | 7               | 3                |                      |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 2                   | 9                 | 2              | 1               | 4                | 1                    |
| Tourist svcs n.e.c., (inc Casino) | 2                   | 2                 | 1              |                 | 1                |                      |
| Banking & finance                 | 10                  | 3                 | 1              |                 | 2                |                      |
| Insurance & Real Estate           | 5                   | 3                 |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Legal, account, oth bus. Svcs     | 31                  | 11                | 7              |                 | 1                |                      |
| Public admin                      | 16                  | 1                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      |
| Educa Services                    | 1                   |                   |                | 1               |                  |                      |
| Medical/health services           | 4                   |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   | 2                   | 1                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 14                  | 19                | 1              |                 | 5                | 1                    |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 5                   | 6                 | 3              |                 |                  |                      |
| Police / Fire Services            | 2                   | 3                 |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Defence                           | 2                   | 3                 |                |                 |                  |                      |
| Sanitary Services                 | 2                   | 1                 |                | 1               |                  |                      |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 14                  | 6                 | 17             | 2               | 1                |                      |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>209</b>          | <b>120</b>        | <b>140</b>     | <b>19</b>       | <b>25</b>        | <b>29</b>            |

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1618**

**August-2004**

| <b>Industry</b>                   | <b>Gibraltar</b> | <b>Other<br/>Brit</b> | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Other<br/>EEC</b> | <b>Other<br/>Non-<br/>EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 11               | 1                     | 20             |                 |                      |                               | 32           |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    |                  |                       |                | 1               |                      |                               | 1            |
| Printing & publishing             | 1                | 2                     |                |                 |                      |                               | 3            |
| M/F n.e.c. (Clothing, et cetera)  |                  |                       |                |                 |                      |                               | 0            |
| Building & Construction           | 18               | 15                    | 44             | 1               | 1                    | 16                            | 95           |
| Electricity Supply                | 1                |                       | 1              |                 |                      |                               | 2            |
| Water Supply                      | 9                |                       |                |                 |                      |                               |              |
| Sea transport / shipping svcs     | 1                |                       |                |                 |                      |                               | 1            |
| Port & Services                   | 1                |                       |                |                 |                      |                               |              |
| Road transport & related svc      | 2                |                       |                |                 |                      |                               | 2            |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 3                |                       |                |                 |                      |                               | 3            |
| Air transport & related svc       |                  |                       |                |                 |                      |                               | 0            |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 13               |                       | 1              |                 |                      |                               | 14           |
| W/sale fuel                       | 2                |                       |                |                 |                      |                               | 2            |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 1                |                       | 1              |                 | 1                    |                               | 3            |
| Retail Food                       | 14               | 3                     | 11             |                 | 1                    |                               | 29           |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 6                | 1                     | 1              |                 |                      |                               | 8            |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         | 6                | 4                     | 1              |                 |                      |                               | 11           |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 2                |                       |                |                 |                      |                               | 2            |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 12               | 2                     | 6              |                 | 1                    |                               | 21           |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 5                | 2                     | 3              | 2               | 4                    |                               | 16           |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 7                | 12                    | 26             | 2               | 2                    |                               | 49           |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 4                | 11                    | 1              | 2               | 1                    |                               | 19           |
| Tourist svcs n.e.c., (inc Casino) | 7                | 2                     | 2              |                 |                      |                               | 11           |
| Banking & finance                 | 14               | 2                     | 1              |                 | 2                    |                               | 19           |
| Insurance & Real Estate           | 8                | 2                     | 1              |                 |                      |                               | 11           |
| Legal, account, oth bus. Svcs     | 25               | 5                     | 1              | 1               | 1                    | 1                             | 34           |
| Public admin                      | 24               | 3                     |                |                 | 1                    |                               | 28           |
| Educa Services                    | 4                | 1                     | 1              |                 | 1                    |                               | 7            |
| Medical/health services           | 15               | 1                     | 2              |                 |                      |                               | 18           |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   | 2                | 3                     |                |                 |                      |                               | 5            |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 16               | 26                    |                |                 | 5                    | 1                             | 48           |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 6                | 3                     |                |                 |                      |                               | 9            |
| Police / Fire Services            | 2                | 3                     | 1              |                 |                      |                               | 6            |
| Defence                           | 7                | 2                     |                |                 |                      |                               | 9            |
| Sanitary Services                 |                  |                       |                |                 |                      |                               |              |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 27               | 9                     | 33             | 3               | 1                    |                               | 73           |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>276</b>       | <b>115</b>            | <b>158</b>     | <b>12</b>       | <b>22</b>            | <b>18</b>                     | <b>601</b>   |

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1618**

**September-2004**

| <b>Industry</b>                   | <b>Gibraltar</b> | <b>Other Brit</b> | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>Moroccan</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Shipbuilding, repair, marine eng. | 3                | 2                 | 14             |                 | 2                |                      | 21           |
| M/F of food, drink and tobacco    |                  | 2                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 3            |
| Printing & publishing             |                  |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 0            |
| M/F n.e.c. (Clothing, et cetera)  |                  |                   | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Building & Construction           | 13               | 17                | 35             | 4               | 6                | 2                    | 77           |
| Electricity Supply                | 1                | 1                 | 4              |                 |                  |                      | 6            |
| Water Supply                      | 1                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |              |
| Sea transport / shipping svcs     | 3                |                   | 2              |                 |                  |                      | 5            |
| Port & Services                   |                  |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |              |
| Road transport & related svc      | 1                |                   | 2              |                 |                  |                      | 3            |
| Post & Telecommunications         | 3                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 3            |
| Air transport & related svc       | 2                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 2            |
| W/sale-food, drink                | 11               |                   | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 12           |
| W/sale fuel                       | 1                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| W/sale-n.e.c                      | 1                | 1                 | 1              |                 |                  | 1                    | 4            |
| Retail Food                       | 6                | 3                 | 4              |                 |                  |                      | 13           |
| Retail drink & tobacco            | 2                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 2            |
| Retail-clothing, footwear         | 7                | 2                 | 2              |                 |                  |                      | 11           |
| Retail-h/hold goods               | 1                | 2                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 4            |
| Retail-n.e.c                      | 10               | 3                 | 6              | 1               |                  |                      | 20           |
| Hotels, hostels, guest house, etc | 6                | 6                 | 6              | 3               | 4                |                      | 25           |
| Restaurants, cafes, etc           | 13               | 11                | 14             | 1               | 2                | 1                    | 42           |
| Bars (Lic to sell alcohol)        | 1                | 7                 | 1              | 1               | 1                |                      | 11           |
| Tourist svcs n.e.c., (inc Casino) | 4                | 3                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 8            |
| Banking & finance                 | 17               | 3                 | 2              |                 | 2                |                      | 24           |
| Insurance & Real Estate           | 10               | 3                 |                |                 | 2                |                      | 15           |
| Legal, account, oth bus. Svcs     | 33               | 10                | 4              | 2               | 2                | 1                    | 52           |
| Public admin                      | 53               | 1                 |                | 1               |                  |                      | 55           |
| Educa Services                    | 1                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 1            |
| Medical/health services           | 7                | 3                 | 1              |                 |                  |                      | 11           |
| Welfare, Charity, religious svc   | 5                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      | 5            |
| Entertainment & Sport             | 17               | 16                | 2              |                 | 2                | 1                    | 38           |
| Repairs-Consumer goods            | 7                | 2                 | 2              |                 |                  |                      | 11           |
| Police / Fire Services            | 6                | 1                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 7            |
| Defence                           | 5                | 4                 |                |                 |                  |                      | 9            |
| Sanitary Services                 | 1                |                   |                |                 |                  |                      |              |
| Services n.e.c (Inc Hairdressers) | 26               | 3                 | 13             | 4               | 1                |                      | 47           |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>278</b>       | <b>106</b>        | <b>120</b>     | <b>17</b>       | <b>24</b>        | <b>6</b>             | <b>551</b>   |

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1618**

Part Time vacancies filled in the months of April to September 2004, by Gibraltarians and other nationals and by sex.

| <b>Gibraltarians</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> | <b>Other Nationals</b> | <b>Male</b> | <b>Female</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| <b>April</b>         | 5           | 25            | 30           | <b>April</b>           | 22          | 39            | 61           |
| <b>May</b>           | 14          | 28            | 42           | <b>May</b>             | 27          | 36            | 63           |
| <b>June</b>          | 20          | 29            | 49           | <b>June</b>            | 37          | 49            | 86           |
| <b>July</b>          | 24          | 45            | 69           | <b>July</b>            | 31          | 66            | 97           |
| <b>August</b>        | 18          | 27            | 45           | <b>August</b>          | 23          | 50            | 73           |
| <b>September</b>     | 7           | 30            | 37           | <b>September</b>       | 31          | 49            | 80           |

Notices of Terms of Engagement registered with the Employment Service for the months of April to September of 2004, including directors and excluding directors.

|                            | <b>April</b> | <b>May</b> | <b>June</b> | <b>July</b> | <b>August</b> | <b>September</b> |
|----------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| <b>Including Directors</b> | 19868        | 19835      | 19987       | 20137       | 20120         | 20216            |
| <b>Excluding Directors</b> | 17925        | 18016      | 18174       | 18328       | 18315         | 18425            |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1615 TO 1618 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I direct the Minister's attention to the front page of the statistical information provided, which is headed 'Answer to Question No. 1618' but is in fact the answer to Question No. 1615, which deals with work permits and a breakdown of occupation, sex and nationality. Can I ask him to look at the table provided for May, which refers to eleven Polish workers having been granted work permits as skilled workers I suppose? Can I ask him that figure increases to 22 in June, because the Immigration Control Ordinance which will provide that nationals from countries from the new Accession States will require work permits, has not yet been transposed and is in fact in this House, on what basis was the Employment Service requiring Polish nationals to obtain work permits to work in Gibraltar in May and June after Poland had acceded to the European Community and this House had not passed legislation reliant on the derogations from the Treaty in that respect?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, I can see the point. There was this nebulous area between the May accession of the Central Europeans and the actual transposition of the derogation powers, but the Employment Service felt that at that stage we should still be requiring work permits as up to then. We actually discussed this in the last meeting of the House and I made it clear that we are still demanding work permits until such derogation powers were sought through legislation.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not disputing the reasoning behind that, but on what possible legal basis could the service, which is a Government service, demand, seek or grant a work permit to somebody who is not legally obliged to seek such a work permit or cannot be the recipient of such a permit, because his nationality does not allow that, until such time until this House passes the Immigration Control Ordinance (Amendment)?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I understand the point that the hon Member is making. The Employment Service was given legal advice on this. I am not a legal man, I do not know the intricacies of the legalisms involved in the mechanics of the thing, but certainly the Employment Service acted according to what was deemed to be by legal advisers to be perfectly in order. I can see the point.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister's position then that any national of one of the Accession States, who has sought employment between May and such time as this House passes the Immigration



Control (Amendment) Ordinance, will be required even now to have a work permit, and that he is not a person who is entitled to obtain employment in Gibraltar?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That has been the practice yes, the whole question of the legality of the thing, but that certainly has been the practice and the Employment Service has acted, after all their function is not one of legal analysis, on the advice that they were given.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Minister whether that advice was provided by the Chambers of the Attorney General?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

We were in contact with the Legislation Support Unit throughout this period of time but I am not too sure whether the advice came from the Chambers of the Attorney General or from the Legislation Support Unit.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the advice then that if a work permit is rejected, because presumably if the advice is that it is legitimate to require a person to have a work permit then therefore the discretion must exist to either grant it or not grant it, and the rules that apply in respect of people that do need work permits is that it can be rejected on the basis that there is available labour with the necessary skills? The advice is then that even before we change the law in this House to require them to have work permits if this can be done then why is it that we are having to change the law?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

We are not changing the law, we are actually now consolidating our legal position by taking advantage of the derogation powers which are afforded by the European Directives.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The moment people join the European Union on 1<sup>st</sup> May, they are required by virtue of regulation going back to 1968, the freedom to go to any Member State to seek employment and therefore to obtain employment as a result, and we have no right to stop them except that there is a derogation and a period of transition for the new entrants this year, which is a three year one, and we are making use of that transition to legislate and we have the legislation in front of this House. Now if in fact we are already

doing what the transition period allows us to do without having exercised the derogation to so legislate, and that is perfectly okay, then why are we legislating?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is a legal issue and I confess it is beyond me as a layman in that respect, but certainly I think from a layman's point of view it seems to me much more in order so we are not questioned as we have been questioned today how on earth did we demand that permit, seems to be much more formal and well established to now legislate as we are doing in this House to establish the need for work permits by these new accession countries, availing ourselves of the derogation powers. It seems now that it is legally established, above board so to speak.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That seems to be a bit of a theological argument not a parliamentary one. We support the continuation of the work permit because it gives us protection for our workforce which we think is a good thing, but from our position in this House, given the fact that the information we have been given in Question Time is that we are already demanding work permits, if we are able to do it, it does not seem to us to be so clear that what we are doing is within the law if the law that gives us the power to do it is not yet on the Statue Book. Simply to say that it is tidier that what we are doing without the backing of the law we should do with the backing of the law and that is why we are doing the legislation. It does not seem to be right. I think having raised it at this stage, perhaps the Minister will see whether this is something that can be dealt with when we come to that legislation, where there is in fact a clause on this business of the work permits and by then we can have a clear answer.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The legislation, the hon Member will know, is in connection with the Bill on Immigration Control. The actual issue of access to the labour market is being approved in terms of Regulations, and amendments to the Employment Ordinance through Regulations. Nevertheless, I suppose it may come in the general debate, the question of work permits and access to our labour market.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well the Minister perhaps may agree that there seems to be no other opportunity in which to do it. In fact in the Explanatory Memorandum, the Hon Mr Picardo has just pointed out to me, it says the Ordinance provides a transitional period will be applied until 30<sup>th</sup> April 2005, during which time the citizens of all these Eastern European countries will not have full European rights of free movement in Gibraltar. In particular, they will not have full European rights to work in Gibraltar, instead they will have to hold a work permit before being able to take up employment without the work permit. That is in the Explanatory Memorandum of the Bill that we have to discuss.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There is an opportunity then, as the hon Member suggests, to debate that issue of access to the labour market.

ORAL

**NO. 1619 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – DETACHED WORKERS**

Can Government state the number of workers that were registered with the Employment Agency as “Detached Workers” in the months of April to September 2004, giving a breakdown of their trade and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1619 of 2004**

Number of workers registered as "Detached Workers" in the months of April to September 2004:

| <b>April</b>                      | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>British</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Managerial</b>                 |                |                |                  | 1                    | 1            |
| <b>Professional</b>               |                |                | 7                | 1                    | 8            |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>     |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Administrative</b>             |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>             | 15             | 1              | 2                |                      | 18           |
| <b>Personal Services</b>          |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Sales &amp; Customer Svcs.</b> |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>            |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>     |                |                |                  | 1                    | 1            |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>15</b>      | <b>1</b>       | <b>9</b>         | <b>3</b>             | <b>28</b>    |

| <b>May</b>                        | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>British</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Managerial</b>                 |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Professional</b>               | 9              | 1              |                  | 2                    | 12           |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>     |                | 2              |                  |                      | 2            |
| <b>Administrative</b>             |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>             | 7              | 2              |                  |                      | 9            |
| <b>Personal Services</b>          |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Sales &amp; Customer Svcs.</b> |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>            |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>     |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>16</b>      | <b>5</b>       |                  | <b>2</b>             | <b>23</b>    |

| <b>June</b>                       | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>British</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Managerial</b>                 |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Professional</b>               | 20             |                | 4                | 6                    | 30           |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>     |                |                | 5                | 10                   | 15           |
| <b>Administrative</b>             |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>             | 22             |                | 7                | 1                    | 30           |
| <b>Personal Services</b>          |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Sales &amp; Customer Svcs.</b> |                |                |                  | 4                    | 4            |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>            |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>     |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>42</b>      |                | <b>16</b>        | <b>21</b>            | <b>79</b>    |

Cont.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question No. 1619 of 2004**

| <b>July</b>                       | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>British</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Managerial</b>                 |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Professional</b>               | 11             | 2              |                  | 5                    | 18           |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>     |                |                | 4                | 2                    | 6            |
| <b>Administrative</b>             |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>             | 27             |                | 1                | 7                    | 35           |
| <b>Personal Services</b>          |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Sales &amp; Customer Svcs.</b> |                | 3              |                  | 1                    | 4            |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>            |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>     |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>38</b>      | <b>5</b>       | <b>5</b>         | <b>15</b>            | <b>63</b>    |

| <b>August</b>                     | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>British</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Managerial</b>                 |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Professional</b>               | 4              |                |                  | 1                    | 5            |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>     | 6              |                |                  |                      | 6            |
| <b>Administrative</b>             |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>             | 14             |                |                  | 6                    | 20           |
| <b>Personal Services</b>          |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Sales &amp; Customer Svcs.</b> |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>            |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>     |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>24</b>      |                |                  | <b>7</b>             | <b>31</b>    |

| <b>September</b>                  | <b>Spanish</b> | <b>British</b> | <b>Other EEC</b> | <b>Other Non-EEC</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Managerial</b>                 |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Professional</b>               | 14             |                |                  |                      | 14           |
| <b>Associate Professional</b>     | 7              |                |                  | 2                    | 9            |
| <b>Administrative</b>             |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Skilled Trades</b>             | 26             |                |                  |                      | 26           |
| <b>Personal Services</b>          |                |                |                  | 1                    | 1            |
| <b>Sales &amp; Customer Svcs.</b> |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Plant Operators</b>            |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Elementary Occupations</b>     |                |                |                  |                      |              |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>47</b>      |                |                  | <b>3</b>             | <b>50</b>    |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1619 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just as a matter of interest and in relation to this question in future and other questions which relate to employment, how can we account for nationals of the five Accession States in future? Will we count them as other EEC or other non-EEC for the purposes of tables of this sort?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I think we will somehow have to create a new category which will be either non-EEC or EC with all the full rights of accession to work and to residence et cetera. We will have to create for the benefit of the Statistics, a new category relating to the new Accession countries. I imagine so, that is the best way to go about it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So other EEC existing and other EEC accession, something like that.

ORAL

**NO. 1620 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – JOB CLUB**

Can government state how many persons have used the facilities provided at the Job Club in the months of April to September 2004, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.



**Answer to Question No. 1620 of 2004**

Number of persons who have used the facilities provided at the Job Club in the months of April to September 2004:

| <b>April</b>         | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 1            | 6              | 7            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 12           | 2              | 14           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 16           | 13             | 29           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>29</b>    | <b>21</b>      | <b>50</b>    |

| <b>May</b>           | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 3            | 7              | 10           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 10           | 6              | 16           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 13           | 22             | 35           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>26</b>    | <b>35</b>      | <b>61</b>    |

| <b>June</b>          | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 4            | 2              | 6            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 9            | 4              | 13           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 22           | 19             | 41           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>35</b>    | <b>25</b>      | <b>60</b>    |

| <b>July</b>          | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 6            | 2              | 8            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 8            | 7              | 15           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 16           | 11             | 27           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>30</b>    | <b>20</b>      | <b>50</b>    |

| <b>August</b>        | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 4            | 0              | 4            |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 3            | 5              | 8            |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 14           | 13             | 27           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>21</b>    | <b>18</b>      | <b>39</b>    |

| <b>September</b>     | <b>Males</b> | <b>Females</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
| <b>Under 18</b>      | 5            | 10             | 15           |
| <b>18-24</b>         | 16           | 17             | 33           |
| <b>25 &amp; Over</b> | 17           | 25             | 42           |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>38</b>    | <b>52</b>      | <b>90</b>    |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1620 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister will have noted that the total number of individuals using the Club, in particular for the periods of August and September, is I would say in particular for September considerably higher. Last year there were 54 people in September and now a total of 90 people in September. Is there an extraneous reason for that, is that perhaps as it is the beginning of a new school term, the time when people start if they are not going back to school, into employment using the services of the Club?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, it could be quite a number of different factors. One of them may be precisely that. September after the respite of the summer months, the young people especially become more serious about their job seeking efforts, but remember we are talking here about seeking the facilities of the Job Club, it is not really centrally related to the number of unemployed or anything of the sort, just simply the number of people who decide to seek the counselling and the advisory and the information facilities given by the Job Club.

**NO. 1621 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NOTICES OF TERMINATION**

Can Government state whether termination forms which are lodged late with the ETB are registered as termination on the date when the form was filed or when the employee ceased work?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Notices of Termination which are lodged late with the Employment Service are registered with the date that the employee ceased work.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1621 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just for clarification, with the date stated on the form as the date when the employee ceased work, I imagine.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In that case then presumably we would need to come back periodically to get an update on the figures that are given, because they are given as at the time that the question was answered but it is quite likely that there will be terminations coming after a given date, which relate to previous figures that have been handed to us. Is that correct?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

In terms of unemployment figures?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of facts when we have asked in a given year, the number of questions on the Order Paper that gives us by month the contracts opened and terminations registered. The terminations registered that were being given in answer to those Questions by month include presumably the terminations that are being put currently but will not include the ones that have still not arrived. So presumably those figures will need updating, is that correct?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

They need to be re-adjusted.

**NO. 1622 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WORKS ABOARD THE ROTTERDAM**

What steps have Government taken to ensure that the works aboard the vessel Rotterdam are carried out in a manner that is safe and in keeping with the Factories Ordinance and the Asbestos at Work Regulations and that any asbestos removed from the vessel is disposed of or treated safely?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Health and Safety Inspectorate is permanently in liaison with Cammell Laird in all aspects related to asbestos work on board the SS Rotterdam, as indeed it would be with any other employer in any similar circumstances. Meetings have been held with representatives from Cammell Laird and contracted parties, as well as the relevant authorities for example the City Fire Brigade and the Environmental Agency, in order to discuss aspects of the work. The due risk assessment and proper notification of work procedures have likewise been produced as required by the Health and Safety Inspectors. The Health and Safety Inspectors remain informed and aware of the works being undertaken and maintain monitoring procedures as deemed appropriate, including on-site inspections. It is consequently and permanently in a position that enables it to be satisfied that the works being conducted are within the bounds prescribed to ensure proper health and safety conditions all round.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1622 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

How many on-site inspections have taken place to date?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have not got the specific information with me but obviously a number of inspections, a number of visits on-site have been made because it speaks in the plural here.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

How do the Health and Safety Inspectorate remain constantly and permanently in a position to ensure that everything is carried out according to the Health and Safety Regulations? From the answer it does not appear that they have got somebody attached to the works or anything like that.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That is not the normal way. When they speak of constantly, it is constant attention obviously linking up as the need arises on an on-going basis. I would say perhaps the best expression is on an on-going basis rather than a continuous, I would say the difference between continual and continuous. If he can see what I mean.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Minister agree to provide after this House the number of inspections that have occurred? If that is agreeable.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Of course.

**NO. 1623 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**GDC – TRAINING**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the training and development courses provided by the Employment and Training division of the Gibraltar Development Corporation Ltd at a cost of £1,284,000 specifying the share of the cost of each course?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The figure quoted in the question was a forecast outturn as published in the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for 2004/2005. The actual expenditure as calculated by the Department is £1,299,096.76p and I now hand the statistical information requested by the hon Member.

**Answer to Question No. 1623**

|                                              |             |                      |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| <b><u>2003/2004 (Other)</u></b>              |             |                      |
| ITP                                          | £397,703.14 |                      |
| Mileage                                      | £2,110.90   |                      |
| Chamber of Commerce                          | £2,000.00   |                      |
| Special Needs                                | £9,211.80   |                      |
| Social Services Agency                       | £3,639.79   |                      |
| Health & Safety                              | £26,880.87  |                      |
| ACCA                                         | £23,553.64  |                      |
| School of Nursing                            | £112,008.44 |                      |
| Telephone Account                            | £6,372.50   |                      |
| Children from Abroad                         | £8,415.60   |                      |
| Repairs                                      | £38,629.15  |                      |
| Civil Service                                | £277,670.88 |                      |
| Books & Equipment GCFE                       | £16,484.51  |                      |
| Care Consortium                              | £2,725.00   |                      |
| Presentation of Certificates                 | £880.00     |                      |
| IT Equipment                                 | £8,552.96   |                      |
| Conferences                                  | £1,585.10   |                      |
| Salaries                                     | £133,024.25 |                      |
| Counselling Skills (CSCT)                    | £2,894.50   |                      |
| Business & Administration                    | £99.97      |                      |
| ICSA                                         | £15,813.00  |                      |
| General Maritime Training (Private)          | £5,004.57   |                      |
| Expert in International Commerce             | £1,000.92   |                      |
| GBC                                          | £5,582.50   |                      |
| Gibraltar Business Management<br>Programme 6 | £21,116.50  |                      |
| Taxation                                     | £1,178.00   |                      |
| Cammell Laird                                | £141,525.49 |                      |
| GHA                                          | £578.94     |                      |
| Maritime Surveyor                            | £4,739.84   |                      |
| Maritime Administration                      | £28,064.00  | <b>£1,299,096.76</b> |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1623 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In the table that the Minister has kindly provided, there is a reference to the biggest item of expenditure being ITP. Could he tell us what ITP is?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do apologise. When I first saw it I was stuck as well. It means Individual Training Programmes. Training Programmes which are provided for individual persons. It has nothing to do with ITC.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister in a position to tell us exactly what type of training the Civil Service has enjoyed for £277,000?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, the training is in terms of business management, management certificates and diplomas which are provided by Durham University.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In respect of children from abroad, is that training provided at the expense of the Gibraltar Government for children from abroad? Or training for locals in respect of the treatment of children from abroad?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am not too sure, I have to confess that for the exact nature of these courses for children from abroad I would have to ask for information, if he wishes to know exactly what is being provided there.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the different amounts for different courses, is this the cost of the courses or are these payments by way of grant or maintenance to the individuals attending? Or is it a mixture of the both?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

A bit of both really. In some cases it is payments. For instance, Durham University has to be paid for their courses, in terms of management courses. Hallam University has to be paid for their consideration, have to be paid a consideration for their courses to teachers in educational management, but in some cases for instance, the Cammell Laird training, it is allowances paid to the trainees, it is a bit of everything.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The item 'Salaries £133,000' that is whose salaries? It is not the salaries obviously of the people in the Gibraltar Development Corporation because that is shown in the Personal Emoluments.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I understood it to be the salaries given but I can see the point that that is shown in the Personal Emoluments. I will have to seek information on that one too.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does this cover for example anybody that is sent to the United Kingdom to study that is not employed by the Government, and I would have expected would actually be getting a grant as a student, or not?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

This does not cover grants given to students to study abroad. That comes under the Scholarship Awards.

**HON S E LINARES:**

When he mentioned the teaching management of education courses that teachers are doing, is it included in that list in the Civil Service list where the £277,000 odd is in the list, because there is another special needs but it is not a special needs course, that would be completely different, but would it be included in the Civil Service one?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It may be because it is not included in the Durham University courses on management, this is more specifically for educational management run by a different University, Sheffield Hallam and it is not listed there. So unless it comes from another vote within the Education Department's budget.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What exactly is the amount spent in terms of Chamber of Commerce £2,000? Is that a grant to the Chamber of Commerce for it to fund its own training?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

This is a course that is run in liaison with the Chamber of Commerce in terms of secretarial work and there is a grant given by the Government, I think in terms of allowances to the persons taking part in the course.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the fact that the total which is nearly £1.3 million, shows an expenditure of £400,000 over the original estimate and also a similar amount over the actual in the preceding year, and now is down £400,000 for the current year and that indeed the uncovered deficit in the GDC was £400,000, it all seems to be the result of this 50 per cent increase in the provision of these courses in this particular year, compared to the previous year which now seems down again. The ITP seems to be the one that comes closest to the total, but is there identifiable something that was done this year that is not being done currently and was not being done the previous year?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That exactly is the explanation. Some courses reach saturation point if I may put it that way and they come to an end that is not the same needed. In many cases this is demand-led and therefore some courses will not be restarted this coming financial year and some courses have been started during this financial year. Hence the differences in the budgeting of these courses.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Perhaps I have not explained myself properly. My question is this, if the Government in 2002/2003 spent £900,000 in the provision of these training and development courses, and in the last financial year 2003/2004 planned to spend the same amount, and in the current year is indeed spending even less than they did two years ago which is £870,000, what is the explanation for the 50 per cent increase that actually took place which was not planned, which is not currently taking place and which did not take place in 2002/2003? Is it something that is spread in the sense that for example the Civil Service spent a bit more and the counselling skills spent a bit more, or is it that there were specific things that are in this year that have not been in previous years and are not in the current year which in fact are big enough to account for the bulk of that £400,000, because it so happens that when we looked at the budget in the area where overspending had taken place, the amount that was overspending and covered in the GDC was exactly this, £400,000?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I think again it is a bit of everything. In some cases it is overspending because as the course developed there was need to finance and fund more generously than was forecast at the beginning. Also I think there may have been new courses, new initiatives, new projects which were started throughout this year because of demand, because it was seen to be necessary at that particular moment and that again would have led to an over-expenditure over the budget established. So it could be quite a number of factors which have led to this discrepancy between the total actual expenditure and the amount that was initially budgeted.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

One of the things that I drew attention to in the Estimates when we debated this, was the fact that the contribution from the European Social Fund which had originally been estimated at £550,000 actually was forecast to have only reached £141,000, which is £400,000 less of income. I noted that the training and development courses which were identified as being EU projects was down from £360,000 to £211,000. Are the Government in a position to confirm whether in fact any of this it had originally been hoped it would be possible to finance as EU projects and then had to be shifted to local spending because that was not the case? Does the Minister know whether this has happened?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, I do not quite know the process or mechanics of what actually happened in that situation. I suspect it is very much along the lines that the hon Member has just pointed out but I would have to check and verify that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just to round off, can the Minister agree to provide in writing at some stage after this meeting, that clarification of what the Head of Expenditure 'Children from Abroad' is? I would be grateful for that.

ORAL

**NO. 1624 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state whether in the months of April to September 2004 there has been any increase in the number of employers participating in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No. 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 1625 of 2004.

**NO. 1625 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state whether in the months of April to September 2004 there has been any increase in the number of persons that have been placed in employment, giving a breakdown by age and sex, in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No. 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

In Question No. 80 of 2004 my hon Friend the Minister for Social Services, Mrs Del Agua in answer to that question stated that there were 10 employees and five employers as up to March 2004. If I may refer the hon Member to my answer to Question No. 1608 answered earlier on in this meeting, he will note a significant increase from those figures in March to those of April et cetera, April, May, June. The average over the April to September in terms of employers was 25 as opposed to five in March, and employees 29.4 as opposed to 10. So certainly an increase at that stage and after that, as can be seen from the table, the figures have remained pretty constant.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1624 AND 1625 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister is not giving me a separate answer in relation to participants in the ESF. The answer refers me back to his answer to Question No. 1608 which is on wage subsidy generally, and the ESF is part of that or is exclusively that?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The ESF is an element in that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can he tell me as I have asked, the number of employers and employees participating in ESF? So for example when he has told me that in April there were 21 employers I think, and 24 employees, how many of those were ESF? That is the answer I have traditionally been provided by the Minister for Social Services in relation to this particular question.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I think the hon Member is referring to the Venia scheme which is how he has sort of labelled it in previous questions. Maybe the confusion lies there that ESF is a general wage subsidy scheme.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have asked this question twice now in the two previous Question Times I have been present in this House and I have got a separate answer from the Minister for Employment in relation to wage subsidy schemes generally, and a separate answer from the Minister for Social Services and Civil Affairs in relation to ESF. My question is phrased in exactly the same way as it was for the first meeting of this House. As Hansard shows, I got a distinct answer in relation to ESF at that time and I think also at the second meeting for Questions this year. So I would be grateful if I could be provided with an answer specific to ESF so that I can continue to draw my trend lines.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well the answers I have given is the way the Employment Service have understood the thrust of the enquiries. If there is something more to the information in respect of ESF specifically, certainly I will require the information from them.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

With respect to the Minister, this is surprising because whenever I have asked my question before it has not been interpreted in that way. It has been interpreted as distinct. I am quite happy if I can be provided the information within the next 10 days. I think it is information that is obviously available because it has been provided on two occasions before and I must say that it was provided when Mr Corby was Minister and when Mr Baldachino asked the same question. I think that this is information that has been provided now, at the very least since 2002, which is the genesis of the scheme.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will try to provide the information.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister confirm whether the scheme still requires that anybody that is placed with an employer, whether it is Government or a private employer, has to take them on in full-time employment at the end of 12 months? Is that still a condition of the ESF funding?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not think it is. I think it is a one year subsidy to the employer who wishes to participate in this scheme, and as we explained earlier, the payment is made at the end of the year, obviously for an incentive to keep the employee but certainly I do not think there is any commitment to taking on the subsidised worker into full-time an independent type of employment.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was under the impression that in fact the incentive was because it would lead to people entering into employment as it were, at the employer's expense instead of being subsidised employment. The subsidised employment was to encourage that to happen.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Initially for a year.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but I seem to remember that at one stage we were told that the system had been changed so that at the end of six months, they got paid extra for the second six months on the understanding that at the end of the year people would be given employment. If in fact, people work the full year, normally in an employer at the end of the full year they have got protection against dismissal. What happens then with the ESF people who have done the full year, they just become unemployed again or what?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I would not like to commit myself in giving a definite answer to that. Again, it is something that I need to investigate further. I apologise.



ORAL

**NO. 1626 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government give a breakdown of full and part-time Employment in respect of Table 11 of the 2003 Employment Survey Report showing employment in the Gibraltar Government and the MOD separately?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1627 and 1628 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1627 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government list the public sector entities that are included as part of the private sector in the 2003 Employment Survey Report and give the breakdown of the number of employees and industry classification of these entities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1626 and 1628 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1628 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government give a breakdown of full and part-time employment in respect of Table 12 of the 2003 Employment Survey Report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

Answer to Question 1628/2004

Public Sector Entities included in the Private Sector by Employee Numbers and Industry, October 2003

|                                    | <u>Number of Employees</u> | <u>Industry</u>                   |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners Ltd  | 32                         | Real Estate & Business Activities |
| GJBS Ltd                           | 96                         | Construction                      |
| Gibraltar Community Projects Ltd   | 167                        | Construction                      |
| Gibraltar Development Corporation  | 170                        | Public Administration and Defence |
| Gibraltar Broadcasting Corporation | 49                         | Other Services                    |
| Elderly Care Agency                | 151                        | Health and Social Work            |
| Office of the Public Ombudsman     | 4                          | Real Estate & Business Activities |
| Social Services Agency             | 131                        | Health and Social Work            |

cont ...

Full-Time MOD Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2003.

| ALL SECTORS   | ALL  |        | GIBRALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|---------------|------|--------|--------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|               | MALE | FEMALE | MALE         | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Public Admin. | 696  | 302    | 681          | 295    | 0    | 0      | 10       | 4      | 2       | 2      | 2        | 0      | 1     | 1      |
| TOTAL         | 696  | 302    | 681          | 295    | 0    | 0      | 10       | 4      | 2       | 2      | 2        | 0      | 1     | 1      |

Part-Time MOD Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2003.

| ALL SECTORS   | ALL  |        | GIBRALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|---------------|------|--------|--------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|               | MALE | FEMALE | MALE         | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Public Admin. | 12   | 60     | 12           | 60     | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL         | 12   | 60     | 12           | 60     | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |

cont...

Contd Answer to Question 1628/2004

Full-Time Gibraltar Government Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2003.

| ALL SECTORS       | ALL   |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|-------------------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                   | MALE  | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Shipbuilding      | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.      | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| ElecWtr Supply    | 131   | 4      | 129         | 4      | 0    | 0      | 1        | 0      | 1       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction      | 289   | 13     | 256         | 13     | 2    | 0      | 28       | 0      | 0       | 0      | 3        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.  | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Hotels/Restmnts.  | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Trans/Comm.       | 89    | 26     | 87          | 26     | 1    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 1     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.    | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac. | 0     | 0      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Public Admin.     | 649   | 280    | 619         | 276    | 14   | 3      | 10       | 1      | 1       | 0      | 5        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education         | 171   | 297    | 166         | 292    | 3    | 5      | 2        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrk | 230   | 438    | 169         | 345    | 35   | 78     | 5        | 1      | 10      | 7      | 2        | 6      | 9     | 1      |
| Other Services    | 34    | 11     | 32          | 11     | 1    | 0      | 1        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL             | 1,593 | 1,069  | 1,458       | 967    | 56   | 86     | 47       | 2      | 12      | 7      | 10       | 6      | 10    | 1      |

cont...

Contd Answer to Question 1628/2004

Part -Time Gibraltar Government Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2003.

| ALL SECTORS       | ALL  |        | GIBRALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|-------------------|------|--------|--------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                   | MALE | FEMALE | MALE         | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Shipbuilding      | 0    | 0      | 0            | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.      | 0    | 0      | 0            | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply   | 0    | 2      | 0            | 2      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction      | 2    | 1      | 1            | 1      | 1    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr.  | 0    | 0      | 0            | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Hotels/Restrnts.  | 0    | 0      | 0            | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Trans/Comm.       | 0    | 4      | 0            | 4      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.    | 0    | 0      | 0            | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac. | 0    | 0      | 0            | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Public Admin.     | 0    | 23     | 0            | 23     | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education         | 0    | 167    | 0            | 166    | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 0      |
| Health/Social Wrk | 2    | 72     | 0            | 67     | 0    | 3      | 0        | 0      | 2       | 1      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 1      |
| Other Services    | 0    | 3      | 0            | 3      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| TOTAL             | 4    | 272    | 1            | 266    | 1    | 3      | 0        | 0      | 2       | 1      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 1      |

cont...

Contd Answer to Question 1628/2004

Part -Time Private Sector Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2003.

| ALL SECTORS      | ALL  |        | GIBALTARIAN |        | UK   |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|------------------|------|--------|-------------|--------|------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                  | MALE | FEMALE | MALE        | FEMALE | MALE | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Shipbuilding     | 5    | 2      | 1           | 2      | 2    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 2       | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.     | 9    | 15     | 1           | 9      | 2    | 2      | 1        | 1      | 5       | 3      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply  | 0    | 1      | 0           | 0      | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 1      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction     | 40   | 33     | 21          | 18     | 8    | 6      | 1        | 2      | 9       | 6      | 1        | 0      | 0     | 1      |
| Whsle/Retail Tr. | 96   | 428    | 48          | 265    | 10   | 46     | 13       | 8      | 23      | 97     | 0        | 4      | 2     | 8      |
| Hotels/Restmnts. | 90   | 173    | 15          | 30     | 24   | 48     | 5        | 12     | 28      | 73     | 11       | 9      | 7     | 1      |
| Trans/Comm.      | 21   | 50     | 18          | 35     | 0    | 5      | 2        | 2      | 1       | 6      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 1      |
| Fin. Intermed.   | 14   | 144    | 8           | 114    | 1    | 20     | 0        | 2      | 2       | 4      | 3        | 4      | 0     | 0      |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac | 316  | 297    | 294         | 228    | 11   | 19     | 3        | 7      | 4       | 39     | 2        | 3      | 2     | 1      |
| Public Admin.    | 1    | 13     | 1           | 12     | 0    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 1      | 0        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education        | 9    | 57     | 8           | 41     | 0    | 6      | 0        | 1      | 0       | 6      | 0        | 2      | 1     | 1      |
| Health/Social Wr | 3    | 46     | 2           | 32     | 1    | 9      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 3      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 1      |
| Other Services   | 60   | 152    | 34          | 71     | 15   | 31     | 3        | 6      | 3       | 39     | 4        | 3      | 1     | 2      |
| TOTAL            | 664  | 1,411  | 451         | 857    | 74   | 192    | 28       | 41     | 77      | 278    | 21       | 27     | 13    | 16     |

cont...



Contd Answer to Question 1628/2004

Full-Time Private Sector Employees by Sex and Nationality, October 2003.

| ALL SECTORS        | ALL   |        | GIBRALTARIAN |        | UK    |        | MOROCCAN |        | SPANISH |        | OTHER EU |        | OTHER |        |
|--------------------|-------|--------|--------------|--------|-------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|-------|--------|
|                    | MALE  | FEMALE | MALE         | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE    | FEMALE | MALE     | FEMALE | MALE  | FEMALE |
| Shipbuilding       | 266   | 13     | 108          | 8      | 30    | 0      | 22       | 2      | 85      | 3      | 20       | 0      | 1     | 0      |
| Other Manuf.       | 106   | 45     | 58           | 31     | 9     | 7      | 15       | 1      | 21      | 5      | 1        | 1      | 2     | 0      |
| Elec/Wtr Supply    | 113   | 15     | 97           | 15     | 6     | 0      | 6        | 0      | 2       | 0      | 2        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Construction       | 1,312 | 58     | 442          | 31     | 302   | 13     | 141      | 2      | 325     | 10     | 82       | 1      | 20    | 1      |
| Whsie/Retail Tr.   | 1,401 | 781    | 696          | 443    | 139   | 84     | 154      | 11     | 330     | 216    | 25       | 17     | 57    | 10     |
| Hotels/Restrmts.   | 385   | 268    | 75           | 42     | 60    | 48     | 112      | 37     | 108     | 124    | 15       | 12     | 15    | 5      |
| Trans/Comm.        | 542   | 175    | 382          | 130    | 68    | 21     | 35       | 3      | 48      | 17     | 9        | 4      | 0     | 0      |
| Fin. Intermed.     | 444   | 635    | 254          | 447    | 97    | 122    | 5        | 1      | 28      | 33     | 45       | 20     | 15    | 12     |
| Real Est./Bus.Ac.  | 546   | 537    | 320          | 360    | 110   | 96     | 24       | 5      | 59      | 57     | 25       | 14     | 8     | 5      |
| Public Admin.      | 130   | 73     | 116          | 71     | 7     | 1      | 5        | 0      | 1       | 1      | 1        | 0      | 0     | 0      |
| Education          | 6     | 26     | 5            | 17     | 1     | 6      | 0        | 0      | 0       | 1      | 0        | 1      | 0     | 1      |
| Health/Social Wrk. | 66    | 280    | 55           | 201    | 3     | 22     | 0        | 3      | 8       | 49     | 0        | 5      | 0     | 0      |
| Other Services     | 716   | 397    | 351          | 157    | 200   | 123    | 24       | 3      | 50      | 50     | 44       | 28     | 47    | 36     |
| TOTAL              | 6,033 | 3,303  | 2,959        | 1,953  | 1,032 | 543    | 543      | 68     | 1,065   | 566    | 269      | 103    | 165   | 70     |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1626 TO 1628 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the public sector entities in the private sector I note that the Regulatory Authority is not included. I think when I asked this question the last time it was not included and then I asked a subsequent question at the subsequent meeting where it was confirmed that it was indeed included as the private sector. Will the Minister not agree that if we are including the Ombudsman then it is logical that the Regulatory Authority, that is also funded by money provided from the Estimates, should be seen as a public sector entity in the private sector?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do agree indeed. It should have been included and it must have been a slip not to have it included if it was agreed already at previous discussions that it was very definitely to be defined as a public sector entity in the private sector, which is very much the way the Regulatory Authority operates.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just clarify for the Minister. It was not included in the original answer I got the last time when I asked this about 2002, but at a subsequent meeting I raised it and it was agreed, but I think it must be referring to the original answer of 2002.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, probably had a standard shopping list of these entities.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Minister accept that in fact I think the problem of asking for one single one is that when there are a number included in an industry, it does not identify the individuals which is the problem with the Statistics Ordinance, that is why I have grouped them. So perhaps I can at some stage be given the figures to be added to the ones that I have been given today.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes indeed.

ORAL

**NO. 1629 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state in respect of October 2003 the number of employers registered with the ETB who were qualifying companies giving a breakdown by industry using the classifications used for the Employment Survey Report of October 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 1630 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1630 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state in respect of October 2003 the number of persons employed by qualifying companies and in each case how many were Gibraltarians, giving a breakdown by industry using the classifications in the Employment Survey Report of October 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1630 of 2004**

| <u>Industry</u>                   | <u>Number of Employers</u> | <u>Number of Employee Jobs</u> | <u>Number of Gibraltarian Employee Jobs</u> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Shipbuilding                      | 1                          | 209                            | 90                                          |
| Wholesale & Retail                | 3                          | 96                             | 55                                          |
| Transport & Communication         | 2                          | 10                             | 5                                           |
| Financial Intermediation          | 14                         | 348                            | 266                                         |
| Real Estate & Business Activities | 3                          | 18                             | 6                                           |
| Other Services                    | 5                          | 194                            | 29                                          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                      | <b>28</b>                  | <b>875</b>                     | <b>451</b>                                  |

ORAL

**NO. 1631 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state in which area of the official sector the eight Gibraltarian frontier workers shown in Table 5 of the October 2003 Employment Survey Report are employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The eight Gibraltarian frontier workers shown in Table 5 of the October 2003 Employment Survey Report were all employed within the MOD.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1631 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the Employment Survey Report is the result of the filling of the questionnaires by employers, presumably the fact that the report shows that no Gibraltarian frontier workers were employed by the Government means that the Government in returning the Survey say that there are none. Is that a logical deduction?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Absolutely. The returns from the Government Departments show that there were no Gibraltarian frontier workers under their employment. There is of course that element of doubt in respect of addresses which are given by employees very often in terms of local addresses, but I would not like to delve too much into that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the Government have got nobody in their entire workforce that have got their residence registered with the employer as being on the other side of the border. That is the position?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Gibraltarians we were talking about. Yes indeed.

**NO. 1632 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can government state in respect of the answer to Question No. 1299 of 2004 the number of employers in each of the industries identified in that answer?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The number of employers in each industry identified as shown in answer to Question No. 1299 of 2004 is as follows:

| <b>Industry Identifier</b> | <b>Number of Employers</b> |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Financial Services         | 12                         |
| Gaming                     | 5                          |
| Bunkering                  | 1                          |
| Exporter of Motor Vehicle  | 1                          |
| Shipping                   | 1                          |
| Company Management         | 6                          |
| Philatelic                 | 1                          |
| Information Technology     | 1                          |
| Communications             | 2                          |
| Other                      | 3                          |



**NO. 1633 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Do Government consider the figure in the October 2003 Employment Survey Report of 164 Gibraltarian frontier workers residing in Spain to be accurate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

As the hon Member is aware, the Employment Survey is carried out on the basis of questionnaires completed and returned by all employers as required under the provisions of the Statistics Ordinance. As such, the accuracy of the statistics depends on the quality of the returns submitted by the employers themselves.

In overall terms, the Government are satisfied that the published figures are reasonable estimates of the number of persons in employment and their earnings as at October each year. The question requiring information in respect of frontier workers, particularly when it comes to Gibraltarians, has traditionally been one that presents employers with some difficulty since, as I explained before, many such employees also make use of local addresses.

The figure of 164 Gibraltarian employees recorded as frontier workers in the October 2003 Employment Survey Report is likely to be as accurate or otherwise as the equivalent figure of 138 published in the April 1996 Report and in other previous reports and subsequently as well.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1633 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So effectively the Government do not have a clue whether it is accurate or not. Is that a correct summary of the position?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No I do not think it is fair to say the Government do not have a clue. We have given an explanation of the difficulties in establishing an exact figure. A difficulty which must have been encountered as well during the time that the hon Member was there. I think I am saying something that he was familiar with.

ORAL

**NO. 1634 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state of the 1298 employers who were sent questionnaires in October 2003 how many were not included in 1082 employers who were sent questionnaires in October 2002 for the purpose of the Employment Survey and can Government give a breakdown by industry of these employers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1635 to 1637 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1635 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state how many employers have been sent questionnaires for the October 2004 Employment Survey Report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1634, 1636 and 1637 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1636 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state of the 1290 employers who responded to the October 2003 Employment Survey Questionnaire how many were not included in the 1043 who had replied to the October 2002 Questionnaire by February 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1634, 1635 and 1637 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1637 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state how many employers made a nil return in response to the October 2002 Employment Survey Questionnaire and how many of them were included in the 238 employers who registered a nil return in respect of October 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1637**

A total of 307 employers were sent questionnaires in October 2003 that were not included in the Employment Survey in 2002.

No employer has been sent a questionnaire for the October 2004 Employment Survey Report.

A total of 304 of the 1290 employers referred to.

A total of 146 employers submitted a nil return in response to the October 2002 Employment Survey questionnaire and 64 of those were included in the 238 employers who registered a nil return in the October 2003 Employment Survey.

| <b>Industry Group</b>               | <b>Number of Employers</b> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Other Manufacture                   | 7                          |
| Electricity and Water               | 2                          |
| Construction                        | 13                         |
| Wholesale and Retail Trade          | 56                         |
| Hotels and Restaurants              | 25                         |
| Transport and Communication         | 17                         |
| Financial Intermediation            | 33                         |
| Real Estate and Business Activities | 37                         |
| Public Administration and Defence   | 1                          |
| Education                           | 3                          |
| Health and Social Work              | 4                          |
| Other Services                      | 18                         |
| Nil Returns                         | 91                         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                        | <b>307</b>                 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1634 TO 1637 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I just say, in answer to Question No. 1635, the Minister says that no one has yet been sent the October Questionnaire. Do these things not normally go out in September so that people can fill them up in October?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, I believe the normal practice is to send in November actually.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In November about the preceding month.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

About the preceding month. It gives the employers time to give the exact figure, or as exact as possible, for the end of October of that year.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the 307 who were sent the questionnaire, it is welcome that the coverage should be so good for the October 2003 since it provides more accurate information, but is it that in fact the Statistics Office in previous years left these employers out or that they sort of became aware in 2003?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The explanation is that they have been more successful for the report of October 2003 than in previous years.



**NO. 1638 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****EMPLOYMENT – CASUAL WORKERS**

Can Government give a monthly breakdown of vacancies for casual workers opened with the Employment Agency by Cammell Laird or alternatively in the shipping industry for the months of April to September 2004 giving a breakdown of how many of these have been filled by Gibraltarians?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The number of vacancies for casual workers opened in the shipping industry for the months of April to September 2004 broken down by how many of these have been filled by Gibraltarians is as follows:

|              | <b>April</b> | <b>May</b> | <b>June</b> | <b>July</b> | <b>August</b> | <b>September</b> |
|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| <b>Total</b> | 31           | 8          | 14          | 26          | 12            | 25               |
| <b>Gib</b>   | 9            | 3          | 7           | 9           | 4             | 3                |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1638 OF 2004****HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Minister note that the proportion of Gibraltarians obtaining employment is very low? In fact, in June it is 50 per cent but in most instances it is well below 20 per cent.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, well it is not unusual. It depends on many factors, as the hon Member should be aware. It depends on the nature of the jobs being created. There is not a huge supply of Gibraltarian labour in many of the areas, where the economy from time to time generates demand. Shopkeepers, the construction trade, these are areas where the take-up of work in the private sector is predominantly taken up by non-resident labour, on any month where the jobs have been created. It is not unsurprising that the percentage of taking up jobs will be non Gibraltarian and indeed as the economy

continues to grow, given that the population is static and our unemployment rates are pretty static, as the economy continues to grow and the number of jobs in the economy continues to grow, it is a mathematical certainty that the percentage of the jobs occupied by Gibraltarians will fall, because our size, our contribution to the statistics is static and therefore the growth in employment is in effect being satisfied by labour from abroad, either from Spain or in the gaming industry from further a field than Spain. That is a reality and the Gibraltarians take a share of those jobs in accordance with the jobs that are suitable for the Gibraltarians that are available seeking jobs. So the simple situation that the hon Member describes is not itself the concern. I agree that the situation would be a concern if the jobs that were coming out into the market were jobs that Gibraltarian people could and should be doing, and that for some reason others were being preferred to Gibraltarians. That would be a worrying situation in which the Government are not free to take completely effective remedial action but which the Government would be interested in doing whatever it could lawfully do to redress that situation, but one cannot deduce that situation from a simple reference to the figures for which there might be a perfectly simple explanation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know whether it is because the Chief Minister has just arrived, but he has not cottoned on to the question, because that is hardly likely to reduce the time we spend in this House. He has given us a wide picture of the performance of the economy and the question is about casual workers in the Dockyard. So the Chief Minister thinks that the nature of the market of casual workers in the Shipyard is exactly the same principle as the gaming, the shop assistants, the construction industry and so on. Well, presumably does he not know that in fact the performance, I hope in fact that he is wrong. Will he not recognise that if indeed the whole of the rest of the private sector were to operate as the Shipyard we would have a situation where there are no permanent jobs, since 75 per cent of the workers are casuals in the Shipyard, and they get taken off, and they get laid off and they get taken back. So it is not different jobs. It is the same job on and off. In that area there is no reason why Gibraltarians who are on the register as unemployed should not be able to go in and work a few weeks as tank cleaners and that kind of thing, unless it is that they do not apply for the jobs. It is a different criteria but I think we are talking specifically of a peculiar sector which does not have the same characteristics as the remainder of the private sector.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the characteristics may be different but the principle is the same. Each sector of the economy, be it the casual sector in the Shipyard, which I accept has, but look the gaming industry has a part-time culture, not a casual, a part-time culture and there are other sectors of the economy that have a requirement for skills that are not readily available in Gibraltar. So every different sector of the economy has its own labour requirement peculiarities, some of which make it more rather than less likely, others less rather than more likely, but Gibraltarians are either able or willing to participate in employment, either because it is not the sort of job one wants to do, or because it is casual and thankfully most people in Gibraltar have full time jobs or part-time. Same reason, people are not attracted to this. The sort of people that can do part-time jobs in this industry are the sort of people who need full time employment. If one is a housewife

willing to work occasionally, one cannot aspire to a job in Cammell Laird cleaning up a tank, it is a mismatch. Most people who can do this sort of work are the sort of people who are bread winners in their family and need full time employment. So the principle is the same. There are many economic activities in Gibraltar, and I think this used to be true before, which access to those jobs is always open to Gibraltarians but for a variety of reasons Gibraltarians choose not to or do not qualify for the employment. I appreciate that the question relates to Cammell Laird and to casual workers but the principle is the same. If the hon Member looks at the statistics that we publish in respect of the filling of vacancies generally in the economy, in the more general employment questions, he will see, I think from memory it hovers around the 50 per cent as well. There are months when it is more than 50 per cent and months where it is less. I am speaking from memory. I do not know if we have passed these questions already or whether they are still to come on the Order Paper but he will see that there is a very high proportion of vacancies generally in the employment market filled by non residents.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, but my original supplementary was to ask the Minister to note that it was answered by the Chief Minister. Perhaps I could ask him to factor into what he has told us the following. Looking at just one particular month, the month of September, 97 male Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register. Of those 28 found employment. Cammell Laird opened 25 vacancies, only three were filled by Gibraltarians. Those are adult males, none of them are the type of individual who the hon Gentleman has suggested would not be looking for full time employment, even if it were casual. Looking at the statistics of employment at Cammell Laird over a period of a year and a half since January 2003, it is really quite surprising how low a proportion of Gibraltarians are actually able to obtain employment with that company. Given all that and given that we were provided with a statistic in answer to Question No. 1623 of spending on training which showed that £141,000 had been spent on training with Cammell Laird, is it not surprising that there is such a low proportion of Gibraltarians being able to access the vacancies of Cammell Laird? I certainly think it is.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member reveals by his last phrase the point that he is wanting to make but which is not sustained by the facts. It is not that Gibraltarians are prohibited from accessing, as he says, the jobs. The Gibraltarians are as free to access the jobs as anybody else, there is not any obstacle to their accessing the jobs. Nor do the statistics that he chooses to quote have the other effects that he is describing. Look, the fact that there were 97 people joining the unemployment register in September, of which he says 28 found employment, presumably from the figures that he has been presented which I do not have in front of me, one would have to analyse who those 97 were. Were they students, were they graduates looking for university? So one cannot extrapolate that figure to the 25 Cammell Laird vacancies which may have been for specialities that were not available in Gibraltar, may have been for part-time work as opposed to full time work, casual work, one cannot just from a simple extrapolation of the figures draw any conclusions like the hon Member is drawing. It may be possible to draw those conclusions from other factors in addition to the statistics. For example, if there was any evidence that Cammell Laird was discriminating against local residents in their

employment prospects, then that is something that the Government would be very concerned about. All I am saying is that one cannot draw those conclusions just from the statistics. I am not arguing the underlying principle that if it were the case that Cammell Laird were discriminating against locals, that would be a very worrying situation and one which the Government would wish to try and do all that they could. So it is not the principle that we are in disagreement on it is the question of whether that state of affairs can be deduced just from the statistics that the hon Member is managing. That is the only point that I am making. I am not challenging that if the position were as the hon Member is describing it would be serious. I think it would be if it were the case.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I appreciate that there is therefore a measure of agreement across the floor but should the figures not at least put us on enquiry and should we not do something to monitor that. For example, would the Minister for Employment undertake to monitor the number of applications for vacancies for jobs opened by Cammell Laird, see how many are applied for by Gibraltarians and see how many Gibraltarians are rejected, so that we can get to the bottom of whether or not Gibraltarians are being discriminated against for something as simple as the fact that their labour is more expensive than those from abroad?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That monitoring process is carried out by the Employment Service. Notices of vacancies are given to us and there is no evidence of any blatant discrimination in that respect. Certainly not in terms of the level of wages.

ORAL

**NO. 1639 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1639 of 2004**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the months of April to September 2004:

**Employment Injuries Insurance Fund**

|                                  | 30-Apr-04  | 31-May-04  | 30-Jun-04  | 31-Jul-04  | 31-Aug-04  | 30-Sep-04  |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Fund Account-<br>Opening Balance | £5,467,236 | £5,407,872 | £5,339,822 | £5,337,226 | £5,313,080 | £5,339,394 |
| Add Receipts                     | £37,647    | £37,089    | £47,307    | £41,467    | £71,708    | £11,595    |
|                                  | £5,504,883 | £5,444,961 | £5,387,129 | £5,378,693 | £5,384,788 | £5,350,989 |
| Less Payments                    | (£97,011)  | (£105,139) | (£49,903)  | (£65,613)  | (£45,394)  | (£49,250)  |
| Closing Balance                  | £5,407,872 | £5,339,822 | £5,337,226 | £5,313,080 | £5,339,394 | £5,301,739 |

ORAL

**NO. 1640 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE**

Can Government state how many fixed penalties have been imposed on employers and in respect of how many employees in the months of April to September 2004 (giving a breakdown for each month) under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance, under which sections of the Ordinance, each penalty has been imposed and whether the penalties have been paid or the matter is being pursued through further prosecution?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information that is requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

Answer to Question 1640 of 2004

|        | Number of Inspections Carried out | Fixed Penalty Notice Issued in respect of Unregistered Labour | Fixed Penalty Notice Issued in respect of Terminations | Fixed Penalty Notice paid in respect of Unregistered Labour | Fixed Penalty Notice Paid in respect of Terminations | Fixed Penalty Notices Pending Payment | Cases Pending with Attorney General |
|--------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Apr-04 | 18                                | 1                                                             | 0                                                      | 1                                                           | 0                                                    | 0                                     | 0                                   |
| May-04 | 24                                | 2                                                             | 0                                                      | 0                                                           | 0                                                    | 0                                     | 0                                   |
| Jun-04 | 38                                | 2                                                             | 0                                                      | 3                                                           | 0                                                    | 0                                     | 0                                   |
| Jul-04 | 44                                | 6                                                             | 0                                                      | 4                                                           | 0                                                    | 1                                     | 0                                   |
| Aug-04 | 33                                | 0                                                             | 0                                                      | 1                                                           | 0                                                    | 1                                     | 0                                   |
| Sep-04 | 44                                | 0                                                             | 0                                                      | 0                                                           | 0                                                    | 0                                     | 0                                   |
| TOTALS | 201                               | 11                                                            | 0                                                      | 9                                                           | 0                                                    | 2                                     | 0                                   |

cont...



**Contd. Answer to Question 1640/2004**

The provisions are as follows:

- 1) Regulation 8(2A) of the Income Tax (Pay As You Earn) Regulations 1989 (Duty to Register).
- 2) Regulation 3 of the Employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations (Duty to Register).
- 3) Regulation 3 of the Employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations as applied by Regulation 4(1) of the Social Security (Contributions) Regulations (Duty to Register).
- 4) Regulation 3 of the Employment Injuries (Contributions) Regulations as applied by Regulation 3(1) of the Social Security (Open Long Term Benefits) (Contributions) Regulations 1997 (Duty to Register).
- 5) Regulation 4 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty of notify Director of vacancy).
- 6) Regulation 6 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to notify Director of intention to engage an entitled worker).
- 7) Regulation 7 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to apply to the Director for a permit in relation to a non-entitled worker).
- 8) Regulation 13 of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Duty to notify Director of termination).
- 9) Regulation 15A(4) of the Employment Regulations 1994 (Amended by L.N.100/94) (Duty to notify Director of temporary employment of Detached workers).
- 10) Section 3 of the Business Trades and Professions (Registration) Ordinance 1989 (Duty to Register).
- 11) Section 57(2) of the Income Tax Ordinance (Duty to give notice to the Commissioner that a person is chargeable for tax purposes).

ORAL

**NO. 1641 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE**

Can Government state how many prosecutions have been commenced under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance in the months of April to September 2004, the date of filing of any such prosecutions and the penalties, if any, imposed by the courts in respect of any prosecutions which may have been completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with question Nos. 1642 and 1643 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1642 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE**

Of the 81 cases filed between July and September 2003 in respect of offences under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance referred to in the answer to Question No. 269 of 2004, how many have resulted in acquittals, how many have resulted in conviction (and what penalties have been imposed in respect of each) and how many are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1641 and 1643 of 2004.

**NO. 1643 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE**

Can Her Majesty's Attorney General state, in relation to the answer to Question No. 268 of 2004, how long the seven pending cases with him in relation to alleged offences under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance have been pending with his Chambers and whether a decision has been taken on whether to proceed or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question No. 1641**

No prosecutions have commenced under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance in the months of April to September 2004, given that all Fixed Penalty Notices issued have been paid, except for two which are pending payment.

**Answer to Question No. 1642**

The 81 cases filed between July and September 2003 were never proceeded with by the Attorney General.

**Answer to Question No. 1643**

Five of the seven cases referred to were withdrawn by the Attorney General during the course of 2003 and the remaining two were not proceeded with.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1641 TO 1643 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I wonder if the Minister would mind explaining a bit further for my benefit. Is it that when the Labour Inspectors pass this to the Attorney General it is because the employer is contesting whether in fact he has acted in breach, is it or is it not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not necessarily. It could be that or it could just be a simple failure to pay the Fixed Penalty Notice. One gets a Fixed Penalty Notice which says if it is paid the matter is left there and not proceeded with. If one does not pay, the papers go forward but the fact that it has not been paid does not mean necessarily that one is challenging the case. It simply means perhaps that one has just failed to pay and some people then pay when they are reminded and pressed. In other words, it is only holding out payment but it could mean that they are challenging it and wish to be prosecuted.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Because they believe they are right obviously.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well because they believe they are right.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That means they can defend themselves.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes absolutely.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In any of these cases that did not go forward, one of those in fact, we can understand if the employer paid rather than go to court even when it got to the final stage, that is fine, that is the logic of that situation but are there any cases where we did not proceed to the prosecution when the individual employer was challenging?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

These are all cases where the payment of the penalty has not been made within a certain time, flexibility and reminders et cetera. Then of course, as the Chief Minister said, the matter has to be referred to the Chambers of the Attorney General for possible prosecution. This is the legal process involved.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If I correctly understand the hon Member's supplementary, he is meaning to ask whether as a matter of policy a decision has been taken not to proceed to prosecution with any

person that has failed to pay the fine. Well, of course, once the Government pass the papers to the Attorney General, the decision of whether to prosecute is his so at that point it ceases to be a matter of policy decision, but I am not aware that the Attorney General has sought to frustrate the good administration of the Ordinance by declining to prosecute anybody who is in breach. There was once an issue here of whether people should or should not have their rights read to them, in the language of American movies, but that is a separate issue.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it safe then to assume that of the 81 cases filed none were proceeded with because all were paid?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, none were paid and they followed the process that has been explained of referring, addressing the matter to the Attorney General.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

We have also been told that those were not proceeded with so unless the Attorney General is trying to frustrate the good administration of the Ordinance, there must be a good reason for that. Is it that they were fined or cases filed which were improperly fined?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I cannot speak for the Attorney General.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I appreciate that but there must be an explanation why these 81 cases have never been proceeded with. I mean, we are told in relation to the seven cases referred to in Question No. 1643, that five were withdrawn and two were not proceeded with, but for 81 cases not to be proceeded with at all, something must have happened. It is a fairly wholesale number.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have given as much of an indication as I am willing to give of an issue that is outstanding.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Perhaps then we are just misunderstanding each other. Those 81 cases are outstanding not proceeded with, they have not yet been proceeded with?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Exactly.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Right, I appreciate that. We were told they were never proceeded with. If we are being told they have not yet been proceeded with, then that is a different matter.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I do not know whether they are not proceeded with, I am not sure what the limitation periods are in terms of prosecution, or whether there are any or whether we are in danger of it. There may come a time when if they are not proceeded with, they may not ever be able to be proceeded with, but that is the issue. An issue by the way in which the Government have a different view to the one being expressed in some quarters within the Attorney General's Chambers but the matter is still outstanding. The view expressed to the Government is that when one is issued a Fixed Penalty Notice one has got to be read ones rights. We cannot understand why that should be the case with Fixed Penalty Notices in employment but not with Fixed Penalty Notices in traffic offences. So the fixed penalty notice is not a prosecution. It is saying to somebody 'we think you have done this offence', not that one has done it, we think one has done it. There is no adjudication. If one agrees that one has done it and want to pay, this is the fine that one can pay. If one does not think that one has done it, do not worry. In due course one may receive a summons and we do not see why one should have to be cautioned in those circumstances, but that is the view somebody has formed and that is the sort of way that we are grappling it at the moment.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In fact, it is the summons that contains the statement of rights of the individual who may or may not be summoned, contains.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Attorney General is constitutionally responsible for the pursuit of prosecution and there is a limit to the extent which the Government can administratively or politically interfere. We can clarify the law if there is allegedly any doubt about what the law is but other than that it is persuasion.

ORAL

**NO. 1644 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BAYSIDE SCHOOL**

Will Government state how many pupils left Bayside School in the academic year of 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 respectively after reaching the age of 15?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 1645 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1645 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – WESTSIDE SCHOOL**

Will Government state how many pupils left Westside School in the academic year of 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 respectively after reaching the age of 15?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1645 of 2004**

**Answer to Question No. 1644**

The number of students who left Bayside after reaching the age of 15 are:

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| 2000/2001 | 16 |
| 2001/2002 | 4  |
| 2002/2003 | 37 |
| 2003/2004 | 5  |

**Answer to Question No. 1645**

The number of students who left Westside after reaching the age of 15 are:

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| 2000/2001 | 31 |
| 2001/2002 | 31 |
| 2002/2003 | 38 |
| 2003/2004 | 23 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1644 AND 1645 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

One thing strikes me initially just by looking at the figures, that there is a big discrepancy between Bayside and Westside. There seems to be more females leaving school than there are males. Is this due to the opportunities that there might be in one school that there is not in the other?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There could be many factors involved. One of them may be opportunities. The fact is that many of the school leavers at 15 choose to go into training and this, by tradition historically, has not been particularly attractive to girls (I am speculating), who seek immediate employment in one of the traditional areas for girls at 15. As I say we could spend the day speculating even about psychological aspects of the whole thing but I would not like to sort of be categorical about the motivations.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes but when we talk about training we are assuming that the pupil has left the school to go into training, so therefore I do not think that would be the case in the sense that if one has more males going into training they will have to leave school at the age of 15. Whilst what I am saying is, for example, in 2003/2004 we had five boys or young adults to 23 girls or young adults leaving the school at the age of 15. It has nothing to do with whether the boys go on to the training and the girls do not but they leave school. I am saying whether it is to do with the opportunity that is actually being offered within the school not the training outside.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There are many factors but I would not say it is the opportunities offered within the school. I think it is also a question of motivation and incentive. I think again I am speculating that boys traditionally want to pursue further their schooling in many areas offered, in the one year course that is being offered to Year 10s in Bayside School, is very attractive. It is a very much hands on type of course with part-time training in the Construction Training Centre, that is particularly attractive to the boys and an incentive to stay on in school to benefit from that facility. Whereas the girls do not seem to be motivated in that line. As I say I am speculating into motivations which is a dicey area to speculate on.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is there a one year course in Westside which would be, I would not say adequate because I would be being rather sexist then, that would be suitable for the girls in

Westside as there is in Bayside? The Minister has just said that in Bayside they go to the Training Centre and we are assuming here that the girls do not want to go to the Training Centre whilst boys do. Is there an equivalent of the one year course in Westside which would be suitable or adequate for the girls?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There is some equivalent, but as I say it is not as attractive it seems for the girls as it is for the boys.

ORAL

**NO. 1646 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LUNCH SUPERVISORS**

Can Government state how many lunch supervisors are currently employed giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1647 and 1648 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1647 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LUNCH SUPERVISORS**

Can Government state what is the pupil/supervisor ratio giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1646 and 1648 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1648 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LUNCH SUPERVISORS**

Can Government state what are the current working hours of lunch supervisors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1648 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1646**

A total of 148 lunch supervisors are currently employed. The breakdown by school is as follows:-

|                    |    |
|--------------------|----|
| Bayside            | 21 |
| Westside           | 14 |
| Bishop Fitzgerald  | 15 |
| St Anne's Middle   | 13 |
| St Joseph's Middle | 11 |
| Sacred Heart       | 9  |
| Hebrew             | 2  |
| St Mary's First    | 8  |
| Notre Dame         | 12 |
| Governor's Meadow  | 13 |
| St Bernard's First | 5  |
| St Joseph's First  | 14 |
| St Paul's First    | 11 |

**Answer to Question 1647**

|                    |          |
|--------------------|----------|
| Westside           | 22.9 : 1 |
| Bayside            | 38.8 : 1 |
| Sacred Heart       | 25.5 : 1 |
| St Anne's Middle   | 29.8 : 1 |
| St Joseph's Middle | 30.3 : 1 |
| Bishop Fitzgerald  | 28.9 : 1 |
| St Paul's First    | 22.7 : 1 |
| Notre Dame         | 14.6 : 1 |
| Governor's Meadow  | 23.1 : 1 |
| St Joseph's First  | 23.5 : 1 |
| St Bernard's First | 18.6 : 1 |
| St Mary's First    | 19.3 : 1 |

**Answer to Question 1648**

The current working hours of lunch supervisors are as follows:-

|                              |   |                    |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Secondary and Middle Schools | - | 12 noon – 2 pm     |
| First Schools                | - | 11.30 am – 1.30 pm |



ORAL

**NO. 1649 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**TRAINING ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government state how many times the Training Advisory Council have met in 2003 and 2004 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Training Advisory Council met once in 2003 and twice in 2004.

**NO. 1650 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – POST 16 EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Can Government state how many times the Post 16 Education Committee have met in 2003 and 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

As explained to the hon Member in answers to Question No. 595 of 2004 and No. 247 of 2004, it was agreed with Mrs Sue Rogers of the NASUWT in UK at a meeting held locally about a year ago, that in the context of the Tomlinson Report on 14-19 Education in UK it was wise that we should all both Union and Government, await developments to consolidate in UK before we took any practical measures forward locally.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1650 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

So until the Tomlinson Report is published nothing happens. Are not the terms of reference of this Committee to see into what has been leaked from the Tomlinson Report, because the Tomlinson Report is not published yet?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Of course it is published.

**HON S E LINARES:**

What I am saying is that if it has been published, why has the Committee not met in order to discuss the Report?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Tomlinson Report is now being submitted to Ministers in the UK. Decisions will have to be taken by Ministers in the UK and those are the developments, real developments in changing the structure and processes of the 14-19 education that we are awaiting. To be frank the ball is very much in the court of the Union at the moment, because it was Mrs Sue Rogers that asked us not to take any steps locally until we can evaluate what is happening in the UK, which is really what we have always done as the hon Member may know.

ORAL

**NO. 1651 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state what their medium and long-term strategic plan is in relation to the acute overcrowding situation at Bishop Fitzgerald School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 1652 of 2004.

**NO. 1652 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state how many toilets are currently available for usage for pupils in Bishop Fitzgerald School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question No. 1651**

The Government intend that the school will revert to the four-form entry that was originally envisaged, once the new school is built at the Fleet Pavilion site. This will eliminate the overcrowding which has existed lately when we have had to take in five-form entry intakes.

**Answer to Question No. 1652**

There are currently 13 toilets available for use by pupils and a further 12 new toilets are to be built very shortly.

ORAL

**NO. 1653 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL CLEANERS**

Can Government state what is the complement of cleaners giving a breakdown by school and whether they are on supply or permanent and pensionable status?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1654 to 1657 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1654 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL SECRETARIES**

Can Government state what is the complement of secretaries giving a breakdown by school and whether they work mornings, afternoons or are full-time?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1653 and 1655 to 1657 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1655 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CLASSROOM AIDES**

Can Government state what is the complement of classroom aides giving a breakdown by school and whether they are on supply, contract or permanent and pensionable status?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1653, 1654 and 1656 to 1657 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1656 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CARETAKERS**

Can Government state what is the complement of caretakers giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1653 to 1655 and 1657 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1657 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – INDUSTRIAL WORKERS**

Can Government state how many industrial civil servants are employed by the Department of Education giving a breakdown by grade and what functions they perform?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1657 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1653**

| School               | P/T (20 hrs) | F/T (37 hrs) | P/T (30 hrs) | F/T (52 hrs) |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Bayside              | 25           |              |              |              |
| Westside             | 23           | 1            |              |              |
| Bishop Fitzgerald    | 8            |              |              |              |
| St Anne's            | 9            | 1            |              |              |
| St Joseph's Middle   | 6            | 1            |              | 1            |
| Sacred Heart         | 6            |              |              |              |
| Hebrew               | 2            |              |              |              |
| St Martin's          |              | 1            | 1            |              |
| Notre Dame           | 7            |              |              |              |
| St Mary's First      | 6            |              |              |              |
| St Joseph's First    | 7            | 1            |              |              |
| St Paul's First      | 6            |              |              |              |
| St Bernard's First   | 4            |              |              |              |
| Governor's Meadow    | 6            |              |              |              |
| College              | 4            | 1            |              |              |
| St Bernard's Nursery | 1            |              |              |              |

All the above posts are permanent. Should there be a supply at any time, then it means the person has resigned/retired and there is a vacancy which will be filled in or someone is either on annual leave or sick leave.

**Answer to Question 1654**

|                    |                                       |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bayside            | 2 full-timers                         |
| Westside           | 2 full-timers                         |
| Bishop Fitzgerald  | 1 part-timer (mornings only)          |
| St Anne's          | 1 part-timer (mornings only)          |
| St Joseph's Middle | 1 part-timer (mornings only)          |
| Sacred Heart       | 1 part-timer (mornings only)          |
| Gibraltar College  | 1 part-timer (3 mornings + 1EO + 1AO) |
| Hebrew             | 1 part-timer (2 mornings only)        |
| St Mary's First    | 1 part-timer (3 mornings only)        |
| St Joseph's First  | 1 part-timer (5 mornings only)        |
| Governor's Meadow  | 1 part-timer (5 mornings only)        |
| Notre Dame         | 1 part-timer (5 mornings only)        |
| St Bernard's First | 1 part-timer (3 mornings only)        |
| St Paul's First    | 1 part-timer (5 mornings only)        |
| St Martin's        | 1 part-timer (4 mornings only)        |

Total number of school secretaries = 4 full-timers  
11 part-timers  
1 EO  
1AO

Contd

**Answer to Question 1657 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1655**

| Name of C. Aide | School                               | Hours       | Status | PT/FT   |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------|---------|
|                 | Governor's Meadow First School       | 37          | pp     | FT      |
| * = same person | Governor's Meadow First School       | 4Xp.m. 8hrs | supply | PT      |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 30hrs       | supply | FT      |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 30 hrs      | supply | FT      |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 30 hrs      | supply | for P&P |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 20+10ehrs   | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 20 a.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | Notre Dame First School              | 16.25hrs    | supply | PT      |
|                 | St Bernard's First School            | 8 hrs       | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Bernard's First School            | 10 p.m.     | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Bernard's First School            | 16.25       | supply | PT      |
|                 | St Joseph's First School             | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Joseph's First School             | 30 hrs      | supply | FT      |
|                 | St. Paul's First School              | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Paul's First School               | 30 hrs      | supply | for P&P |
|                 | St Paul's First School               | 30 hrs      | supply | FT      |
|                 | St Paul's First School               | 30 hrs      | supply | PT      |
|                 | St Paul's First School               | 16.25       | supply | PT      |
|                 | Hebrew Primary School                | 20 hrs      | supply | PT      |
|                 | Bishop Fitzgerald's Middle School    | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Bishop Fitzgerald's Middle School    | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Bishop Fitzgerald's Middle School    | 20 hrs      | pp     | PT      |
|                 | Bishop Fitzgerald's Middle School    | 20+10ehrs   | pp     | PT      |
|                 | Bishop Fitzgerald Middle School      | 30 hrs      | supply | FT      |
|                 | Bishop Fitzgerald Middle School      | 37hrs       | pp     | FT      |
| * = same person | Bishop Fitzgerald Middle School      | 2 hrs       | supply | PT      |
|                 | Westside                             | 30 hrs      | supply | FT      |
|                 | Westside                             | 30 hrs      | supply | FT      |
|                 | Bayside                              | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Bayside                              | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Bayside                              | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | Bayside/ St. Anne's                  | 20/10 hrs   | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 a.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 a.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 a.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 a.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 a.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 a.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 a.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 p.m.     | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20          | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20          | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Martin's                          | 20 hrs      | supply | PT      |
| * = same person | St. Mary's                           | 10 hrs      | supply | PT      |
|                 | St Bernard's Nursery                 | 20 a.m      | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St. Bernard's N. am/St. Bernard's S. | 37 hrs      | pp     | PT      |
|                 | St. Bernard's Nursery/ S. H.         | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |
|                 | St Paul's Cathay                     | 37 hrs      | pp     | FT      |

Contd

### **Answer to Question 1657 of 2004**

### **Answer to Question 1656**

There are a total of 20 School Attendants employed at present. The breakdown by schools is as follows:-

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Bayside              | 2 |
| Westside             | 2 |
| Gibraltar College    | 2 |
| Bishop Fitzgerald    | 1 |
| St Anne's Middle     | 1 |
| St Joseph's Middle   | 1 |
| Sacred Heart         | 1 |
| Hebrew               | 1 |
| St Mary's First      | 1 |
| Notre Dame           | 1 |
| Governor's Meadow    | 1 |
| St Bernard's First   | 1 |
| St Joseph's First    | 1 |
| St Paul's First      | 1 |
| St Bernard's Nursery | 1 |
| St Paul's Nursery    | 1 |
| St Martin's          | 1 |

### **Answer to Question 1657**

|                                  |            |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| School Attendants                | 20         |
| Driver/Labourer                  | 1          |
| Labourers                        | 5          |
| Support Service Assistant/Driver | 1          |
| General Hand                     | 1          |
| Cleaners                         | <u>128</u> |
| Total                            | <u>156</u> |

**NO. 1658 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PURCHASE OF STATIONERY**

Can Government state what are the current procedures in relation to procuring stationery, equipment and other materials for schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Tenders are invited from both local and UK suppliers. After closing date, tenders are looked into by a Committee involving representatives from the three levels of schools and a Departmental officer.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1658 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is this a departure from last year or the previous years in which we had first of all direct buying, then we had tendering, and now we seem to have a mixture of both?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Now we have tendering. The only departure is that now we tender and invite tenders from local and UK suppliers.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes, but as the Minister well knows, before the tendering system it was a direct buying, schools and departments used to do direct buying. Then it was all tendering local buying and then it was tender.....

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Tendering locally and in the UK.

ORAL

**NO. 1659 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PUPIL/TEACHER RATIO**

Can Government state what is the pupil/teacher ratio in this academic year giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1660 and 1661 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1660 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NUMBER OF PUPILS**

Can Government say what is the average classroom size giving a breakdown by school and year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1659 and 1661 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1661 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NUMBER OF TEACHERS**

Will Government state what is the complement of teachers in each school giving a breakdown by school, responsibility held and whether they are on supply or on permanent and pensionable status?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1661 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1659**

Pupil/Teacher Ration – 2004/05 (figures as at 30 September 2004)

| School                           | p/t ratio    |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| Governor's Meadow                | 17.39        |
| St Joseph's First                | 17.56        |
| Notre Dame First                 | 16.93        |
| St Bernard's First               | 13.67        |
| St Mary's First                  | 15.50        |
| St Paul's First                  | 18.00        |
| <b>Average First Schools</b>     | <b>16.83</b> |
| Bishop Fitzgerald                | 19.63        |
| St Joseph's Middle               | 19.39        |
| Sacred Heart                     | 17.07        |
| St Anne's                        | 19.14        |
| <b>Average Middle Schools</b>    | <b>19.10</b> |
| Hebrew                           | 14.60        |
| Bayside                          | 15.83        |
| Westside                         | 15.36        |
| <b>Average Secondary Schools</b> | <b>15.60</b> |

Cont.....



**Answer to Question 1661 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1661**

| <b>School</b>      | <b>No. of Teachers</b>                | <b>Responsibilities</b>                             |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| Governor's Meadow  | 18 f/t p&p                            | 1 HT;1DHT;MA2x4;<br>MA1x4                           |
| St Joseph's First  | 18 f/t p&p; 2 p/t supply              | 1HT; 1DHT; MA2x5<br>MA1x3                           |
| Notre Dame         | 16 f/t p&p                            | 1HT; 1DHT; MA2x4;<br>MA1x2; SNx1                    |
| St Bernard's       | 9 f/t p&p                             | 1HT; 1DHT; MA2x3                                    |
| St Mary's          | 10 f/t p&p                            | 1HT; 1DHT; MA2x3;<br>MA1x1                          |
| St Paul's          | 16 f/t p&p                            | 1HT; 1DGHT; MA2x4;<br>MA1x1                         |
| Bishop Fitzgerald  | 26 f/t p&p                            | 1HT; 1DHT; MA3x4;<br>MA2x4; MA1x1; SNx2             |
| St Joseph's Middle | 18 f/t p&p                            | 1HT; 1DHT; MA2x5;<br>MA1x3                          |
| Sacred Heart       | 15 f/t p&p                            | 1HT; 1DHT; MA2x5;<br>MA1x3                          |
| Hebrew Primary     | 5 f/t P&P                             | 1HT; 1DHT; MA2x1;<br>MA1x1                          |
| St Anne's          | 22 f/t p&p                            | 1HT; 1DHT; MA3x4;<br>MA2x5; MA1x2                   |
| Bayside            | 62 f/t p&p; 3 f/t supply<br>1 p/t p&p | 1HT; 3DHT; MA5x4;<br>MA4x9; MA3x8; MA2x6;<br>MA1x6  |
| Westside           | 64 f/t p&p; 1 f/t supply<br>1 p/t p&p | 1HT; 3DHT; MA5x4;<br>MA4x6; MA3x11; MA2x5;<br>MA1x7 |

Key: p&p = permanent and pensionable  
p/t = part-time  
f/t = full-time  
HT = Headteacher  
DHT = Deputy Headteacher  
MA = Management Allowance  
SN = Special Needs Allowance

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1659 TO 1661 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state what criteria is being used to give supply work since we have a great number of qualified teachers either unemployed or awaiting employment by the Department of Education? Is there any specific criteria used?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The criteria used for the provision of supply work depends very much on the needs of the school that can make a case over and above their complement because of particular circumstances that require that additional support.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So therefore I presume that the Head teacher is the one that has a lot of say in determining the sort of teacher that needs to come in for supply work.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Head teacher will make a bid but the decision is not taken by the Head teacher, it is assessed by the Department, advisers et cetera.

**HON S E LINARES:**

That is why I am saying that the Head teacher has a lot of say but obviously the ultimate decision comes from the Department of Education who employs the supply teacher. What I am saying is that there have been certain representations made to me that certain teachers are going in for example in Bayside to teach French and the teacher is a primary school teacher who has not got a clue of French, and is being employed on a supply basis when these pupils need at least somebody fluent in French.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have no evidence of that type of anomaly and I am very surprised that it should happen at all. I think head teachers and Departmental officers are sensible enough not to commit that type of anomalous situation.

**HON S E LINARES:**

When applications come out for the teaching profession, that is every academic year there is a pool of supply, is there any preference to pick the teachers that are on a full-

time supply basis? Do they have preference to get the job at permanent and pensionable or everybody goes into the pool regardless?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The fact that a teacher has already been on supply for a year or two years is a factor that is taken into consideration, but not the only factor, also the needs of the school, the needs specially in subject areas and the subject qualification of teachers offering themselves for employment is also another very important factor.

ORAL

**NO. 1662 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CLASSROOM AIDES**

Can Government state what is the ratio of classroom aides to pupils in the inclusion programme in this academic year giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 1663 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1663 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – INCLUSION PROGRAMME**

Will Government state how many pupils are currently on the inclusion programme giving a breakdown by school and year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1663 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1662**

| SCHOOL                   | NO. OF CHILDREN | CLASSROOM AIDES         | ADDITIONAL INFORMATION          |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>FIRST SCHOOLS</b>     |                 |                         |                                 |
| Governor's Meadow        | 5               | 1 Full time 1 part time | * same C.A.                     |
| Notre Dame               | 15              | 6 Full time 2 part time |                                 |
| St Bernard's             | 4               | 2 Part time             | Hd. Of St. B.N. (8 hrs support) |
| St Joseph's              | 1               | 1 Full time             |                                 |
| St Mary's                | 1               | 10 hours                | *                               |
| St Paul's                | 5               | 3 Full time 1 part time |                                 |
| Hebrew School            | 1               |                         | Support from VTS                |
| <b>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</b>    |                 |                         |                                 |
| Bishop Fitzgerald        | 15              | 4 Full time 1 part time | 2 hrs from*                     |
| Sacred Heart             | 2               |                         | 10 hrs from St B.N.             |
| St Anne's                | 10              | 1 Part time             | BEST                            |
| St Joseph's              | 0               | None                    |                                 |
| <b>SECONDARY SCHOOLS</b> |                 |                         |                                 |
| Bayside                  | 17              | 3 Full time 1 part time | Part time BEST                  |
| Westside                 | 4               | 2 Full time             |                                 |
| <b>SPECIAL SCHOOLS</b>   |                 |                         |                                 |
| St Martin's              | 7               | 2 Full time             | Outreach Programme              |
| <b>GIBRALTAR COLLEGE</b> |                 |                         |                                 |
|                          | 1               | None                    |                                 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>             | <b>88</b>       |                         |                                 |

The ratio ranges from 1:1 to 1:6

We employ 23 FT C.A. and 9 PT C.A. = 27.5 Ft equivalent

The average ratio is 1:3

Cont'd.....

**Answer to Question 1663 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1663**

| <b>First Schools</b>  | <b>Reception</b> | <b>Year 1</b> | <b>Year 2</b> | <b>Year 3</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|-----------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Governor's Meadow     | 1                | 1             | 2             | 1             | 5            |
| Notre Dame            | 1                | 3             | 5             | 6             | 15           |
| St Bernard's          | 2                | 1             |               | 1             | 4            |
| St Joseph's           |                  |               | 1             |               | 1            |
| St Mary's             |                  |               | 1             |               | 1            |
| St Paul's             | 2                | 1             | 1             | 1             | 5            |
| Hebrew School         |                  |               |               | 1             | 1            |
|                       |                  |               |               |               | <b>32</b>    |
|                       |                  |               |               |               |              |
| <b>Middle Schools</b> | <b>Year 4</b>    | <b>Year 5</b> | <b>Year 6</b> | <b>Year 7</b> | <b>Total</b> |
| Bishop Fitzgerald     | 3                | 4             | 3             | 5             | 15           |
| Sacred Heart          | 0                | 0             | 0             | 2             | 2            |
| St Anne's             | 2                | 2             | 2             | 4             | 10           |
| St Joseph's           | 0                | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0            |
|                       |                  |               |               |               |              |
|                       |                  |               |               |               | <b>27</b>    |

| <b>Gibraltar College</b> | <b>Yr 10</b>  | <b>Yr 11</b>  | <b>Yr 12</b>  | <b>Yr 13</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|                          | 0             | 0             | 0             | 1            | 1            |
|                          |               |               |               |              |              |
|                          |               |               |               |              | <b>1</b>     |
| <b>St Martin's</b>       | <b>Unit 1</b> | <b>Unit 2</b> | <b>Unit 3</b> | <b>Total</b> |              |
|                          | <b>4</b>      | <b>3</b>      | <b>0</b>      | <b>7</b>     |              |
|                          |               |               |               |              |              |
|                          |               |               |               |              |              |

| <b>Secondary Schools</b> | <b>Year 8</b> | <b>Year 9</b> | <b>Year 10</b> | <b>Year 11</b> | <b>Year 12</b> | <b>Year 13</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Bayside                  | 5             | 3             | 6              | 2              | 1              | 0              | 17           |
| Westside                 | 2             | 1             | 1              | 0              | 0              | 0              | 4            |
|                          |               |               |                |                |                |                |              |
|                          |               |               |                |                |                |                | <b>21</b>    |

Total 88

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1662 AND 1663 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to the classroom aides, they are all noted here as full time and part-time, are there not any supplies, or full time supplies or is it permanent and pensionable status? There does not seem to be any supplies, whilst the argument last time was that one cannot have full time permanent and pensionable classroom aides, because one year one might have 20 in the inclusion programme whilst the next year one might have 10 and therefore one does not need the same amount of classroom aides one year as opposed to the other.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The hon Member is confusing the term full time with permanence and continuity. Full time means the classroom aide works the full day not just half day. That is a full time job. There are supplies currently employed on a permanent basis for the reasons we have explained before and which the hon Member has repeated just now, that they are there for a particular purpose that may end at any particular moment of time, the need may not be there at a particular moment of time.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Has the Minister got with him whether they are on permanent and pensionable on supply terms? I agree with the Minister in the sense that I have not posed the question in asking how many are on supply, permanent and pensionable status, I understand that, but I am just asking now whether that information he has got available here, and if he has not is it possible to get it?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes the information there is not a distinction between permanent and pensionable and supply classroom aides was not asked for. I will by all means afford the information.

**NO. 1664 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CONSTRUCTION AND TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state why trainees at the Construction and Training Centre were sent home for two weeks at the beginning of this academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Upon return from the August Bank Holiday weekend, that is on Tuesday 31<sup>st</sup> August 2004, the Gibraltar Construction Training Centre was found to be flooded due to a burst water pipe. It was therefore found necessary to release all trainees from training within the Centre in order to carry out emergency repairs.

The repairs which had to be carried out resulted in the replacement of the broken water pipe, drying out of waterlogged floors, drying and checking electrical installations, replacement of a collapsed ceiling covering an area of approximately 40 square metres which included the trainees' toilets.

These works were carried out in a satisfactory manner by staff from JBS and the Gibraltar Electricity Authority. However, due to the Centre operating summer hours during this period, their working time was reduced to practically only half days. May I say also in appreciation of the efforts of the instructors and the management that the students, the trainees were offered on the basis of their theoretical work, on their portfolios and the academic side of their training, to be in daily touch with the instructors in order to be able to carry on monitoring and guiding them in that aspect of their work which was not the hands on with machines and all that which would have been extremely dangerous.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1664 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I was going to ask what other alternatives were found, because I understand it that the students actually went to the Centre and were sent home without any sort of alternatives to be found. I am glad that the Minister says that some alternatives were found. Not

according to the students but then again it could well be that the students misunderstood the alternative, but that is the actual information that I get from the students. They went there, it was flooded, there were lots of problems and they were just told *'look, I am sorry, I cannot deal with you just go home and then come back tomorrow and see how the situation is'*, and they did that for two weeks.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am sure that there were some students who took advantage of the situation to take a bit of a respite of their work, and may have been in the first few days because of the confusion but certainly it is unfair, very unfair, not to express appreciation of the work done by the instructors and management in insisting on offering homework so to speak to the students, and coming back to them to check that they had followed and completed tasks of a written nature.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I would also like to put on record that I do appreciate the fact that the management of the Training Centre did as the Minister said, if they did have alternatives they did well, that is without question. What I am saying is the feedback that I am getting from the students and therefore I qualified it by saying maybe the students either misunderstood that they had alternatives to do or they did not want to do it anyway. That is what I am saying. Thank you.

ORAL

**NO. 1665 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GCSE EXAMS**

Will Government state how many pupils sat GCSE exams in 2003/2004 academic year giving a breakdown by subject and by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1666 to 1670 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1666 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GCSE EXAMS**

Will Government state how many pupils passed GCSE exams in 2003/2004 academic year giving a breakdown by subject and by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1665 and 1667 to 1670 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1667 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – AS LEVEL EXAMS**

Will Government state how many pupils sat AS level exams in 2003/2004 academic year giving a breakdown by subject and by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1665, 1666 and 1668 to 1670 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1668 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – AS LEVEL EXAMS**

Will Government state how many pupils passed AS level exams in 2003/2004 academic year giving a breakdown by subject and by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1665 to 1667 and 1669 to 1670 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1669 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – A LEVEL EXAMS**

Will Government state how many pupils sat A level exams in 2003/2004 academic year giving a breakdown by subject and by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1665 to 1668 and 1670 of 2004.

**NO. 1670 OF 2004****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION – A LEVEL EXAMS**

Can Government state how many pupils passed A level exams in 2003/2004 academic year giving a breakdown by subject and by school?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The number of pupils who sat public examinations in 2003/2004 are as follows:

|                | <b>Bayside</b> | <b>Westside</b> |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <b>GCSE</b>    | 177            | 162             |
| <b>A/S</b>     | 82             | 115             |
| <b>A Level</b> | 78             | 80              |

I hand the hon Member tables giving details of numbers passing each subject for both schools.

Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

Answer to Questions 1669 and 1670

Bayside School

GCE 'A' Level Results - 2004

| Subject             | A         | B         | %<br>A-B      | C         | D         | E         | %<br>A-E      | No of<br>Passes | U        | Total No<br>of entries |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| Art & Design        | 1         | 2         | 43%           | 2         | 0         | 2         | 100.00%       | 7               | 0        | 7                      |
| Biology             | 3         | 4         | 39%           | 3         | 4         | 3         |               | 17              | 1        | 18                     |
| Business Studies    | 1         | 1         | 29%           | 0         | 2         | 2         | 85.71%        | 6               | 1        | 7                      |
| Chemistry           | 1         | 2         | 50%           | 1         | 1         | 1         | 100.00%       | 6               | 0        | 6                      |
| Computing           | 2         | 2         | 36%           | 3         | 3         | 0         | 90.91%        | 10              | 1        | 11                     |
| Economics           | 1         | 0         | 50%           | 0         | 0         | 0         | 50.00%        | 1               | 1        | 2                      |
| English Literature  | 3         | 6         | 32%           | 8         | 10        | 1         | 100.00%       | 28              | 0        | 28                     |
| French              | 2         | 3         | 56%           | 2         | 0         | 1         | 88.89%        | 8               | 1        | 9                      |
| Geography           | 0         | 0         | 0%            | 1         | 0         | 2         | 100.00%       | 3               | 0        | 3                      |
| History             | 2         | 0         | 17%           | 4         | 3         | 3         | 100.00%       | 12              | 0        | 12                     |
| Law                 | 0         | 0         | 0%            | 0         | 1         | 0         | 100.00%       | 1               | 0        | 1                      |
| Mathematics         | 7         | 5         | 80%           | 3         | 0         | 0         | 100.00%       | 15              | 0        | 15                     |
| Physics             | 3         | 6         | 53%           | 2         | 5         | 1         | 100.00%       | 17              | 0        | 17                     |
| Product Design      | 1         | 1         | 18%           | 5         | 2         | 1         | 90.91%        | 10              | 1        | 11                     |
| Religious Studies   | 1         | 1         | 100%          | 0         | 0         | 0         | 100.00%       | 2               | 0        | 2                      |
| Sociology           | 4         | 2         | 43%           | 3         | 4         | 1         | 100.00%       | 14              | 0        | 14                     |
| Spanish             | 44        | 15        | 92%           | 4         | 0         | 1         | 100.00%       | 64              | 0        | 64                     |
| Sports Studies & PE | 0         | 2         | 25%           | 4         | 1         | 1         | 100.00%       | 8               | 0        | 8                      |
| <b>Totals</b>       | <b>76</b> | <b>52</b> | <b>54.47%</b> | <b>45</b> | <b>36</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>97.45%</b> | <b>229</b>      | <b>6</b> | <b>235</b>             |

Contd

'A' Level Results

Contd Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

Contd Answer to Question 1669 and 1670

Westside School

GCE 'A' Level Results - 2004

| Subject            | A         | B         | %<br>A-B      | C         | D         | E         | %<br>A-E      | No of<br>Passes | U        | Total No<br>of entries |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| Art & Design       | 7         | 1         | 67%           | 2         | 1         | 1         | 100%          | 12              | 0        | 12                     |
| Biology            | 7         | 6         | 54%           | 6         | 0         | 3         | 92%           | 22              | 2        | 24                     |
| Business Studies   | 1         | 3         | 44%           | 1         | 3         | 0         | 89%           | 8               | 1        | 9                      |
| Chemistry          | 5         | 4         | 82%           | 2         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 11              | 0        | 11                     |
| Economics          | 4         | 0         | 100%          | 0         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 4               | 0        | 4                      |
| English Literature | 5         | 4         | 47%           | 8         | 1         | 1         | 100%          | 19              | 0        | 19                     |
| French             | 1         | 1         | 15%           | 4         | 4         | 3         | 100%          | 13              | 0        | 13                     |
| Geography          | 3         | 1         | 50%           | 2         | 2         | 0         | 100%          | 8               | 0        | 8                      |
| History            | 6         | 9         | 68%           | 5         | 2         | 0         | 100%          | 22              | 0        | 22                     |
| History of Art     | 1         | 1         | 12%           | 4         | 8         | 2         | 94%           | 16              | 1        | 17                     |
| Mathematics        | 4         | 2         | 100%          | 0         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 6               | 0        | 6                      |
| Physics            | 2         | 3         | 83%           | 0         | 1         | 0         | 100%          | 6               | 0        | 6                      |
| Psychology         | 0         | 1         | 50%           | 1         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 2               | 0        | 2                      |
| Religious Studies  | 0         | 0         | 0%            | 1         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 1               | 0        | 1                      |
| Sociology          | 0         | 1         | 50%           | 1         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 2               | 0        | 2                      |
| Spanish            | 44        | 15        | 89%           | 7         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 66              | 0        | 66                     |
| Sports Studies/PE  | 2         | 3         | 83%           | 0         | 1         | 0         | 100%          | 6               | 0        | 6                      |
| <b>Totals</b>      | <b>92</b> | <b>55</b> | <b>64.47%</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>23</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>98.25%</b> | <b>224</b>      | <b>4</b> | <b>228</b>             |

Contd

'A' Level Results

Contd Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

Contd Answer to Question 1669 and 1670

Summary of both schools

|                     |   |        |
|---------------------|---|--------|
| Total Passes        | = | 453    |
| Total No of entries | = | 463    |
| Pass Rate A - B     | = | 59.40% |
| Pass Rate A - E     | = | 97.84% |

Contd

Contd Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

Answer to Questions 1667 and 1668

Bayside School

GCE 'AS' Level Results - Summer 2004

| Subject                | A         | B         | %<br>A - B | C         | D         | E         | %<br>A-E Pass | No of<br>Passes | U         | Total No<br>of entries |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------|
| Applied Mathematics    | 8         | 2         | 63%        | 2         | 1         | 1         | 88%           | 14              | 2         | 16                     |
| Art & Design           | 0         | 1         | 20%        | 1         | 2         | 0         | 80%           | 4               | 1         | 5                      |
| Biology                | 2         | 2         | 31%        | 2         | 1         | 0         | 54%           | 7               | 6         | 13                     |
| Business Studies       | 0         | 1         | 33%        | 0         | 1         | 1         | 100%          | 3               | 0         | 3                      |
| Chemistry              | 1         | 4         | 38%        | 3         | 1         | 1         | 77%           | 10              | 3         | 13                     |
| Computing              | 1         | 4         | 24%        | 2         | 3         | 3         | 62%           | 13              | 8         | 21                     |
| English Literature     | 7         | 6         | 54%        | 9         | 2         | 0         | 100%          | 25              | 0         | 24                     |
| French                 | 2         | 5         | 30%        | 2         | 6         | 3         | 78%           | 18              | 5         | 23                     |
| History                | 2         | 1         | 27%        | 3         | 2         | 2         | 91%           | 10              | 1         | 11                     |
| Music                  | 0         | 0         | 0%         | 1         | 3         | 1         | 100%          | 5               | 0         | 5                      |
| Phys Ed/Sports Studies | 0         | 1         | 17%        | 2         | 2         | 1         | 100%          | 6               | 0         | 6                      |
| Physics                | 4         | 1         | 25%        | 6         | 2         | 0         | 65%           | 13              | 7         | 20                     |
| Psychology             | 0         | 1         | 20%        | 2         | 1         | 0         | 80%           | 4               | 1         | 5                      |
| Product Design         | 0         | 2         | 13%        | 1         | 3         | 4         | 67%           | 10              | 5         | 15                     |
| Sociology              | 4         | 3         | 44%        | 4         | 1         | 3         | 94%           | 15              | 1         | 16                     |
| Spanish                | 34        | 19        | 90%        | 6         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 60              | 0         | 59                     |
| <b>Totals</b>          | <b>65</b> | <b>53</b> | <b>46%</b> | <b>46</b> | <b>31</b> | <b>20</b> | <b>84%</b>    | <b>220</b>      | <b>40</b> | <b>255</b>             |

Contd

'A' Level Results



Contd Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

Contd Answer to Questions 1667 and 1668

Westside School

GCE 'AS' Level Results - Summer 2004

| Subject             | A         | B         | %<br>A - B | C         | D         | E         | %<br>A-E Pass | No of<br>Passes | U         | Total No<br>of entries |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|------------------------|
| Applied Mathematics | 4         | 2         | 60%        | 1         | 3         | 0         | 100%          | 10              | 0         | 10                     |
| Art & Design        | 3         | 1         | 36%        | 0         | 2         | 5         | 100%          | 11              | 0         | 11                     |
| Biology             | 1         | 5         | 19%        | 7         | 7         | 9         | 94%           | 29              | 2         | 31                     |
| Business Studies    | 0         | 1         | 4%         | 5         | 9         | 6         | 88%           | 21              | 3         | 24                     |
| Chemistry           | 1         | 4         | 28%        | 3         | 6         | 1         | 83%           | 15              | 3         | 18                     |
| Economics           | 0         | 1         | 25%        | 1         | 1         | 1         | 100%          | 4               | 0         | 4                      |
| English Literature  | 6         | 4         | 31%        | 5         | 15        | 2         | 100%          | 32              | 0         | 32                     |
| French              | 1         | 3         | 44%        | 4         | 1         | 0         | 100%          | 9               | 0         | 9                      |
| Geography           | 0         | 2         | 25%        | 1         | 1         | 2         | 75%           | 2               | 2         | 8                      |
| History             | 4         | 8         | 46%        | 9         | 3         | 2         | 100%          | 26              | 0         | 26                     |
| History of Art      | 1         | 0         | 20%        | 0         | 3         | 1         | 100%          | 5               | 0         | 5                      |
| Music               | 0         | 1         | 25%        | 0         | 3         | 0         | 100%          | 4               | 0         | 4                      |
| Sport & PE          | 2         | 1         | 27%        | 2         | 2         | 3         | 91%           | 10              | 1         | 11                     |
| Physics             | 2         | 1         | 60%        | 1         | 1         | 0         | 100%          | 5               | 0         | 5                      |
| Psychology          | 2         | 1         | 50%        | 3         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 6               | 0         | 6                      |
| Religious Studies   | 2         | 1         | 100%       | 0         | 0         | 0         | 100%          | 3               | 0         | 3                      |
| Sociology           | 1         | 0         | 25%        | 0         | 1         | 1         | 75%           | 3               | 1         | 4                      |
| Spanish             | 62        | 13        | 93%        | 5         | 1         | 0         | 100%          | 81              | 0         | 81                     |
| <b>Totals</b>       | <b>92</b> | <b>49</b> | <b>48%</b> | <b>47</b> | <b>59</b> | <b>33</b> | <b>96%</b>    | <b>280</b>      | <b>12</b> | <b>292</b>             |

Contd

'A' Level Results

Contd Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

Contd Answer to Question 1667 and 1668

Summary of both schools

|                     |   |          |
|---------------------|---|----------|
| Total Passes        | = | 499.6683 |
| Total No of entries | = | 547      |
| Pass Rate           | = | 91%      |

'A' Level Results

Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

**Bayside School**  
**GCSE Results - 2004**

Answer to Questions 1665 and 1666

| Subject                           | A*         | % A*       | A          | B          | C          | % A*-C     | D          | E          | F         | G         | % A*-G Pass | U         | No of Entries |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|---------------|
| Art & Design                      | 1          | 4%         | 3          | 6          | 7          | 63%        | 6          | 2          | 2         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 27            |
| Business and Commercial Syst      | 0          | 0%         | 1          | 2          | 4          | 25%        | 11         | 6          | 1         | 1         | 93%         | 2         | 28            |
| Business Studies                  | 1          | 5%         | 2          | 6          | 9          | 90%        | 1          | 1          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 20            |
| Design & Tech:Product Design      | 0          | 0%         | 1          | 16         | 20         | 55%        | 24         | 5          | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 67            |
| English                           | 1          | 1%         | 15         | 32         | 77         | 74%        | 37         | 6          | 0         | 1         | 100%        | 0         | 169           |
| English Literature                | 4          | 10%        | 9          | 17         | 10         | 95%        | 2          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 42            |
| French                            | 17         | 38%        | 15         | 10         | 3          | 100%       | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 45            |
| Geography                         | 0          | 0%         | 5          | 2          | 5          | 86%        | 1          | 1          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 14            |
| History                           | 5          | 15%        | 4          | 4          | 4          | 50%        | 7          | 6          | 3         | 1         | 100%        | 0         | 34            |
| Home Economics (Food & Nutrition) | 0          | 0%         | 0          | 0          | 8          | 80%        | 1          | 1          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 10            |
| ICT                               | 6          | 8%         | 15         | 11         | 15         | 66%        | 13         | 6          | 2         | 2         | 99%         | 1         | 71            |
| ICT - Short course                | 0          | 0%         | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0%         | 1          | 1          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 2             |
| Italian                           | 2          | 25%        | 3          | 1          | 2          | 100%       | 0          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 8             |
| Mathematics                       | 12         | 7%         | 16         | 36         | 60         | 72%        | 30         | 14         | 1         | 2         | 99%         | 1         | 172           |
| Music                             | 0          | 0%         | 0          | 2          | 4          | 50%        | 6          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 12            |
| Physical Education - short course | 0          | 0%         | 0          | 0          | 0          | 0%         | 5          | 3          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 8             |
| Physical Education                | 0          | 0%         | 2          | 4          | 3          | 39%        | 11         | 2          | 0         | 1         | 100%        | 0         | 23            |
| Religious Studies                 | 3          | 2%         | 10         | 6          | 20         | 24%        | 39         | 33         | 21        | 22        | 96%         | 6         | 160           |
| Science: Biology                  | 2          | 10%        | 7          | 4          | 4          | 85%        | 2          | 1          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 20            |
| Science: Chemistry                | 1          | 5%         | 8          | 3          | 6          | 90%        | 1          | 1          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 20            |
| Science: Physics                  | 1          | 5%         | 6          | 7          | 3          | 85%        | 3          | 0          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 20            |
| Science: Double Award             | 4          | 3%         | 8          | 20         | 72         | 87%        | 12         | 4          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 120           |
| Science: Single Award             | 1          | 1%         | 0          | 1          | 31         | 38%        | 23         | 16         | 12        | 1         | 99%         | 1         | 86            |
| Sociology                         | 1          | 14%        | 1          | 0          | 3          | 71%        | 1          | 1          | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 7             |
| Spanish                           | 101        | 58%        | 43         | 15         | 12         | 98%        | 3          | 0          | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0         | 175           |
| <b>Totals</b>                     | <b>163</b> | <b>12%</b> | <b>174</b> | <b>205</b> | <b>382</b> | <b>68%</b> | <b>240</b> | <b>110</b> | <b>44</b> | <b>31</b> | <b>99%</b>  | <b>11</b> | <b>1360</b>   |

Contd

Contd Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

Contd Answer to Questions 1665 and 1666

**Westside School**

**GCSE Results - 2004**

| Subject                   | A*         | % A*       | A          | B          | C          | % A*-C     | D          | E         | F         | G         | % A*-G Pass | U        | No of Entries |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|----------|---------------|
| Arabic                    | 1          | 33%        | 1          | 0          | 1          | 100%       | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 3             |
| Art & Design              | 5          | 12%        | 3          | 13         | 10         | 74%        | 8          | 2         | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 42            |
| Business Studies          | 1          | 3%         | 6          | 4          | 8          | 54%        | 6          | 7         | 3         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 35            |
| Drama                     | 0          | 0%         | 7          | 10         | 3          | 87%        | 2          | 1         | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 23            |
| Economics                 | 0          | 0%         | 6          | 2          | 4          | 80%        | 1          | 1         | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 15            |
| English                   | 1          | 1%         | 5          | 32         | 65         | 67%        | 34         | 15        | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 153           |
| English Literature        | 30         | 37%        | 36         | 13         | 2          | 100%       | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 81            |
| French                    | 5          | 14%        | 10         | 14         | 4          | 94%        | 1          | 1         | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 35            |
| Geography                 | 2          | 7%         | 6          | 5          | 8          | 72%        | 2          | 4         | 1         | 1         | 100%        | 0        | 29            |
| History                   | 1          | 2%         | 14         | 10         | 11         | 71%        | 7          | 2         | 4         | 1         | 98%         | 1        | 51            |
| Home Economics (CD)       | 1          | 3%         | 2          | 3          | 23         | 73%        | 4          | 6         | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 40            |
| Home Economics(F&N)       | 0          | 0%         | 1          | 0          | 10         | 69%        | 3          | 1         | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 16            |
| Mathematics               | 24         | 15%        | 11         | 39         | 35         | 69%        | 20         | 22        | 5         | 2         | 99%         | 1        | 159           |
| Music                     | 2          | 22%        | 0          | 5          | 1          | 89%        | 0          | 1         | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 9             |
| Physical Education        | 6          | 17%        | 12         | 8          | 3          | 81%        | 6          | 0         | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 36            |
| Religious Studies         | 3          | 4%         | 14         | 15         | 24         | 73%        | 15         | 5         | 1         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 77            |
| Religious Studies (Islam) | 0          | 0%         | 1          | 0          | 0          | 100%       | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 1             |
| Russian                   | 1          | 100%       | 0          | 0          | 0          | 100%       | 0          | 0         | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 1             |
| Science:Double Award      | 42         | 30%        | 22         | 26         | 38         | 90%        | 8          | 6         | 0         | 0         | 100%        | 0        | 142           |
| Science:Single Award      | 0          | 0%         | 5          | 4          | 27         | 40%        | 25         | 17        | 6         | 5         | 100%        | 0        | 89            |
| Spanish                   | 102        | 64%        | 29         | 14         | 6          | 94%        | 6          | 1         | 1         | 1         | 100%        | 0        | 160           |
| <b>Totals</b>             | <b>227</b> | <b>19%</b> | <b>191</b> | <b>217</b> | <b>283</b> | <b>77%</b> | <b>148</b> | <b>92</b> | <b>27</b> | <b>10</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>1197</b>   |

Contd

Contd Answer to Question 1670 of 2004

Contd Answer to Question 1665 and 1666

**Summary for both schools**

|                          |   |      |
|--------------------------|---|------|
| No of entries            | = | 2557 |
| No of passes (A*-C)      | = | 1842 |
| Percentage pass (A* - C) | = | 72%  |

GCSE Results

**NO. 1671 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CONSTRUCTION AND TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state how many students attended or are currently attending the Construction and Training Centre after leaving school at the age of 15 in the academic years of 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The number of students aged 15 who joined the Vocational Training Scheme, in 2000/2001 – 13; in 2001/2002 – 14; in 2002/2003 - 8; in 2003/2004 – 10; in 2004/2005 – 1.

Nine students attended the College at the age of 15 in the year 2000. Four did so in 2001, seven in 2002, 24 in 2003 and seven this current year, 2004.

**NO. 1672 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BLEAK HOUSE TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government state how many students attended Bleak House Training Centre after leaving school at the age of 15 in the academic years of 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Bleak House Training Centre does not organise courses as such of any nature. Bleak House Institute is a facilitator of courses to a whole variety of entities, offering facilities and equipment and is used by training providers, not by the Bleak House Training Centre. For example, the Royal Bank of Scotland and the Gibraltar Society of Chartered and Certified Accountants, their training unit is housed in Bleak House and the training unit does provide basic courses in literacy and numeracy and ICT to the vocational trainees, those BTS trainees who are placed in employment but nevertheless do come for courses in literacy and numeracy and ICT at the Bleak House Training Centre. It is just a question of not understanding that fifteen year olds go to Bleak House as such for a particular full-time course, it is only there for certain courses and that is it. In that sense Bleak House is more of a training institute than a training centre.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1672 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

So what the Minister is saying is that there is not any records of the training unit which he has just mentioned, whether the pupils of that training unit are pupils that have just left school at the age of fifteen. There is no record of that?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

What does the hon Member want to know, the number of vocational trainees?

**HON S E LINARES:**

That is what I have asked in the Question.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, what the hon Member asked in the question was how many leaving fifteen go to Bleak House.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes and one of the things that they do in Bleak House is a training unit.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No the training unit actually helps them in the placements that they have with different employers, practical experience with training employers. The training unit actually also sponsors courses in literacy, numeracy and ICT to cushion and to support and give a bit of academic background to these trainees. If the hon Member wants to know how many of these students, I would say there are the number of trainees who are in the BTS scheme but I do not have the figure with me here and now.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is it possible to have that figure?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes of course it is possible. We know exactly how many are in placement.



**NO. 1673 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GCFE**

Can Government state how many students attended the GCFE after leaving school at the age of 15 in the academic years of 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Nine students attended the College at the age of fifteen in the year 2000, four did so in 2001, seven in 2002, twenty-four in 2003 and seven this current year 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1674 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GCFE**

Can Government state how many students are currently attending the GCFE giving a breakdown by subject, accreditation to be obtained at the end of course and year they are currently at?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1674 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1671**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule that I now hand to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 1672**

The number of students aged 15 who joined the Vocational Training Scheme are:

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| 2000/2001 | 13 |
| 2001/2002 | 14 |
| 2002/2003 | 8  |
| 2003/2004 | 10 |
| 2004/2005 | 1  |

**Answer to Question 1673**

9 students attended the College at the age of 15 in the year 2000; 4 did so in 2001; 7 in 2002; 24 in 2003 and 7 this current year 2004.

**Answer to Question 1674**

The College does not operate as a school, that is, whole cohorts of students do not necessarily progress through a particular course over an academic year. It is quite possible for a student to be in Year 3 of a particular course but yet only have joined the College that year. I am assuming that by accreditation you mean qualification – but just in case – I am providing the hon Member opposite with the Awarding Bodies as well.

Cont'd.....

### Cont'd Answer to Question 1674

| COURSE NAME                                            | No of students | Remarks                                                                 | Level | Awarding Body |
|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------------|
| AAT Foundation                                         | 8              | Association of Accounting Technician – stage 1 done by level 3 students | 1     | AAT           |
| Art & Design As                                        | 8              | A' Level – level 3 programme.                                           | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE Business Double Year 1                            | 13             | A'level – level 3 programme. TWO 'A' level equivalent                   | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE Business Double Year 2                            | 6              | A'level – level 3 programme. TWO 'A' level equivalent                   | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE Business Single Year 1                            | 22             | A' Level – level 3 programme.                                           | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE Business Single Year 2                            | 3              | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE CBE Double Year 1                                 | 18             | A' Level – level 3 programme. TWO 'A'level equivalent                   | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE CBE Double Year 2                                 | 4              | A' Level – level 3 programme. TWO 'A'level equivalent                   | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE CBE Single Year 1                                 | 2              | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE CBE Single Year 2                                 | 2              | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE ICT Double Year 1                                 | 33             | A' Level – level 3 programme. TWO 'A'level equivalent                   | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE ICT Double Year 2                                 | 17             | A' Level – level 3 programme. TWO 'A'level equivalent                   | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE ICT Single in 1 Year                              | 2              | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE ICT Single Year 1                                 | 55             | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| AVCE ICT Single Year 2                                 | 24             | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| Business As                                            | 10             | A' Level – level 3 programme. Bayside link                              | 3     | AQA           |
| CLAIT New                                              | 53             | Level 1 programme but level 2 students do this too.                     | 1     | OCR           |
| Double Vocational GCSE in Art & Design                 | 2              | GCE TWO GCE equivalent                                                  | 2     | Edexcel       |
| GCE "O" Level English                                  | 82             | GCE                                                                     | 2     | Edx / Camb    |
| GCSE Maths                                             | 103            | GCE                                                                     | 2     | AQA           |
| GCSE Spanish                                           | 15             | GCE                                                                     | 2     | AQA           |
| Home Design                                            | 30             | College devised module                                                  | 1     | College       |
| Initial Award in Office Practice                       | 30             |                                                                         | 1     | OCR           |
| Intermediate GNVQ Business                             | 27             |                                                                         | 2     | Edexcel       |
| Intermediate GNVQ Construction & the Built Environment | 17             |                                                                         | 2     | Edexcel       |
| Intermediate GNVQ ICT                                  | 48             |                                                                         | 2     | Edexcel       |
| Introduction to Art & Design                           | 30             | College devised module                                                  | 1     | College       |
| Numeracy & Literacy                                    | 31             |                                                                         | 1     | OCR           |
| Practical Word Processing                              | 30             |                                                                         | 1     | OCR           |
| Psychology A2                                          | 10             | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| Psychology As                                          | 73             | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| Sociology A2                                           | 5              | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| Sociology As                                           | 12             | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| Spanish A2                                             | 38             | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| Spanish As                                             | 59             | A' Level – level 3 programme                                            | 3     | Edexcel       |
| TEFL (SET)                                             | 2              | English for Beginners as a foreign Language                             | -     | Edexcel       |

**Please note:**

As with UK colleges, students freely choose the courses they feel will enhance their career prospects.

After our Diagnostic tests and interview they are placed into programmes that they are likely to succeed in and are happy to proceed with.

Students will generally register for more than one programme; this means that the figures on this page cannot be added up.

ORAL

**NO. 1675 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NUMBER OF PUPILS SUSPENDED**

Can Government state how many pupils were suspended from school in the last academic year due to challenging behaviour giving a breakdown by school and year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1676 to 1679 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1676 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT**

Will Government state how many pupils were taught by peripatetic teachers, from the Pupil Referral Unit since it was instituted to date giving a breakdown by school and year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1675 and 1677 to 1679 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1677 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT**

Will Government state how many pupils were referred to the Educational Psychologist in the academic years of 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1675, 1676 and 1678 to 1679 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1678 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT**

Will Government state how many pupils were referred to the Educational Psychologist for challenging behaviour in the academic years of 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1675 to 1677 and 1679 of 2004.



**NO. 1679 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT**

Can Government state how many pupils are statemented and at what level giving a breakdown by year and school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question No. 1675**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1676**

As explained repeatedly in answer to Question No. 228 of 2004, and even No. 574 of 2002 the model that has been adopted for this purpose in Gibraltar is referred to as the Behaviour Education Support Team (BEST). The team consists of three experienced teachers and a classroom aide. Between them they provide peripatetic support in all the Government schools. Children are supported in sessional basis either in small groups, one to one or in class support working with a group within the class, and it is difficult to give exact figures as requested by the hon Member concerning the number of pupils who attended, for a number of reasons. The allocation of support to schools is reviewed on an on-going basis, on a termly basis and can change. Therefore the numbers can fluctuate from one term to another and children can also receive support for different lengths of time, but total numbers for schools have not changed dramatically over the years but what has changed is the length of time of support that they are now receiving since the team, BEST team as we call it, Behaviour Educational Support Team, has increased for individuals and groups of children as the level of peripatetic support has also increased.

The principal Educational Psychologist does not run a referral system as such. He has an agreed protocol with schools which he visits two or six times per term, depending on pupil numbers on roll and also on the pupils registered as having special educational needs. Requests for advice on new pupils come in at a rate of about 150 per year but not all of them will warrant full assessment. Thus a medium sized school for instance

will raise an average of 10 new pupils in the year and these will join another 30 pupils who are on record or being reviewed.

In answer to the Question about the challenging behaviour. The hon Member should know that the term challenging behaviour is used only for the most extreme forms of conduct disorder and characterises really only about 2 per cent of the population. If there are 15 to 16 new cases of behaviour difficulties raised in one year, maybe there is only one which may warrant the classification of challenging behaviour. The great majority of cases are classified into other categories. (1) Behaviour and conduct difficulties; (2) learning difficulties; (3) social emotional problems. Apart from sensory and other disabilities which overlap with all three categories, 30 to 40 per cent of cases undertaken will have as a core issue the behaviour difficulties of the child.

In Gibraltar we do not adhere to the UK statutory Statementing of Special Educational Needs as these are, we find, laboriously bureaucratic, costly in administrative resources and above all unnecessarily prescriptive and over-formal. However, we do acknowledge formally when a child's needs are over and above what the school can normally provide from within its resources. There is a panel of assessors of each child that shows signs of difficulties that I have defined above. The breakdown required is provided in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1679 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1675**

| <b>Bayside</b>                         | <b>Westside</b>   | <b>Bishop Fitzgerald</b> | <b>St Anne's</b> | <b>Sacred Heart</b> |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 12                                     | 5                 | 2                        | 4                | 4                   |
| 6xYr 8<br>2xYr 9<br>1xYr 10<br>3xYr 11 | 3xYr 9<br>2xYr 10 | 2xYr 4                   | 4xYr 7           | 2xYr 6<br>2xYr 7    |

**Total = 27**

**Answer to Question 1679**

|                               | <b>2000/1</b> | <b>2001/2</b> | <b>2002/3</b> | <b>2003/4</b> |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>New cases</b>              | 140           | 160           | 155           | 158           |
|                               |               |               |               |               |
| <b>New Behaviour problems</b> | 48            | 56            | 50            | 55            |
|                               |               |               |               |               |
| <b>"Statements"</b>           | 69            | 70            | 72            | 75            |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1675 TO 1679 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to Question No. 1676 the Minister has said that there is an increase in peripatetic teachers. The last time I asked there were three. It has increased to what?

**DR B A LINARES:**

In May 1996 when this initiative was started there was only one teacher supporting all schools. She supported 60 to 70 pupils four days a week. In 2001 there was a second teacher who was engaged four days a week, primarily for the First School pupils and in 2002 a third teacher was engaged for three days a week. Last year, 2003, we added the support of a classroom aide.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So we have four now.

**DR B A LINARES:**

Four persons, three teachers, highly qualified teachers and one classroom aide who has shown experience in the field of special educational needs.

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to the statementing, it is surprising that the information cannot be given now and it is surprising in a way that the Minister says that we do not follow what is the code of practice as in the special needs, because I have asked this question before and I have had an answer. I have had a schedule actually stating the level exactly at which pupils are, even giving me a breakdown by school and by year. I have asked that question previously and I have had the whole schedule. It seems as if probably it has ceased now but I would urge the Minister to see in previous questions that he has answered this question and why he should not do so now.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not doubt the word of the hon Member but I have before me here all his past questions on the question of special educational needs and I do not find here any tables as described by him in detail of that type of situation, but certainly I do not doubt his word and I will look back to see if that type of specific and very detailed information, particularly also sensitive because we are dealing with individual children who could be easily identified in a small community like ours.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes, but last time the Minister gave me the list, it did not have any names, it did not have any specifics. One can say that in Westside there is one child at level 1, I am not going to go now and investigate who is the child who is at level 1. What I am saying is that this has been answered before, but I will also investigate and look in Hansard and show the Minister that it has been given before. I will do that.

**NO. 1680 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NUMBER OF PUPILS**

Can Government state how many children are currently in years R, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 giving a breakdown by school, how many are entitled pupils and what are the sums payable by those not entitled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

All these are entitled to free education. There are 17 attending secondary schools and 12 attending first and middle schools who are not entitled to free education. The current fees are £864.23p per term for secondary schools and £648.17p per term for first and middle schools.

**Answer to Question 1680**

| School            | Reception  | Year 1     | Year 2     | Year 3     | Total       |
|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| St Mary's         | 32         | 34         | 43         | 46         | 155         |
| Notre Dame        | 49         | 58         | 58         | 72         | 237         |
| St Paul's         | 75         | 58         | 69         | 68         | 270         |
| Governor's Meadow | 63         | 87         | 88         | 75         | 313         |
| St Joseph's First | 85         | 65         | 73         | 93         | 316         |
| St Bernard's      | 30         | 30         | 37         | 26         | 123         |
| Hebrew            | 7          | 14         | 16         | 5          | 42          |
| <b>Totals</b>     | <b>341</b> | <b>346</b> | <b>384</b> | <b>385</b> | <b>1456</b> |

| School             | Year 4     | Year 5     | Year 6     | Year 7     | Total       |
|--------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| St Joseph's Middle | 83         | 91         | 84         | 91         | 349         |
| Bishop Fitzgerald  | 123        | 102        | 141        | 117        | 483         |
| St Anne's          | 110        | 108        | 97         | 106        | 421         |
| Sacred Heart       | 54         | 60         | 67         | 75         | 256         |
| Hebrew             | 7          | 13         | 5          | 6          | 31          |
| <b>Totals</b>      | <b>377</b> | <b>374</b> | <b>394</b> | <b>395</b> | <b>1540</b> |

| School        | Year 8    | Year 9     | Year 10    | Year 11    | Year 12    | Year 13    | Total       |
|---------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Bayside       | 250       | 204        | 218        | 198        | 86         | 81         | 1037        |
| Westside      | 235       | 197        | 191        | 180        | 118        | 85         | 1006        |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>48</b> | <b>401</b> | <b>409</b> | <b>378</b> | <b>204</b> | <b>166</b> | <b>2043</b> |

First = 1456  
 Middle = 1540  
 Secondary = 2043  
 Total = **5039**

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1680 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Out of the 17 that are in the secondary, would the Minister say that most of them are MOD personnel or do the MOD personnel pay for their students?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Almost certainly. Most of them will be MOD children and they certainly pay the same rates as other non-entitled children.



**NO. 1681 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NURSERIES**

Can Government state how many children attend full-time Nursery Education this academic year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The total number of children attending Government nurseries this year is 248. Children attend either morning or afternoon sessions at the nurseries. There were 323 places available for nursery education this academic year 2004/2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1681 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Out of the 248 are those split between those who go in mornings or afternoons, or is the Minister saying that there are 248 that attend morning.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Either morning or afternoon.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So basically the figure of 248 is split between some that do mornings and some that do afternoons. Correct? The figure of 323 that I have been given is the places that they have which would mean the morning and the afternoon sessions, correct?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The hon Member speaks of full-time nursery education but as he knows traditionally full-time nursery education has been a morning or an afternoon which is reasonable because small children at that age cannot sustain really whole days.

**HON S E LINARES:**

That is a matter of argument and opinion because most children of parents who are working all day attend nursery all day. They attend the Government nursery in the morning and then they are transported to another nursery, private usually, in the afternoon. So there is an element of opinion here.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is up to the parents. We should not be a party to practices which are not seen to be educationally viable.

ORAL

**NO. 1682 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PARENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

Can Government confirm whether the parental contribution system has now been abolished?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 1683 of 2004.

**NO. 1683 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – PARENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

Can Government confirm whether the abolition of the parental contribution will apply to all students currently studying abroad?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Government can confirm that parental contribution has been abolished as from this academic year and that it applies to all students in receipt of a Government scholarship, either mandatory or discretionary.

ORAL

**NO. 1684 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST MARTIN’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state whether the playground at St Martin’s School is now complete?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1685 and 1686 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1685 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state whether the hall at St Paul’s is complete?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1684 and 1686 of 2004.

**NO. 1686 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state whether the temporary classrooms at Bishop Fitzgerald School are still in place and when they envisage the construction of permanent facilities in the said school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question No. 1684**

The playground at St Martin's School is not yet complete but the Department have been reliably informed that it will be by the end of this month.

**Answer to Question No. 1685**

The new Hall, together with five classrooms and the new nursery unit, are now complete in St Paul's School and have been in use since the start of this term.

**Answer to Question No. 1686**

The temporary classrooms at Bishop Fitzgerald School are still in place in the playground and the children continue to use the tennis courts adjacent to the school as one of their playgrounds. The Government do not envisage constructing extra teaching areas for the reason given in Question No. 1651 that we hope in the near future to alleviate the problem of overcrowding in Bishop Fitzgerald School. At present the two temporary facilities are used as a classroom and as a Library.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1684 TO 1686 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to Bishop Fitzgerald School where the Minister has said that they are using the tennis courts. Is it envisaged that these tennis courts will become permanently part of Bishop Fitzgerald School in the near future or will the school, once a new school is built somewhere else, and the temporary container or whatever classrooms are removed that Bishop Fitzgerald will revert back to its original surface area or area or that the tennis courts will be added to it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The decision is not yet made and really depends on the extent to which the new school, how much additional capacity the new school, the new first and middle school which is planned for nearby, which is not intended to replace but to be an additional school, how much capacity that provides. In other words, Bishop Fitzgerald and Governors Meadow relieved of some of the pressure that they are presently under by some of the additional capacity of the new school may or may not need all the add-on facilities that they have had or it may be re-developed in some other way by allowing more playground space. It is one of the factors that will be decided when the design and capacity of the new school have been fixed and that in turn is considered next to the demographic projections for the next decade or so along those schools in Gibraltar. So both are possible. Either that Bishop Fitzgerald, how those two schools will then have the assets shared between them and whether it will be the same as now or a different permutation to now is one of the issues that remain to be decided.



ORAL

**NO. 1687 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL LUNCHES**

Have Government conducted any enquiries in relation to the possibility of producing meals for children at school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 1696 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1688 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISCRETIONARY GRANTS**

Can Government state how many discretionary grants have been given this academic year, that is, for September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1689 to 1695 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1689 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MANDATORY GRANTS**

Can Government state for what subjects the mandatory grants were awarded and the institutions that students will be attending or are currently attending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1688 and 1690 to 1695 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1690 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISCRETIONARY GRANTS**

Can Government say for what subjects the discretionary grants were awarded and the institutions that students will be attending or are currently attending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1688, 1689 and 1691 to 1695 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1691 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISTANCE LEARNING GRANTS**

Can Government state how much was spent in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 respectively in distance learning grants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1688 to 1690 and 1692 to 1695 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1692 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISTANCE LEARNING GRANTS**

Can Government state how many people who applied in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 respectively actually obtained a distance learning grant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1688 to 1691 and 1693 to 1695 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1693 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MANDATORY GRANTS**

Can Government state how many mandatory grants have been given this academic year, that is, for September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1688 to 1692 and 1694 to 1695 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1694 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISCRETIONARY GRANTS**

Can Government state how many of those who applied for discretionary grants were for second degrees, master degrees, doctorate or PGCE?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1688 to 1693 and 1695 of 2004.



**NO. 1695 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – DISTANCE LEARNING GRANTS**

Can Government state how many people applied for distance learning grants in the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question No. 1688**

A total of 15 discretionary grants have been granted this year, tenable from September 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 1689**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1690**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1691**

The monies spent on new distance learning subsidies awarded in the period in question, breakdown as follows:

|                         |            |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Academic year 2000/2001 | £39,178.99 |
| Academic year 2001/2002 | £28,931.50 |
| Academic year 2002/2003 | £58,784.20 |
| Academic year 2003/2004 | £19,771.45 |
| Academic year 2004/2005 | £17,830.00 |

**Answer to Question No. 1692**

The figures for the number of distance learning subsidies awarded in the period in question break down as follows:

|                         |                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Academic year 2000/2001 | 32 subsidies awarded |
| Academic year 2001/2002 | 30 subsidies awarded |
| Academic year 2002/2003 | 48 subsidies awarded |
| Academic year 2003/2004 | 20 subsidies awarded |
| Academic year 2004/2005 | 14 subsidies awarded |

**Answer to Question No. 1693**

A total of 175 mandatory scholarships have been awarded tenable from September 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 1694**

The breakdown of applications in the categories requested by the hon Member is as follows:

|                 |    |
|-----------------|----|
| Second degrees  | 3  |
| Masters degrees | 19 |
| Doctorates      | 3  |
| PGCEs           | 17 |

**Answer to Question No. 1695**

The number of applicants for distance learning subsidies was as follows:

|      |    |
|------|----|
| 2000 | 40 |
| 2001 | 43 |
| 2002 | 53 |
| 2003 | 32 |
| 2004 | 34 |

## Answer to Question 1695 of 2004

## Answer to Question 1689

|    | <b>Subjects being studied 2004</b>                                                         | <b>Institutions</b>                              |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
|    | <i>Brackets indicate number of students following a course or attending an institution</i> |                                                  |
| 1  | Accountancy & Finance (6)                                                                  | Anglia Polytechnic University                    |
| 2  | Accounting & Finance with Spanish (2)                                                      | Aston University                                 |
| 3  | Accounting & Financial Management                                                          | Bournemouth University                           |
| 4  | Advertising & Film Studies                                                                 | Bradford College (2)                             |
| 5  | American Studies & Spanish                                                                 | Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College (4) |
| 6  | Architectural Design & Technology                                                          | Cambridge University (3)                         |
| 7  | Architecture (4)                                                                           | Canterbury Christchurch University               |
| 8  | Art & Design (8)                                                                           | Coventry University                              |
| 9  | Art (Practice & History)                                                                   | Darlington College of Arts                       |
| 10 | Biology                                                                                    | Grantham College                                 |
| 11 | Business                                                                                   | Heriot Watt University                           |
| 12 | Business & Marketing Management                                                            | Kent Institute of Art & Design (6)               |
| 13 | Business Management (3)                                                                    | Kingston University (7)                          |
| 14 | Business Marketing                                                                         | Lancaster University                             |
| 15 | Business Studies (3)                                                                       | Leeds Metropolitan University (6)                |
| 16 | Childhood Studies                                                                          | Lincoln University                               |
| 17 | Cities, Environmental Design & Development                                                 | London Metropolitan University                   |
| 18 | Computer Animation & Special Effects                                                       | London School of Contemporary Music              |
| 19 | Computer Networks and web Design                                                           | London School of Economics                       |
| 20 | Computer Science                                                                           | London School of Economics & Political Science   |
| 21 | Computing                                                                                  | London School of Theology                        |
| 22 | Construction (2)                                                                           | London South Bank University                     |
| 23 | Counselling & Theology                                                                     | Loughborough College                             |
| 24 | Criminology with Criminal Justice                                                          | Loughborough University                          |
| 25 | Criminology/Sociology                                                                      | Manchester Metropolitan University               |
| 26 | Dentistry                                                                                  | Middlesex University (2)                         |
| 27 | Design Animation                                                                           | Newcastle University (2)                         |
| 28 | Design Crafts                                                                              | Northumbria University                           |
| 29 | Drama & Professional & Creative Writing                                                    | Nottingham Trent University (9)                  |
| 30 | Early Childhood Studies                                                                    | Oxford Brookes University (7)                    |
| 31 | Earth Sciences                                                                             | Oxford University                                |
| 32 | E-Commerce                                                                                 | Queen Mary University London                     |
| 33 | Economics & Finance                                                                        | Roehampton University of Surrey                  |
| 34 | Economics (3)                                                                              | Sheffield Hallam (2)                             |
| 35 | Economics, Econometrics & Finance                                                          | Southampton Institute (8)                        |
| 36 | Education Studies & Spanish                                                                | Southampton University                           |
| 37 | Electronic & Communication Engineering                                                     | St Mary's College (9)                            |
| 38 | Electronic Engineering                                                                     | Teeside University                               |
| 39 | Engineering                                                                                | Thames Valley University                         |
| 40 | English & History of Art                                                                   | Trinity College Carmathen                        |
| 41 | English & PE Teaching                                                                      | University College Chichester                    |
| 42 | English & Spanish Law                                                                      | University College London                        |
| 43 | English Education & Employment                                                             | University College Northampton                   |
| 44 | English Literature & Multimedia Journalism                                                 | University of Bath                               |
| 45 | English Literature & Politics                                                              | University of Birmingham (2)                     |
| 46 | English Studies/Film & Media Studies                                                       | University of Brighton (6)                       |
| 47 | Environmental Health                                                                       | University of Bristol (2)                        |
| 48 | European Law                                                                               | University of Buckingham                         |
|    |                                                                                            | Cont'd                                           |

Cont'd Answer to Question 1695 of 2004

Cont'd Answer to Question 1689

|    |                                                 |                                           |
|----|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 49 | Finance, Accounting & Management                | University of Cardiff (6)                 |
| 50 | Fine Art & Teaching + PGCE                      | University of Central Lancashire          |
| 51 | Fine Art (2)                                    | University of Derby (3)                   |
| 52 | Forensic Psychology                             | University of Durham (2)                  |
| 53 | French & Italian + PGCE                         | University of Exeter (2)                  |
| 54 | French & Russian                                | University of Hertfordshire               |
| 55 | Geography & Planning                            | University of Hull (3)                    |
| 56 | Graphic Design                                  | University of Kent Canterbury (5)         |
| 57 | History & English                               | University of Leeds (4)                   |
| 58 | History & Politics                              | University of Leicester                   |
| 59 | History & Politics + PGCE                       | University of Lincoln                     |
| 60 | History (4)                                     | University of Liverpool                   |
| 61 | Human Anatomy & Biology                         | University of Manchester (4)              |
| 62 | Illustration & Animation                        | University of Newcastle (2)               |
| 63 | International Business & Economics              | University of Northampton                 |
| 64 | International Hospitality Management            | University of Nottingham (3)              |
| 65 | International Relations with Strategic Studies  | University of Plymouth (5)                |
| 66 | Law (11)                                        | University of Portsmouth                  |
| 67 | Law with Business                               | University of Reading (3)                 |
| 68 | Law with English Literature                     | University of Sheffield                   |
| 69 | Law with Hispanic Law                           | University of Sterling (2)                |
| 70 | Law with IT                                     | University of Wales Institute Cardiff (6) |
| 71 | LPC                                             | University of Warwick                     |
| 72 | Management Studies with Spanish                 | University of West England, Bristol       |
| 73 | Marine Technologies                             | University of Wolverhampton               |
| 74 | Mathematics & Physics                           | University of York (5)                    |
| 75 | Mathematics (4)                                 |                                           |
| 76 | Mechanical Engineering                          |                                           |
| 77 | Medicine (3)                                    |                                           |
| 78 | Merchant Ship Operations                        |                                           |
| 79 | Midwifery                                       |                                           |
| 80 | Modern Languages                                |                                           |
| 81 | Money Banking & Finance                         |                                           |
| 82 | Music                                           |                                           |
| 83 | Music Industry Management & Live Production (2) |                                           |
| 84 | Music Performance & Production                  |                                           |
| 85 | Occupational Therapy                            |                                           |
| 86 | PGCE (3)                                        |                                           |
| 87 | Photography                                     |                                           |
| 88 | Physical Education                              |                                           |
| 89 | Physics (3)                                     |                                           |
| 90 | Primary Education (9)                           |                                           |
| 91 | Primary Teaching with History                   |                                           |
| 92 | Psychology (4)                                  |                                           |
| 93 | Quantity Surveying                              |                                           |
| 94 | Science                                         |                                           |
| 95 | Social Policy                                   |                                           |
| 96 | Social Work                                     |                                           |
| 97 | Sociology                                       |                                           |
| 98 | Sociology & Social Policy (2)                   |                                           |
| 99 | Sonic Arts                                      |                                           |
|    |                                                 | Cont'd                                    |

Cont'd Answer to Question 1694 of 2004

Cont'd Answer to Question 1689 of 2004

|     |                               |  |
|-----|-------------------------------|--|
| 100 | Spanish & Italian             |  |
| 101 | Spanish & Tourism             |  |
| 102 | Sport Science (2)             |  |
| 103 | Sports & Exercise Science     |  |
| 104 | Sports Coaching Management    |  |
| 105 | Sports Management             |  |
| 106 | Sports Studies with Business  |  |
| 107 | Sports Technology             |  |
| 108 | Study of Religions & Theology |  |
| 109 | Teaching                      |  |
| 110 | Tourism Management            |  |
| 111 | War Studies                   |  |
| 112 | Web Development               |  |
| 113 | Writing                       |  |
| 114 | Yacht Manufacture & Surveying |  |

Answer to Question 1695 of 2004

Answer to Question 1690

|    | <b>Discretionary Awards<br/>Subjects being studied 2004</b> | <b>Institutions</b>                             |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Catering                                                    | Guildford College                               |
| 2  | Drums and Contemporary Popular Music                        | Academy of Contemporary Music                   |
| 3  | Catering Food and Hospitality                               | Guildford College                               |
| 4  | Actuarial Science                                           | University of Edinburgh                         |
| 5  | Hospitality and Business Management                         | Leeds Metropolitan University                   |
| 6  | Human Evolutionary Studies                                  | University of Cambridge                         |
| 7  | Psychology of Child Development                             | University of Central Lancashire                |
| 8  | Environmental Technology                                    | Imperial College, London                        |
| 9  | Biomedical Science                                          | University of Portsmouth                        |
| 10 | Tourism Studies                                             | University of Wales Institute                   |
| 11 | Economics                                                   | University of London                            |
| 12 | Counselling                                                 | University of Surrey                            |
| 13 | Finance                                                     | Imperial College, London                        |
| 14 | Operatic Studies                                            | University of Music and Performing Arts, Vienna |
| 15 | Mussic                                                      | Trinity College                                 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1688 TO 1695 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister explain why there has been a decrease, a great decrease, in discretionary grants this year? Last year, when I asked a question, there were 64. This year we have 15.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I can tell the hon Member that these awards are assessed by the Scholarship Awards Committee on intrinsic merits and there were 25 applications for discretionary awards in second degrees, masters and doctorates and 15 of the 25 were found to be meritorious intrinsically and were awarded. I have to add there a note that the 17 PGCEs which have also added to the figure in previous years, this year have not been awarded for the simple reason that the Department for Education and Skills in the UK are now funding all PGCE courses, tuition fees and really with a very generous maintenance grant of £6,000 so it was something that is a saving on the taxpayer locally and we thought it was not either fair or reasonable to fund the PGCEs which we have traditionally funded. That is another reason why the figure is lower this year.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So the Minister then is confirming that from the 17 who applied for PGCEs the 17 are actually going?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Actually being paid by the British Government.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Government also explain why the numbers of distance learning grants have also been decreased? We had 32 awarded in the year 2000 and yet in the year 2004 we had 14. Can the Minister explain why again a decrease on this one?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There were 34 applications for new distance learning courses this year, 34 applications only and in fact we find that for distance learning 34 were granted.

**HON S E LINARES:**

How many applied in 2000?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The number of applicants for distance learning subsidies were this year 34 and 14 were awarded.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Whilst in the year 2000 the Minister said there were 40 applicants and 32 got it with the figure of £34,000 spent.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not the case then, that in the case of discretionary grants more people have been turned down this year than previously? Forgetting for a moment the PGCE who are really not being turned down because they are doing it paid for by somebody else. Of those that are paid from local funds, have more people been rejected who applied for discretionary grants or just a normal average?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is a normal average. I gave the figures. There were 25 applications and 15 were awarded so that is more than 50 per cent.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to Question No. 237 of 2004, the Minister said that 35 people had applied for discretionary post-graduate grants and 33 applications had been successful and two unsuccessful. That is almost 100 per cent yes. That does not seem to be the same this year. Is it that the quality of the candidates is less and their qualifications are not so good or what?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Government leave that judgement entirely to the professional assessment board, the Scholarship Awards Committee. I can tell the hon Member that all recommendations, all the applicants who were recommended by the Scholarship Awards Committee this year have been granted awards.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it is not that the Awards Committee had a smaller pot of money from which to make awards? It is not that the Awards Committee had a smaller pot of money in this budget.



**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Scholarship Awards Committee does not look at any pot of money, they look at students, applicants, and judge them through interviews and track record and past degrees and assess them accordingly.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If I could add. I would not want the hon Member to create a sort of jurisprudence on this issue. The Government do not take the view that funds for non-mandatory scholarships are unlimited. In other words, it is not the policy of the Government that everybody that applies for a discretionary scholarship that the Board considers appropriate should be sent, because that in effect is subject to the Board's adjudication. That is a second tier of mandatory scholarships subject to being approved by the Board. There is a financial figure written in to this area and certainly, it may not have arisen yet, but certainly for those of us that have to make the Government's budget balance at least or have surpluses at best, the idea that there is an unlimited pot of money for non-mandatory scholarships is certainly not the view that I take of things. It has not arisen yet and long may that continue to be the case. I think the House should also be aware of the context to which I make this point. That is that we are committed to continuing to pay the tuition fees for all Gibraltar university students even when they are increased substantially as they are to be, I think it will be with effect from the next academic year, which could result, different universities will increase their fees by different amounts, but it could be up to three times more in tuition fees than we are paying at the moment. That of course is for mandatory, discretionary and everybody else. So this is not the discretionary scholarships. The mandatory scholarships do operate in a non financially restrained environment. That is a pure demand-led expenditure on the mandatory but on the discretionary side they do not operate in a no financial restraints environment.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I suppose then one needs to qualify the previous answer which was in fact that the discretionary academic committee gets 50 applications and then decides whether they recommend all 50 or 20 or 10.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it does not require to qualify the previous answer because apparently the Minister has told the House that the amount of money available enables them to fund all the ones that they wanted to recommend. This is what he has told the House. I therefore, relying on that, said that it has not arisen yet and I was just saying it because I did not want the hon Member to misinterpret the Minister's answer as meaning that that would necessarily always be the case. In other words, it has not operated yet and I said I hope it continues to be the case for many years but that this is not, the discretionary pot is not a bottomless pit of money.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, would the Government not agree that it is most peculiar that the discretionary committee has made recommendations which fall within the amount that is in the pot? That in reaching that decision they have been guided purely by academic considerations without any knowledge of what is in the pot, because they are not put, that is what he also told us. That they do not take into account the amount of money available, that is the statement that has been made, and that somehow (*Interruption*). It is not on their minds because they do not decide to give less because there is less money, that is what we have been told.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I easily envisage the situation in which it might have to be on their minds. In other words, there is a figure which Government write in to how much is available. That may operate on their minds, I do not know if it operates on their minds or not.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well the Chief Minister does not know whether it operates on their minds and the other Minister does know that it does not operate in their minds, otherwise he has not been telling us the truth. He has told us quite specifically to a specific question, '*does this Committee take a decision as to how many discretionary grants they make depending on how much money they have got?*' The answer was '*no, they make their recommendation purely on academic grounds, we do not intervene and I do not know why they have recommended so many this year*'. That was the answer, the original answer given. Now, all I am telling the Minister, is would the Government not agree that if the academic committee decided this year to give less scholarships, not because there was less money, that they might arrive in future but it has not yet arrived. So without taking into account the amount of money that was available they decide to give less, but by some peculiar use of a crystal ball at the beginning of the year the Government reduced the available money from £120,000 to £47,000. Well that is what happened in this year's Budget. In last year's Budget they provided £120,000 in order to give new scholarships in September 2003, in the year 2003/2004 and this year they applied £47,000 for 2004/2005. Now is this the fact that less money is being spent, is this something that is driven by a decision that it is not an unlimited pot which we understand that can be a policy decision of the Government in terms of deciding, unlike the mandatory, we accept the mandatory by definition, if it is mandatory it has to be met. The discretionary is something that at any given point in time the Government can decide, 'well look we can afford so many or we cannot afford so many'. Now it seems that since the two are coinciding, that is are not coincidence, the decision to reduce the money taken independently from the decision to make the recommendation, both happen to be pointing in the same direction.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Perhaps I can convince the Leader of the Opposition if I tell him that all the applicants who were recommended by the Scholarship Awards Committee have been before me

and that all of them have been given awards, scholarship awards. Perhaps I can convince him if I say that the cost of that went well over the pot. In fact there was more money needed to cover all these recommendations of the Awards Committee and fortunately, in our budgetary arrangements, we have been able to fund over and above the £47,000 that the hon Member referred to in our original budget, in order to accommodate, in order to be able to provide awards for all those who were unrecommended by the Scholarship Awards Committee, but there is one point I would like to make a note of. The hon Member said 'is it the lowering of numbers this year? Is it that the quality of the applicants?' Well I would not like that to go on record. I am not in any way indicting the quality of the applicants because there are many factors that are taken into consideration by the Board. For instance, the relevance of their course with the needs of Gibraltar. That has nothing to do with the quality of the applicant, at least not the academic quality but certainly the needs of Gibraltar is one of the main considerations, one of the main criteria taken by the Board and some are rejected precisely because of esoteric types of courses that they choose, a degree in Beckham proficiency and that sort of thing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I note, in fact, that the last statement from the Minister does not seem to coincide with the previous statement by the Chief Minister, who said we had not yet reached the stage of having to take a policy decision because the pot had been exceeded. This year the pot has been exceeded then.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I said that we had not yet had to take a policy decision of curtailing the number of grants available that had been approved by the Board, because the Government were unwilling to provide the funding. In other words, one could find oneself in a situation where the Government, just as we have allowed them subject to virement or a funding source which may end up coming back to this House as supplementary, I do not know how it is going to be done, just as we have allowed them to exceed this year the amount of voted funds in order to allow them to fund all the ones that they have been willing to recommend, there is no obligation on the part of Government to do that. We have done it this year and therefore the need has not arisen but it is possible that at some future date and at some future year, they may wish to recommend 50 and the Government may only be willing to fund 49, or 40 or 30. That possibility exists, it has not happened yet.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that in the scholarships budget last year there was quite a substantial under-funding for reasons which are not very clear, would in fact the position not have been attained that instead of the money being vired as we have seen, there was something in the order of £780,000 vired out of mandatory scholarships Head in July this year in the reallocations that have been tabled at this meeting of the House. If the House originally was asked to provide this money and it did, and for reasons that are not very clear to us because there was no indication last year of any cutback, the money was not all spent,

is that not something to bear in mind if it has been reallocated into other uses instead of being kept in the Scholarship Fund because it could easily. Given that we have got a Scholarship Fund, we could easily carry the money forward from one year to the other. It went into other expenses in the Education Department because it was reallocation within Head 1 from Sub-Head 7A and 7B to other Sub-Heads but can the Government say whether in fact the actual expenditure which is going to be higher than the £47,000, how that compares with the amount in the preceding year or do they not have that kind of information at hand?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have not got the specific information with me.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just as a point of clarification as well. It says in the Statement of Reallocation No. 6 2003/2004, which the hon Colleague is referring to. It is for Head 1A Education and Culture, that is no longer education and culture. Well, it is last year's – it would be right.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is there a process for appeal from the Board should an applicant be dissatisfied? Is there a process of appeal from the Board?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Member knows well, there is a de facto appeal to the Minister, that people complain when their discretionary grant is not given to them because there is a growing tendency to regard discretionary grants as a matter of right. Hon Members should be aware, I am sure they are aware, that it is now much easier to get mandatory grants. Let me put it another way, it is now much easier to get into university than it used to be many years ago, and universities are doing many different types of courses and things like that. The accessibility to the mandatory grants through the normal university degree mainstream course is much more open now than it was say 10 years ago because they know the commercial imperatives that have been imposed on UK universities now. So there is not a formal, statutory procedure but I know that the Minister is approached by almost every unsuccessful applicant. That is not an appeals procedure but it does result in political pressure which is no doubt why the hon Members are asking these questions.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister in his first reply referred to the Board as a professional body, which of course it is not. It is a body made up of professionals but it is not a professional body and there could be a difference of opinion, could there not?, between the Minister and the political Government's view of what is relevant for the needs of Gibraltar and that body's view of what is relevant for the needs of Gibraltar. Therefore, has there been any

instance in the past three or four years of the Minister disagreeing with a decision of the Board and granting it himself so to speak?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There may be instances when the Minister, the Minister by the way is not a Member of the Board, when I say professional it is totally independent of the political body but the Minister may not agree sometimes in his own mind after all I have been an educator myself so I can actually assess these things also from an academic point of view. Certainly, I do not overrule the decisions of the Board and I make it very clear in my replies to all those letters, that I am not prepared to overrule the decisions of the Board except in extreme cases, which have never occurred, where there is transgression of the rules or a manifest injustice which in the area of discretionary awards is very difficult to exist. In any case, this has never been the case. What I have to confess I have often done, is actually some letter which seems to me to carry some sort of argument, pass it on to the Board to see if they can reconsider but certainly that is not the same as the Minister overruling the decision of the Board. By all means I am not prepared to do that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Has that sort of reference back to the Board resulted in the Board recommending individuals contrary to their initial recommendation?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Certainly not this year. I cannot remember, there may have been odd cases in the past but certainly not this year. As I say, they did recommend awards beyond the allotted sums.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

If the Board do not know the size of the pot, which is what apparently is the position, well they know the size of the pot but they sometimes recommend beyond that, are they told 'we will take a maximum of fifteen', for example? Are they told the number if not a monetary amount?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They cannot be told a number because all these courses cost different amounts of money, but they are aware of the size of the pot and of course it remains Government policy that people should stick to their voted funds, but if they come back making a strong case and the Government can find the money from somewhere else, we would rather find the money from somewhere else than leave their recommendations unfunded.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So if there is money, say there is £100,000 and 15 are recommended, are the 15 that are recommended simply stamped 'recommended' or are they categorised 'first recommendee', 'second recommendee' so that if we run out of money.....

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

They do actually in their assessment have a system of points, a pointage system related to different criteria and in that context they do have a rank order but at a certain stage they say this is it, they draw the line and from this point down they do not think there should be awards.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The 10 who have not got it are from that line down this year?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Right.

**NO. 1696 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL LUNCHES**

Can Government say how the Department of Education monitors the situation in relation to children staying for lunch during the lunch break?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question No. 1687**

The Department has made enquiries from Headteachers concerning their views and those of their staff and parents in relation to providing meals for children in schools. No external consultation has taken place so far.

**Answer to Question No. 1696**

The Department of Education and Training monitors the situation during the lunch break through the Headteachers who have responsibility for the children's welfare during this time in teamship with the Deputy Headteachers. Feedback is provided to the Headteacher by the lunchtime supervisors and the Deputy Headteachers. Representations, if felt necessary, are passed on to the Director for appropriate action.

The Department at all times attends to the views of individual parents, individually or collectively, whenever these are put to the Department directly.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1687 AND 1696**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In relation to the providing of meals, the Minister stated that it is an internal enquiry which is being made and so far have not gone out to private individuals or companies to provide meals.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is not the answer that the Minister has given. The Minister has said that no external consultation has taken place so far, but the hon Member assumes that there is going to be a provision of school meals and that parents want it long before the Government come to consider how the service might be delivered, if the Government decide to deliver it, the first stage before all of that is to decide the extent of support that exists among parents for the service to be delivered. So this would be preceded by a consultation with parents, as we did when changing the school hours, there will be a consultation with parents about the possibility of the service. That is the external consultation which the Minister said had not taken place so far and not as the hon Member appears to have understood it, an external consultation with possible service providers.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I am glad the Chief Minister has answered the question because my question actually said "any enquiry" and therefore any enquiry, he has now just enforced that, that it could be any as in already doing the first part which is the internal one. The second part would be consultation with parents I presume, and the third part will be with providers.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not for me to speculate what may be happening in the hon Member's mind but the question was 'have Government conducted any enquiries in relation to the possibility of producing the meals for children at school?'. That question does not suggest that the enquiries relate to the tender process of who is going to provide the service. Any enquiries in relation to the possibility of producing meals for schools, well the tender process is not about the possibility of producing meals for schools, it is to produce meals for schools not the possibility of producing meals. The enquiries that are germane to the possibility of producing meals for schools are enquiries leading to the policy decision of whether or not to provide meals at school. That is why the answer was drafted in the way that it has been drafted. The question does not suggest that it is directed toward the mechanical process of procuring a service after the policy decision has been made to provide the service. We are a long way from that stage and indeed the Government have not made the policy decision to provide the service. No such policy decision would be made without it being preceded by a consultation process and if the hon Member reads his party's last election manifesto he will see that it is couched on terms compatible with what I am now saying to him.



ORAL

**NO. 1697 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How much of the 2004/2005 £980,000 Tourism budget for Marketing, Promotions and Conferences has been spent as at 31<sup>st</sup> August 2004, giving a breakdown of the expenditure in question?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1698 to 1700 and 1732 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1698 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £13,141.27p Miscellaneous Expenditure in respect of the spend of £1,025,706.18p allocated to Tourism, Promotion and Conferences for the year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1697, 1699, 1700 and 1732 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1699 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ADVERTISING**

Following the answer to Question No. 967 of 2004, in respect of advertising by the Gibraltar Tourist Board, can Government provide a detailed breakdown of the £23,389 spent on “Special Features” showing the newspaper or magazine when the feature appeared, on what date and in exchange for what the sum was paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1697, 1698, 1700 and 1732 of 2004.

**NO. 1700 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ADVERTISING**

Following the answer to Question No. 967 of 2004, in respect of £448,564.52p advertising expenditure by the Gibraltar Tourist Board, can Government provide a detailed breakdown of the following:

- (a) £182,479.69p spent on “brochure panels (UK)”;
- (b) £80,153.49p spent on “consumer awareness (UK)”;
- (c) £33,298.72p spent on “Spanish Market (Madrid) Spain”;
- (d) £25,968.30p spent on “Spanish Market (C.Sur) Spain”; and
- (e) £5,406.25p spent on “Spanish Market (Costa) Spain”?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1697 to 1699 and 1732 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1701 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MINISTER’S OVERSEAS VISITS**

Can the Minister with responsibility for Tourism give the dates when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business from 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2004 to date, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I have been away on two occasions as follows:

|                                                              |                                                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Wednesday 23 <sup>rd</sup> – Friday 25 <sup>th</sup> June    | Manchester tourism promotion                             |
| Sunday 12 <sup>th</sup> – Tuesday 14 <sup>th</sup> September | London: a series of meetings, including a UKGTA meeting. |

ORAL

**NO. 1702 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Tourism Advisory Council met since 19<sup>th</sup> February 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1747, 1790 and 1811 of 2004.

**NO. 1703 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HOTEL GRADINGS**

Have Gibraltar's hotels been inspected in 2004 in respect of their star grading, by whom at what cost and with what results?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The hotels were inspected by the RAC in 2004 at a cost of £3,050 and graded as follows:

|               |   |                             |
|---------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Elliott Hotel | - | 4 stars                     |
| Caleta Hotel  | - | 4 stars                     |
| Rock Hotel    | - | 4 stars and 2 dining awards |
| Cannon Hotel  | - | 1 diamond                   |

The Continental Hotel did not receive a grading. The Bristol and Queen's Hotel do not participate in the grading scheme.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1703 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the case that these inspections take place on an annual basis?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, these inspections take place annually and they are not announced. Obviously these inspections are done on an ad-hoc basis and then the gradings are assessed after the visit.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government aware whether the two hotels that are now not participating in the scheme, will participate at some point in the future?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

When we changed from the previous assessors to the RAC, there were certain criteria that has to be met and in the case of the Bristol and the Queens, they were both concerned that they would not meet certain criteria in order to meet their grading. They wanted a bit more time for that to happen and I think that hopefully next year all hotels will come on board, but they felt that they may lose their status within the hotel grading if the RAC enforced all criteria. Something like in order to have a three star there has to be a restaurant for example. In the case of the Bristol they do not have a restaurant, so they did not want to lose their three star rating as a result of that, but they are now looking into that possibility.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There is no legal requirement for hotels to submit themselves to this grading scheme.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No there is not a legal requirement but let me say that my view and those of my Department is that all hotels should be graded. In fact, in our literature we will be specifying hotels that are actually graded by the RAC, which is an international grading system, and those that are not. I feel that those that are not graded actually stand to lose because the public will not feel that they are being in any way guaranteeing a certain level of service and quality of product.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to who carried out the inspections, can the Minister explain why they moved from the previous company to the RAC?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The previous company that did the assessment ceased trading.



**NO. 1704 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ST MICHAEL’S CAVE**

Are Government now in a position to say what fee the Electricity Authority will charge for the maintenance of the sound and light system at St Michael’s Cave?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Electricity Authority have notified the Gibraltar Tourist Board that they are unable to maintain the sound and light system at St Michael’s Cave. They will not therefore charge a fee for this.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1704 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister confirm whether the system is actually being maintained by anybody at present?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the system will be maintained by in actual fact the original suppliers of the equipment, Electro Sonic Systems Limited in the UK, and we are in the process of signing a service agreement which will cover these requirements.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Since the warranty expired on the system, presumably the system has required to be maintained on several occasions. Is it the case that it has not been maintained by anybody and will be maintained by Electro Sonic in the future when the agreement is signed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Up until now the actual sound and light system has been serviced by the Electricity Authority, to the best of our ability with input from Electro Sonic Systems Limited, but it became evident as time went by that the Electricity Department was unable to maintain the system adequately. So, we entered negotiations with the original supplier, which was not our preferred choice. Our preferred choice would have been to have had the Electricity Authority in Gibraltar doing it in-house, but we have had to go down this route and as I say we are in the process of finalising the details of an annual maintenance programme.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Our understanding is that, I remember coming out with this issue several times, there was a problem with the lighting, at the end of the steps, and I think at one point Thomson pulled out of sending tours up to the Cave because they thought it was not safe and tourists were falling over and they had these types of problems. Is it the case that these problems continue and will continue until the maintenance agreement comes into place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, there were some issues, the hon Member is right in saying, in respect of lighting at some of the steps et cetera. Those have been addressed and Thomson are back on board. In fact, before we actually undertook the exercise we actually got and sat down with the tour operators themselves to make sure that there was no misunderstanding in what we were addressing, and in fact they were quite happy with the rectifications and improvements that we have done. As I say, they now continue to offer tours including St Michael's Cave.

**HON S E LINARES:**

As a matter of interest I went to St Michael's Cave a week ago I think, with my daughter, there was absolute mayhem outside. I am aware there was a liner in the Port and therefore there must have been a lot of tourists being bussed up or taxied up, but there was mayhem outside the St Michael's Cave, which is worrying. I understand there are two security guards there who are supposed to be putting some order and control there, but they were neither doing so nor capable of doing so because of the amount of people and buses and taxis that are up there. Is there any way, or any long-term or medium-term plan in order to alleviate that problem as in traffic flow, which is what I would be thinking of? As one well knows, in the entrance of St Michael's Cave, the present entrance because the entrance used to be at the top and now it is at the bottom, there is like a hill going down which goes to the entrance of Lower St Michael's, there might be somewhere where the Government could look in the future to make a road down that way, where the buses or taxis can come up and then go down the other way. It is just a question that I was quite shocked at the amount. Quite frankly, I just parked my car to one side because the security guard was telling me to go up to Spur Battery and I said '*look, it is impossible, I cannot move*', so does the Minister not agree then that there is a case for actually alleviating the problem?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, if the problem could be alleviated tomorrow I would definitely do something about it. It is a very complex issue, but at the same time we are victims of our own success in our tourism policy. I am glad that the hon Dr Garcia agrees that we do have a lot of people in the Upper Rock. Joking apart, when we do have a cruise liner in Port it actually becomes a nightmare up there and as the hon Member clearly pointed out, the security guards find themselves with lots of difficulty. We are now looking at the possibility of restricting access to the Upper Rock in certain areas, and we are also looking at possibilities of addressing the actual pricing of tickets et cetera, and I will shortly be entering some form of consultation with the industry to see how best we can sort that out. The last thing we want is to cause any financial damage to any particular sector of either the transport industry or tourism industry, but yes, it is coming to the fact that numbers are just increasing and therefore we need to address that.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Taking up the Minister on his last answer, the figures which he supplies me with for people who go to the Upper Rock have actually been going down and not going up. So, I know the hon Member has been there, he was there last week and saw the problem for himself but as there are less people going up, why is the problem more acute now? Secondly, if I can revert to the original question, the Minister said that Electro Sonic Systems Limited will be carrying out the maintenance. I forgot to ask the Minister earlier, what will that cost?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, on the first part of the question about numbers on the Upper Rock, I suggest the hon Member wait until we get the figures for the end of September because September was an extremely good month, well beyond the normality, so there he will find that we are xxxxx up with the figures. To be honest the point on the actual fees, we are currently in negotiations with the company, we have not finalised that, but let me say that we are talking of a maintenance fee of about £1,500 to £1,700 per annum for the maintenance. However, we have not yet concluded that because we are still discussing how certain maintenance and certain response to any fault to the system is going to be solved, and the level of promptness that we want that response to be because obviously that will have a cost. So we are trying to finalise that but we are talking roughly of about £100 and £150 a month.

ORAL

**NO. 1705 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES WITH MOROCCO**

Can Government say whether there is any prospect of a resumption of scheduled air links between Gibraltar and Morocco?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1706 to 1708 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1706 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINE – GIBRALTAR/LONDON HEATHROW**

Are Government holding discussions with any airline designed to re-open air communications between Gibraltar and London Heathrow airport?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1705, 1707 and 1708 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1707 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINE – GIBRALTAR/SOUTH WEST REGION**

Can Government say whether air links between Gibraltar and the South West Region of England remains under discussion?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1705, 1706 and 1708 of 2004.

**NO. 1708 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES**

Further to the answer to Question No. 1005 of 2004, with how many of the five airlines that the Government were in discussion with, do those discussions continue?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government would wish to see a resumption of the air service with Morocco. However, it is for commercial operators to put in place scheduled air links.

Government are not in discussion with any airline wishing to operate between Gibraltar and London Heathrow airport. The possibility of air links with an airport in the south-west of England continues under discussion.

Discussions still continue with five airlines, as I said in answer to Question No. 1005 of 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1705 to 1708 of 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are they the same five airlines now as at that time?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes they are the same ones.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has any progress been made in those discussions or are they still the same?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I must say that discussions are slow and there has not really been any major progress since the last Question Time in the House.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The last time that we discussed the question of air links, I remember the name of Flybe was mentioned as the name of the airline that was interested in flying to the south-west, it was one of the possibilities. So do Flybe remain as one of the five?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, I have said they are exactly the same ones as they were last time and that included Flybe.



ORAL

**NO. 1709 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FLIGHTS GIBRALTAR/MANCHESTER**

How many flights between Gibraltar and Manchester airport were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis since operations commenced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1710 and 1711 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1710 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FLIGHTS – GIBRALTAR/LONDON LUTON**

How many flights between Gibraltar and London Luton were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis since January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1709 and 1711 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1711 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FLIGHTS – GIBRALTAR/LONDON GATWICK**

How many flights between Gibraltar and London Gatwick were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis since January 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 1711 of 2004**

(a) Flights time tabled per month between Gibraltar and Manchester airport.

| <b>Month</b> | <b>No of Flights</b> |
|--------------|----------------------|
| <b>2003</b>  |                      |
| November     | 12                   |
| December     | 12                   |
| <b>2004</b>  |                      |
| January      | 13                   |
| February     | 12                   |
| March        | 14                   |
| April        | 13                   |
| May          | 18                   |
| June         | 17                   |
| July         | 17                   |
| August       | 18                   |
| September    | 17                   |

No flights were cancelled.

(b) Flights time tabled per month between Gibraltar and London Luton airport.

| <b>Month</b> | <b>No of Flights</b> |
|--------------|----------------------|
| <b>2004</b>  |                      |
| January      | 22                   |
| February     | 21                   |
| March        | 23                   |
| April        | 30                   |
| May          | 31                   |
| June         | 30                   |
| July         | 31                   |
| August       | 31                   |
| September    | 30                   |

No flights were cancelled.

Cont'd.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question 1711 of 2004**

(c) Flights time tabled per month between Gibraltar and London Gatwick airport.

| <b>Month</b> | <b>No of Flights</b> | <b>Cancelled Flights</b> |
|--------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| January      | 53                   | 13                       |
| February     | 46                   | 6                        |
| March        | 62                   | 6                        |
| April        | 60                   | -                        |
| May          | 62                   | -                        |
| June         | 60                   | -                        |
| July         | 62                   | -                        |
| August       | 62                   | -                        |
| September    | 60                   | -                        |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1709 TO 1711 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the third table, to flights between Gibraltar and London Gatwick, from April in terms of the cancelled flights we know there are thirteen, in January six, in February six, in March six but from April to September does that mean there were no flights cancelled or does it mean they do not have the figures?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It means that no flights were cancelled.

ORAL

**NO. 1712 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HOTEL ASSISTANCE SCHEME**

Can Government say what amounts are due to Government in respect of loans and grants under the Hotel Assistance Scheme, listing the hotels in question and the amounts repaid as at 31<sup>st</sup> August 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 1712 of 2004**

| <b>Name of Hotel</b> | <b>Amount of Loan</b> | <b>Amount Drawn</b> | <b>Amount Repaid as per Loan Agreement</b> | <b>Amounts Outstanding as per Loan Agreement</b> |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Bell Hotels Ltd      | £1,000,000            | £1,000,000          | £175,000                                   | £825,000                                         |
| G & J B Hotels Ltd   | £1,500,000            | £1,450,000          | £145,000                                   | £1,305,000                                       |
| Rock Hotel           | £1,500,000            | £1,425,790          | £213,869                                   | £1,211,921                                       |



ORAL

**NO. 1713 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HOTEL ARREARS**

What amounts are due and owing to Government by hotels broken down by item and in respect of which period these monies become due as at 31<sup>st</sup> August 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

I presume that this question refers to the historical arrears of £923,748 owed by hotels. This sum has now been recovered by Government in full.

**NO. 1714 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from April 2004 inclusive:

- (a) by charging coaches that use the coach park?
- (b) in admission fees to the Upper Rock?
- (c) in entrance fees to the Gibraltar Museum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 1714 of 2004**

Revenue raised by Government on a monthly basis, April 2004 – September 2004.

(a) Revenue from the Coach Park

| <b>Month</b>   | <b>Amount</b> |
|----------------|---------------|
| April 2004     | £ 9,324       |
| May 2004       | £10,356       |
| June 2004      | £ 9,694       |
| July 2004      | £ 8,169       |
| August 2004    | £ 7,133       |
| September 2004 | £11,136       |

(b) Revenue from Upper Rock admissions

| <b>Month</b>   | <b>Amount</b> |
|----------------|---------------|
| April 2004     | £198,813      |
| May 2004       | £198,421      |
| June 2004      | £190,362      |
| July 2004      | £226,387      |
| August 2004    | £237,827      |
| September 2004 | £255,409      |

(c) Revenue from Museum admissions

| <b>Month</b> | <b>Amount</b> |
|--------------|---------------|
| April 2004   | £3,401        |
| May 2004     | £1,224        |
| June 2004    | £1,554        |
| July 2004    | £1,602        |
| August 2004  | £1,930        |

The revenue for September 2004 is not yet available.

ORAL

**NO. 1715 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say of the number of persons who have been interviewed since March 2004 inclusive, who said that they had not stayed at a hotel, how many were interviewed at the airport, how many were interviewed at the land frontier, and how many were interviewed elsewhere, and in each case what was the average length of stay in hotels?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1716 and 1717 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1716 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews have been carried out with persons who said that they had not stayed at a hotel since March 2004 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1715 and 1717 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1717 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews with persons who said that they had stayed at a hotel have been carried out since March 2004 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 1717 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1716**

| <b>2004</b> | <b>Total Interviews</b> | <b>Airport</b> | <b>Port</b> | <b>Frontier</b> | <b>Marina</b> | <b>Coach Park</b> |
|-------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| March       | 1768                    | 7              | 43          | 1616            | 7             | <b>95</b>         |
| April       | 1764                    | 12             | 55          | 1552            | 5             | <b>140</b>        |
| May         | 1739                    | 7              | 19          | 1521            | 6             | <b>186</b>        |
| June        | 1831                    | 28             | 33          | 1580            | 2             | <b>188</b>        |
| July        | 1883                    | 27             | 127         | 1572            | 25            | <b>132</b>        |

**Answer to Question 1717 of 2004**

(b) Interviews with persons staying at hotels and place of interview:

| <b>2004</b> | <b>Stayed at Hotel</b> | <b>Airport</b> | <b>Frontier</b> |
|-------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| March       | 8                      | 6              | 2               |
| April       | 17                     | 15             | 2               |
| May         | 13                     | 9              | 4               |
| June        | 51                     | 44             | 7               |
| July        | 16                     | 14             | 2               |

The information requested at Question 1715 is identical to that requested at Question 1716.

The information in respect of August and September 2004 is not yet available.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1715 TO 1717 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I just say, in relation to the answer, it says that the information requested in Question No. 1715 is identical to that at Question No. 1716. Question No. 1715 requests the average length of stay in hotels, apart from the rest of the information, whereas Question No. 1716 does not.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the hon Member is correct. I will send him that information, I had read both questions as being identical. Sorry.



**NO. 1718 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SECURITY GUARDS**

How many tenders were submitted in respect of the provision of a security guard service at various tourist sites, who was the successful tenderer and in what amount?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The successful tenderer was Admiral Security (Gibraltar) Limited in the sum of £9,384.83p per month. Three tenders were received in all.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1718 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say what amounts were bid by the other tenderers, or can he say at least whether this was the lowest tender?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, I can tell him that this was the lowest tender but I do not think it is Government policy to actually publish the offers made by those who do not succeed.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say what tourist sites are covered by the provision of these security guards?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, they cover basically various points on the Upper Rock, like St Michael's Cave, Jews Gate, the entrance by the Moorish Castle, some areas up in Great Siege Tunnels.

ORAL

**NO. 1719 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – UPPER ROCK SITE OFFICERS**

Have the vacancies for the post of Upper Rock Site Officer advertised in June now been filled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1720 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1720 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – UPPER ROCK SITE OFFICERS**

How many persons applied for the post of Upper Rock Site Officer in response to the notice of 28<sup>th</sup> June, how many were Gibraltarians and how many vacancies were available?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Upper Rock Site Officer vacancies have been filled.

There were 24 applicants for the two vacancies. Two were British, the others were Gibraltarians.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1719 TO 1720 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say which nationality took the two vacancies?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Two Gibraltarians.

ORAL

**NO. 1721 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SITU**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the Gibraltar Tourist Board's participation in SITU tourist fair which took place in Barcelona in April this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1722, 1723 and 1725 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1722 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SITU**

Can Government say who were the 23 journalists who attended the reception for the travel press hosted by the Gibraltar Tourist Board at SITU in Barcelona, and what media did each of them represent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1721, 1723 and 1725 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1723 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SITU**

Can Government say how many travel articles on Gibraltar were published as a result of 23 journalists attending a reception at SITU in Barcelona in April and what were they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1721, 1722 and 1725 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1724 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HOTEL INDUSTRY**

What direct representations have been made to the hotel industry in Gibraltar and when, following the Minister's statement in Barcelona in April that the challenge for the industry in Gibraltar is "to compete for business on price, on the basis of value for money"?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1728 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1725 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SITU**

How many persons made up the GTB delegation to the SITU tourist fair in Barcelona in April?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.



## **SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 1725 OF 2004**

Two persons made up the GTB delegation to SITC.

The cost of the GTB participation at SITC was:-

|                                        |             |
|----------------------------------------|-------------|
| Cost of stand                          | Euros 710   |
| Transportation of literature et cetera | Euros 448   |
| On stand catering                      | Euros 195   |
| Air tickets (2 persons)                | Euros 387   |
| Hotel (2 rooms)                        | Euros 1,067 |

The 22 journalists who attended the SITC reception for the travel press and the titles for which they work are:-

Magazine IH: Mercedes Moran  
Hosteleria y Turismo: Esther Rodriguez  
Hosteltur: Mercedes Tello  
La Vanguardia  
Diario Metro: Angels Mas  
Air Classe: Virtudes Rodrigo  
Revista Escapada: Miguel Rinon  
Banca 15: Susana Gomez  
Transporte Aereo y Turismo: Ma Fernanda Fernandez  
Ejecutivos, Instituciones y Empresas: Ma Victoria Rojas  
Guia Espanola del Transporte: Fernando Margareto  
Viajes y Vacaciones: Isabel Conde  
Nexotur: Pepita Hernandez  
RNE: Pablo Ignacio Dalmases  
Turismo & Ocio Magazine: Silvia Barrufet  
Expoturismo: Victor Escribano  
Mas Viajes: Marcos Melchi  
Aviacion y Turismo: Maryan Ramos  
Editur: Gloria Prunes  
Viajeros por Tierra, Mar y Aire: Conchita Arregui  
Europa Press: Javier Carrion  
Lunas de Miel: Asela Olea

In addition, Nora Wasserman of Global attended the event.

Already a number of travel articles have appeared in the Spanish media, as listed below. However, the importance of events such as the travel press reception goes much further. They serve to forge links with important travel press publications, and their continued support of Gibraltar tourism in the long term is of key importance. Articles do not necessarily appear immediately after a media event : they continue to filter through over time. The list that follows is therefore expected to grow over the next few months:

|                                          |                     |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Air Classe                               | July/August edition |
| Banca 15                                 | June edition        |
| Guia Espanola del Transporte – Issue 161 |                     |
| IH                                       | June edition        |
| RNE                                      | 4 reports           |
| TAT                                      | May/June edition    |

The above articles and features are those of which the GTB is aware, as all titles are not monitored by the Madrid Office staff.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1721 TO 1725 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has listed the 22 journalists who attended from the different media in his answer, and he has also listed six media where articles or reports appeared, but it also mentions that this is something which is not monitored by the office in Madrid. How do the Government then monitor the effectiveness of this kind of marketing strategy?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

What I was trying to say there was that there may have been some other reports in the press as a result of that in the meantime, but that they had not been brought to our attention and we have not picked them up. Sometimes, normally it is normal practice that when the reporter appears in a feature in one of these magazines, complimentary copies are obviously sent to the Tourist Board but that does not always follow. Therefore, what I am saying is that all those that are listed there may not be the only reports that we have had. Obviously we do like to monitor. If we do have a reception we invite 22 journalist we do like to follow up but let me say that reports or features of this nature do not actually take, reporters do not come to an event and then the next day run off and write a report. Sometimes they can take as much as a year before something appears, or may not appear at all. So therefore that has to be borne in mind when assessing and analysing the information.

ORAL

**NO. 1726 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – BEACH CONCESSIONS**

Can Government say who was successful in respect of the application for Beach Concessions in respect of each beach in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1727 of 2004.

**NO. 1727 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – BEACH CONCESSIONS**

Can Government say how many applications for Beach Concessions were received for the bathing season 2004 giving the amount paid to the Government, the name of the beach and the nature of the concession in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There were six applications for beach concessions. Five of them were successful as follows:

- |     |               |   |               |   |             |
|-----|---------------|---|---------------|---|-------------|
| (1) | Camp Bay      | - | Mr W Parody   | - | Kiosk       |
| (2) | Little Bay    | - | Mr A de Bono  | - | Kiosk       |
| (3) | Eastern Beach | - | Mr G Parker   | - | Kiosk       |
|     |               |   | Mr P J Parody | - | Kiosk       |
|     |               |   | Mr C Bond     | - | Beach Rides |
| (4) | Catalan Bay   | - | Mr C Bond     | - | Beach Rides |

The fees in respect of each of these concessions was £325.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1726 AND 1727 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I just clarify in relation to the answer given? When the Minister mentions people who have kiosks, is it that they have a separate concession to the kiosk or is the kiosk the actual concession in which he is answering the question?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The kiosk is a concession.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So in respect of people who have canoes and that kind of thing, is that not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is a beach ride which I have just mentioned.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Just to clarify further, is the £325 what a kiosk pays for all the summer in rent?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes I think that is the case. It seems very competitive to me and good value for money in this case.

**NO. 1728 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ADVERTISING**

Can Government say what steps they are taking to monitor the success or otherwise of their objective to position Gibraltar as a new product within the long-weekend or “puentes” market in Spain?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No further direct representations have been made to Gibraltar hotels by me since April 2004. The hotels are all well aware of the Government’s interest in making Gibraltar an attractive tourist destination for the Spanish weekend and “puentes” market. No further approaches have therefore been necessary.

The Gibraltar Tourist Board’s task is to promote Gibraltar as an attractive place to visit. Hotels can add value to a visitor’s time in Gibraltar if that person chooses to overnight in Gibraltar. The basis on which they can be successful is that of value for money. This is something which I have discussed with hotels, and they are in complete agreement. Naturally, when a hotel receives awards, for example for its cuisine, from a respected hotel grading association, this helps to convey the message to potential visitors.

All travel press initiatives in the Spanish market which the GTB designs are aimed specifically at the weekend and “puentes” market. It is extremely difficult to gauge the success of particular initiatives because the GTB does not sell any tourist products, so therefore we cannot look to see how many bookings are achieved from a particular advertisement or from a specific article in the travel press.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1724 AND 1728 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In identifying the need to compete on value for money as a challenge, was that because the Government consider that hotels in Gibraltar at the moment are not competitive and are not providing value for money?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, hotels in Gibraltar are totally conversant and aware of the fact that they do not represent value for money when comparing themselves with hotels on the other side of the border. However, they do offer a good product, now more than ever, and the results of the hotels in recent times actually vouch for the fact that occupancy figures are higher and therefore success is there, which must mean value for money for those that come and visit us.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think we ought to understand each other. The difference between the phrase 'value for money' and 'competitive'. I think it is probably more accurate to say that they are not competitive, I think they are value for money compared with other places, but to be competitive it is a question of price compared to their similar product in a neighbouring market place but they are value for money in the sense that what it costs one to stay here and what it costs one to stay in a hotel in London with the same facilities, it is cheaper here than in London. Competitiveness brings into hook the price that the competitor can offer in equivalence. I think hotels in Gibraltar in that sense are not competitive.

ORAL

**NO. 1729 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – VISIT TO MANCHESTER**

How many persons from Manchester's Travel industry attended the presentation given by the GTB in that city in June?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1730 and 1731 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1730 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – VISIT TO MANCHESTER**

How many persons from Manchester attended the GTB exhibition and showcase held at Manchester Town Hall in June?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1729 and 1731 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1731 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – VISIT TO MANCHESTER**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the GTB exhibition and showcase on Gibraltar held at Manchester Town Hall in June, how many persons made up the delegation and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

## **SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 1731 OF 2004**

Seventy persons attended the trade presentation given by the Gibraltar Tourist Board in Manchester.

The large turnout from the general public at the GTB exhibition and showcase at the Manchester Town Hall consisted of about 600 persons.

The persons who made up the Gibraltar delegation at the Manchester events were:-

|                  |   |                                                 |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------|
| Hon J J Holliday | - | Minister for Tourism                            |
| Mr P Canessa     | - | Chief Executive/GTB                             |
| Mr A Poggio      | - | Director, Gibraltar Government Office in London |
| Mr M Sanguinetti | - | Sales Manager/GTB                               |

They were assisted by the following staff from the London Office:-

|                  |   |                                      |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Mr I Leyde       | - | GTB Sales Manager (UK)               |
| Mr O Yeats       | - | Information Officer                  |
| Ms A Montegriffo | - | Placement Student, GTB London Office |

The costs of the event were:-

|                                                             |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Cost of stand, including installation and dismantling costs | £ 9,450 |
| Catering : canapés and finger buffet                        | £ 5,385 |
| Hire of Musicians                                           | £ 615   |
| Invitations, including postage                              | £ 1,140 |
| Crystal paperweights, including freight charges             | £ 744   |
| Balloons and decorations                                    | £ 194   |
| Hotel accommodation and travel                              | £ 1,646 |
|                                                             | <hr/>   |
|                                                             | £19,174 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1729 TO 1731 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

According to the information supplied by the Minister, the cost of this event in Manchester was £19,174. Of that the catering was £5,300 which is about a quarter of the sum. It is described here as canapés and finger buffet. Can the Minister explain why that particular cost is so high compared to the overall cost of the event?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I cannot really explain apart from the fact that that was the cost of entertaining the 70 people from the trade who came for the presentation and then the dinner which followed after that. It included an element of canapés and it was a finger buffet actually more than a dinner although there were tables where people could sit down as well.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am tempted also, given that we have been talking about competitiveness and value for money, to ask after the £615 it cost to hire musicians. Was this for the dinner, was it for the stand or for what?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the hiring of the musicians was some form of small little orchestra that kept going throughout the exhibition while the general public were visiting et cetera.

ORAL

**NO. 1732 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ADVERTISING**

On what dates and in what media did Government spend £4,854.40p advertising “Portugal and Morocco (GIB)”, showing a breakdown of the sum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

#### **SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 1732 OF 2004**

When negotiating with publications over their advertising rates, it is usually possible to obtain significant discounts which can be negotiated by regular advertisers. The Government do not therefore wish to make public the exact amount which is spent on any particular insertion in a newspaper or magazine. Such information is considered to be commercially sensitive.

#### **Answer to Question 1697 of 2004**

As at 31 August 2004, £441,055 had been spent out of the marketing budget of £980,000 as follows:

|                                                                                                                    |          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Literature                                                                                                         | £ 43,567 |
| Trade Activity (UK brochure distribution)                                                                          | £ 3,460  |
| Media Activity                                                                                                     | £ 18,845 |
| Promotional material                                                                                               | £ 110    |
| Advertising                                                                                                        | £ 99,325 |
| Trade Fairs                                                                                                        | £ 40,442 |
| Consumer Fairs                                                                                                     | £ 4,290  |
| Events                                                                                                             | £164,567 |
| Website maintenance                                                                                                | £ 4,314  |
| Subscriptions, GTB London staff tourism promotion expenses, UKGTA meeting expenses, UK PR costs                    | £ 40,022 |
| PR costs in Spain, travelling expenses in Spain                                                                    | £ 13,587 |
| Miscellaneous (press monitoring service, promotional trade support, banner stand, giveaways, insurance, et cetera) | £ 8,526  |
|                                                                                                                    | -----    |
|                                                                                                                    | £441,055 |

#### **Answer to Question 1698 of 2004**

The sum of £13,141.27 can be broken down as follows:

|                                                                            |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Morgan classic rally – drinks and tapas                                    | £ 480.00  |
| GibLive Music Society – rental of stage for                                | £ 200.00  |
| Hire of PA system from The Studio                                          | £ 785.00  |
| Inaugural Cruise calls – payment of band and historical re-enactment group | £1,020.00 |
| Aerial Photo shoot                                                         | £1,214.28 |

Cont'd.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question 1732 of 2004**

|                                                         |                    |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Photo shoot Catalina Celebrities                        | £ 109.00           |
| Design, artwork, printing and file covers with new logo | £ 5,925.99         |
| 1400 stems of carnations (give away for visitors)       | £ 210.00           |
| Chiropractic Conference                                 | £ 640.90           |
| Cruise ship advertisement in Vox                        | £ 302.00           |
| Rock Tour CAA Conference                                | £ 302.00           |
| Miscellaneous travel expenses                           | £ 88.18            |
| Seatrade subsistence costs                              | £ 839.84           |
| Giveaways USA Custom Shop                               | £ 25.97            |
| Taxi fares for passengers                               | £ 30.00            |
| Editorial page                                          | £ 550.00           |
| Dinner (Casino)                                         | £ 53.57            |
|                                                         | <u>£ 13,141.27</u> |

**Answer to Question 1699 of 2004**

The special features referred to in Question 967 of 2004 were:-

- A special Gibraltar report in The Times
- A series of features on Gibraltar in La Tribuna

**Answer to Question 1700 of 2004**

(a) Brochure panels were carried in the following UK newspapers and magazines:-

- Media Mint Productions
- News of the World
- Daily Mail
- Radio Times
- Classic Travel
- Readers Digest
- M&S Magazine
- Home from Home
- Mail on Sunday
- Daily Telegraph
- Sun
- Times Magazine
- Telegraph Magazine
- Daily Mail Weekend Magazine
- Night & Day Mail on Sunday
- Mail on Sunday
- Manchester Evening News
- Liverpool Echo
- Sunday Times Magazine

(b) The consumer awareness campaign comprised advertising on taxis in London.

Cont'd.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question 1732 of 2004**

(c) The Spanish media which carried Gibraltar advertisements were:-

Ducal ediciones  
Viajeros por tierra y mar  
Expo Turismo  
Mas revistas  
TAT  
Ediciones turisticas  
Group Arthux  
Yucapro (Spanish guide)  
Temas 5  
Ediciones Profesionales  
Spot 90  
Adsen  
Guia de Viajes  
Ediciones Conde

(d) A series of adverts was placed with Canal Sur television, over 6 months.

(e) The titles which carried advertisements were:

Top Holiday and Travel  
ESTD 2003  
123 Publication

**Answer to Question 1732 of 2004**

Advertisements were placed in Portugal in The News, an Algarve English-language newspaper.

There were no advertisements for Morocco.

More than one insertion was placed in certain publications.



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1697 TO 1700 AND 1732 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1732 which referred to advertising and special features, the Minister has replied, I am not sure if it is an answer to that question. Can the Minister clarify the opening paragraph to the schedule he has given me, what question does that refer to?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think the opening paragraph is just the opening statement because there are questions on rates and we felt that it was commercially sensitive to actually give rates over the floor of the House in respect of particular contracts that are established. One never accepts the contract rate that is offered by any publication for advertising. These are negotiated depending on the frequency, on the timing, and therefore the published rates are not rates that are normally accepted or even agreed with those concerned. That was a general opening paragraph which actually applies to a number of these questions. In respect of Question No. 1732 which is specifically requesting in respect of advertising under the heading 'Portugal and Morocco', it refers to advertising in Portugal in an English language newspaper called 'The News'. Whilst in Morocco there had not been any advertising but we do have a heading called 'Portugal and Morocco' as a heading but not specifically because there has been advertising in that respect.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Would the Minister be willing to supply that information to the Opposition on a confidential basis in writing?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Does the hon Member actually mean spell out the advertising and the rates? Yes, it would be a laborious exercise but it can be made available. It is available.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1697, one of the items in the breakdown is £4,300 spent on website maintenance. Is that the website of the Tourist Board here or the UK Office?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This is the maintenance of the website in the UK, which is a specifically tourism website.

ORAL

**NO. 1733 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PRESS ON THE ROCK**

Can Government provide the cost, with a breakdown, of the press on the Rock that took place in June this year, listing the journalists who came to Gibraltar and the media that they represented?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

## **SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 1733 OF 2004**

The cost of the Press on the Rock visit was £5,994 broken down as follows:-

|                                  |        |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Ed Lacy Award (prize money)      | £ 600  |
| Ed Lacy Award (engraving trophy) | £ 60   |
| Ed Lacy Award (expenses)         | £4,571 |
| Dinner for journalists           | £ 500  |
| Miscellaneous                    | £ 23   |
| Prints                           | £ 180  |
| Photography                      | £ 60   |
|                                  | <hr/>  |
|                                  | £5,994 |

The journalists who visited Gibraltar, and the media they represent were:-

|                  |                                                   |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Annie Bennett    | Spanish specialist – nationals (freelance)        |
| Phil Boucher     | Travel Weekly (freelance)                         |
| Diana Groves     | Prima                                             |
| Matt Holmes      | The Citizen, Gloucester                           |
| Anna Hyman       | Motoring & Leisure                                |
| Jon Kelly        | Daily Mirror                                      |
| Samm Taylor      | Daily Star                                        |
| Stephen White    | Western Daily Press, Bristol                      |
| Wendy Watts      | Kent Messenger Series                             |
| Richard Williams | Selling Short Breaks & Classic Travel (freelance) |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1733 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the answer given to Question No. 1733, the cost of the Press on the Rock visit is £5,994. Of that I note that £4,571 of that amount refers to the Ed Lacy Award expenses. Is it that an award is given to somebody and this is a monetary award?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid that I actually spotted that myself only a few minutes ago. Really it should not have been the Ed Lacy Award. When we actually do Press on the Rock we contract a company in the UK who does public relations to actually pick the various medias. They accompany them here, they look after them, although the Tourist Board obviously look after them as well, but they are here for the duration of the Press on the Rock and then they go back with them even though they are accompanied by a member of our own staff. That is actually £4,275 so that is basically public relations. They actually do quite a lot of work in preparation for the visit in order to make sure that those that are coming are people that are going to give us the sort of result that we want when they go back. They actually then have the obligation to follow up in order that we do get, although they are not under strict obligations to deliver a report, they are actually able to monitor because they tend to have the right connections within the industry to ensure that we get as much positive press as possible.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given the cost of that public relations company, could this work not be done by the Gibraltar Office in London?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No not really because one really needs to be in this specific area. We are talking of a company called Doug Goodman Public Relations, Doug Goodman is a well established public relations company who is well connected in the travel and press industry and they have been doing this for us now for a number of years and it has always paid well to have their involvement in the exercise. One must realise that the total sum of this exercise is £5,594, so the hotels join forces because they feel that they can benefit from this exercise. The airlines participate by giving us free tickets coming out. Local restaurants actually feed the contingent while they are out here on a sort of public relations exercise, so we all, both public sector and private sector, join forces to try and make this as value for money as possible, but on the other hand making sure that we get the right results when these people go back. At the end of the day we could have all of them coming out on a jolly and then going back and producing nothing, but this actually puts a stop to that to the best of our ability and so far when we have had them involved, and that goes back possibly four or five years now, we have noticed that they actually work. Actually Doug Goodman, the managing director of the company was a personal friend of Ed Lacy who was a very strong supporter of Gibraltar. So therefore he has a

certain amount of personal commitment to the project because Ed Lacy actually started coming out to Gibraltar when we first initially started to do this initiative. So there is a bit of personal commitment to the whole exercise as well. The reality is that £4,000 have people out here for four days and they bring out a party of at least two or three, is not really money in the UK for carrying out such an exercise.

ORAL

**NO. 1734 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ADVERTISING**

Can Government say how and when Gibraltar's marketing strategies were evaluated and its advertising initiatives refreshed following the UKGTA meeting in Gibraltar in June?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1735 of 2004.

**NO. 1735 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ADVERTISING**

How many initiatives is the UKGTA currently progressing work on and what are they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Gibraltar Tourist Board is continually evaluating its marketing strategies. Following the UKGTA meeting in Gibraltar in June 2004, the structure and components of the marketing strategy were closely examined. This included examining the value and relevance of every item of marketing expenditure from the cost of exhibiting at different travel exhibitions, dedicated Gibraltar roadshows, the form of the UKGTA brochure, the media selected for advertising, the form of advertisements used, the advertising slogan for this year's campaign and so on. In examining the marketing expenditure, the advice of the Gibraltar Tourist Board advertising consultants and PR consultants was sought.

In addition, marketing trends in the UK were closely scrutinised and the confidential feedback and advice of the UK members of the UKGTA were closely considered.

The initiatives which the UKGTA are currently progressing, under the leadership of the GTB, are as follows:

1. preparation of a 2005 UKGTA brochure;
2. deciding at which regional travel trade shows and exhibitions Gibraltar should have a presence;
3. considering the 2004/2005 advertising campaign;
4. formulating an on-line advertising campaign;
5. UK tour operators are considering how best to support GTB initiatives, including travel trade press trips and familiarisation trips for travel agency staff;
6. Supporting educational strategies within UK for UK tour operators and travel agency staff to enhance Gibraltar's tourist product knowledge.

**NO. 1736 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – CRUISE SHIPS**

Are Government aware of the response of the Spanish Government to the representations made by MedCruise and the European Cruise Council following the news of a six months moratorium on cruise ships calling at a Spanish port after calling at Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1736 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are Government in a position to find out what the response has been?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

As far as I am aware, and I think I am correct in saying that the MedCruise part of the question has definitely not received any response. However, in respect of the European Cruise Council that is a different matter but we have had no feedback that there has been any reply either.



ORAL

**NO. 1737 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POST OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR**

Has the post of Maritime Administrator now been filled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1738 and 1739 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1738 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POST OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR**

How many persons applied for the post of Maritime Administrator advertised on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, and what nationality were the applicants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1737 and 1739 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1739 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POST OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR**

What salary will be paid to the Maritime Administrator?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The selection board for the post of Maritime Administrator has made its recommendations which are now being considered. There were ten applicants for the post. One applicant was Greek; the others were British. The salary for the post of Maritime Administrator is £54,325 per annum.

ORAL

**NO. 1740 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PORT AUTHORITY**

Can Government state the result of the discussions with Port Department staff regarding their possible transfer to a statutory Port Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The discussions are on-going.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1740 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

When was the last time they met with the staff representatives?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

A meeting was planned last Thursday with myself. Unfortunately I was unwell and I was unable to attend the meeting. However, officials of my Department did meet with the staff representatives in order to progress negotiations.

**NO. 1741 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – NUMBER OF COLLISIONS**

Can Government say how many collisions have taken place in the Bay of Gibraltar in the last twelve months, giving the date when the collision took place and the names and type of vessels involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There were two collisions. On 20<sup>th</sup> May 2004, two bulk carriers collided. They were the MV SUN and the MV DAPENGHAI.

On 26<sup>th</sup> September 2004, the cruise liner VAN GOGH and the oil tanker SPETSES were involved in a collision.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1741 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has this information normally compiled by the Port Department, regardless of whether the collision takes place on our side of the Bay as it were or on the Spanish side of the Bay, and where did these two take place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely, if it takes place within the Bay of Gibraltar in our side or whatever, it is recorded of course.

ORAL

**NO. 1742 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT AUTHORITY – CONFERENCES**

In what capacity was the Gibraltar Port Authority or the Gibraltar Government invited to participate in the “1<sup>st</sup> Century Ports; Terminals; Bunkers; Logistics Conference” which took place in April?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1743 and 1744 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1743 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT AUTHORITY – CONFERENCES**

What was the cost of Gibraltar's participation in the "21<sup>st</sup> Century Ports; Terminals; Bunkers; Logistics Conference" in April?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1742 and 1744 of 2004.

**NO. 1744 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT AUTHORITY – CONFERENCES**

What officials from the Gibraltar Port Authority or the Gibraltar Government attended the “21<sup>st</sup> Century Ports; Terminals; Bunkers; Logistics Conference” which took place in April?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Initially, an invitation was extended to the Chief Executive of the Ministry with responsibility for shipping to present a paper at the Conference. This invitation was subsequently withdrawn and the Port of Gibraltar were offered several free tickets for delegates to the Conference by the organiser.

The Bunkering Superintendent attended the Conference as a delegate.

There was no cost to Government of his attendance at this event.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1742 TO 1744 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister tell the House why the invitation was withdrawn?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The organisers informed the Chief Executive at the Ministry that there had been a change in the programme, so therefore the issue that was going to be addressed by the Chief Executive was no longer on the order paper. I feel that they were fairly embarrassed about the whole thing and that there was definitely pressure to have them withdrawn.



**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Minister says 'pressure' does he mean political pressure exercised by the Spanish Government in Madrid, is that it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We are speculating, I mean nobody gave us that as an excuse. The excuse was that there had been a change in the order paper and the topics being addressed so therefore the topic that the Chief Executive was going to address from a Gibraltar perspective was no longer a topic to be discussed, so therefore his presence was no longer required.

ORAL

**NO. 1745 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT DEPARTMENT – POST OF SEAMAN/MECHANIC**

Further to the answer to Question No. 1061 of 2004, has the vacancy for the post of Seaman/Mechanic in the Port Department now been filled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1745 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say what was the nationality of the person who filled the vacancy?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Gibraltarian I believe.

ORAL

**NO. 1746 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SHIPS VISITS**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar this year to date on a monthly basis for:

- (a) repair;
- (b) cargo?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1749 and 1750 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1747 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Port Advisory Council met since it was set up?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1702, 1790 and 1811 of 2004.

**NO. 1748 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – DREDGING**

Can Government say whether they have now taken a decision to proceed with the dredging of the Western Arm of the Port?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The position has not changed since the hon Member last raised this matter in the House.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1748 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does that mean that it has not gone up in the Government's scale of priorities which is what I recall was the answer last time?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It means exactly what I said the last time the matter was raised, and that was precisely the case.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does that mean that the other calls which are scheduled by the Queen Mary will also take place with them anchoring in the Bay and using tenders?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The calls will be going ahead, they have not been cancelled?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The call is going ahead and the same logistics as was undertaken in September when the Queen Mary arrived will be repeated again.

ORAL

**NO. 1749 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

Have any new applications for a bunkering licence been made since April 2004 and have any new licences been issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1746 and 1750 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1750 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar since April 2004 on a monthly basis, for bunkering and how many tonnes of bunker fuel were sold each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.



## SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 1750

### Questions 1746 and 1750

(a) Ship Calls at Gibraltar per month.

| <u>2004</u>  | <u>PURPOSE OF CALL</u> |               |                  |
|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------|
|              | <u>Cargo</u>           | <u>Repair</u> |                  |
| January      | 4                      | 9             |                  |
| February     | 5                      | 4             |                  |
| March        | 6                      | 11            |                  |
|              | <u>Cargo</u>           | <u>Repair</u> | <u>Bunkering</u> |
| April        | 5                      | 6             | 435              |
| May          | 7                      | 7             | 491              |
| June         | 2                      | 5             | 453              |
| July         | 6                      | 12            | 422              |
| August       | 2                      | 2             | 379              |
| September    | 3                      | 7             | 426              |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>40</b>              | <b>63</b>     | <b>3532</b>      |

(b) Volume of bunkers sold per month since April 2004.

|       |                |
|-------|----------------|
| April | 170,275 tonnes |
| May   | 449,964        |
| June  | 294,941        |
| July  | 298,087        |

The figures for August and September are not yet available.

### Question 1749

No new application for bunkering licences have been made since April 2004.

**NO. 1751 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

What works were carried out by the contractor to the Piazza development after the official opening by the Princess Royal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

After the official opening of the John Mackintosh Square development by the Princess Royal, the contractor undertook the following works:

- (i) paving of the floor of the Lobby of the House of Assembly;
- (ii) erected the handrails on the small steps leading to the House of Assembly, by the western façade;
- (iii) erected the bollards to the House of Assembly forecourt area;
- (iv) constructed the bases for the telephone booths;
- (v) repaved an area of footway that had been damaged by vehicles being driven on it;
- (vi) undertook snagging works such as grinding of identification marks on manhole covers and compaction and levelling of paving that were not up to the required standard;
- (vii) the specified light fittings for the public toilets have also been fixed and final kitting out of the janitor's room was also completed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1751 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Was there any additional cost involved for those works?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The only item that I have mentioned which was not part of the main contract was the paving of the floor of the Lobby of the House of Assembly, the rest were all included in the original contract. The only additional cost was in respect of that item.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister in a position to tell the House what the cost of that paving was?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This item was always scheduled to be done. However, it was not part of the original contract. I have not got that information with me but I can make that information available to the hon Member if he wishes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just add something just to make sure my hon Colleague does not inadvertently. I think his answer is correct but I am not sure the final certification for that contract has yet been done. Although I am not suggesting that it is the case, it may be the case that additional overtime costs were incurred in order to finish certain tasks in time for the inauguration by the Princess Royal. So I am not saying that there was or that I think there was, or that I am aware of any such issue, I am not but I know that there was a last minute rush and that there was weekend working and working late into the evening. I do not know whether that entitles or does not entitle the contractor to make an additional claim for overtime in respect of this labour. So with that caveat, which I will confirm to the hon Member, the Minister's answer stands.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Yes, I would be grateful if the hon Members could confirm that situation to me. Has the development been handed over by the contractor to the Government already or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe that the contract has not yet been handed over completely. However, it is almost there.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the additional costs which we were discussing, I seem to recall when we debated this issue earlier that the project had been delayed and that there was a kind of penalty clause whereby the contractor would have to pay the Government so much money depending on the length of the delay. Can the Minister say if he has this

information available whether the contractor will end up paying more to the Government than the Government to the contractor for the additional work that took place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think we will not be able to confirm one way or the other until the contract is actually terminated and the final analysis is done of the work by the architect et cetera.

ORAL

**NO. 1752 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – WESTERN BEACH**

Can Government say whether and if so when the kiosk at Western Beach was put out to tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There is no kiosk at Western Beach.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1752 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is there a facility at the beach whereby food and drink is sold to the people who go to the beach?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There are not any facilities on Western Beach.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is there a facility near the beach to which users of the beach avail themselves of?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There are indeed facilities near the beach but not on Western Beach.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the facility which is near the beach and not on the beach, was that put out to tender and if so when?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I will explain the situation. A certain gentleman approached the Gibraltar Tourist Board with the idea of obtaining a concession as a beach concession, like a lot of others during the bathing season. In fact, this concession was offered to him after his application but the gentleman concerned decided not to take the offer. He subsequently built up some form of kiosk in the adjacent land, which is not under the jurisdiction of the Gibraltar Tourist Board as such for beach concessions. When questioned by the Port Department he claimed he had a concession by the Gibraltar Tourist Board. For a while the thing was left in limbo in that the Port thought that the Tourist Board had done it, the Tourist Board thought that the Port had done it. It then subsequently came to light and by the time the thing had been brought to a head, the season was almost over. So that is how the matter developed but let me say that people on the beach and those that use the small boat owners facilities were actually quite keen with the facility because it provided a much needed facility to the area. So obviously this will not happen next year because everybody will be on alert but unfortunately that situation arose.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

So is it the case then that for next year this will be included in the general tender for beach concessions that we discussed earlier in this meeting?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the situation is one where the facilities were offered as a beach concession but was not taken up. He subsequently built up a facility in the adjacent area which does not come under the Gibraltar Tourist Board. So the facilities will be available again next year and applicants will be able to apply. Obviously the Port Department will keep an eye that a repetition does not re-occur.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Just as a point of clarification, the land in question comes under the Port Department not under the GTB but it is not MOD land, is that the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, not at all. It is part of the jurisdiction of the Port.

**NO. 1753 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CATALAN BAY**

Has the tender for Phase 2 and Phase 3 for the beautification of Catalan Bay now been awarded, and if so to whom and for how much, showing the amounts bid by the unsuccessful tenderers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government decided not to proceed with the tender for Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the beautification of Catalan Bay. A new tender, for revised specifications, was advertised on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2004. It was awarded to AMCO (Gibraltar) Limited in the sum of £346,899.16p.

It is not Government policy to state the amounts bid by unsuccessful tenderers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1753 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government say whether the tender by AMCO was the lowest tender?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid I cannot confirm this. I believe it was but I will have to check this and maybe confirm the matter to him by writing to him. I believe it was but I would not say that I am absolutely sure that that was the case.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I would welcome confirmation by writing.

**NO. 1754 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ALLOCATION OF VACANT UNITS**

Have the tenders in respect of the vacant units at the following sites now been allocated, and if so to whom and for what purpose:

- (a) Lathbury Barracks units 1, 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 28;
- (b) Europa Business Centre unit F10A;
- (c) Governor's Cottage Camp unit 12;
- (d) Harbour's Walk, New Harbours units 73, 74, 90, 91, 98 and 102;
- (e) Harbour's Deck, New Harbours units 44b and 61?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.



**Answer to Question 1754**

**ALLOCATION OF TENDERS FOR VACANT UNITS**

**(a) Lathbury Barracks Industrial Park**

| Unit no | Awarded to              | User                              |
|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1       | Triay Stagnetto Neish   | Store                             |
| 5       | Parcee Investments      | Wholesale Store                   |
| 10      | A Berrak & A Lagrieh    | Carpentry Workshop                |
| 17      | Hammonds Ltd            | Store                             |
| 18      | Ross Co Ltd             | Warehousing, Offices and Showroom |
| 19      | Duncan Borg             | Store                             |
| 23      | Nebig Constructions Ltd | Store                             |
| 24      | Colomendy Ltd           | Store                             |
| 26      | E A Management Ltd      | Workshop                          |
| 27      | D Menez                 | Store                             |
| 28      | Not allocated           |                                   |

**(b) Europa Business Centre**

| Unit no | Awarded to    | User |
|---------|---------------|------|
| F10A    | Not allocated |      |

**(c) Governor's Cottage Camp**

| Unit no | Awarded to    | User |
|---------|---------------|------|
| 12      | Not allocated |      |

**(d) Harbour's Walk – New Harbours**

| Unit no | Awarded to             | User                    |
|---------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| 73      | Gibtelecom Ltd         | Operations Headquarters |
| 74      | Gibtelecom Ltd         | Operations Headquarters |
| 90      | Not allocated          |                         |
| 91      | Not allocated          |                         |
| 98      | Not allocated          |                         |
| 102     | Micro Business Systems | Office/Store/Showroom   |

**(e) Harbour's Deck – New Harbours**

| Unit no | Awarded to    | User         |
|---------|---------------|--------------|
| 44B     | Techtrolec    | Office/Store |
| 61      | Not allocated |              |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1754 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Because there are five different areas, in relation first to the Lathbury Barracks Industrial park, is it possible for the Minister to say whether the people who were awarded tenders were in fact the highest, the ones who would pay more, or were these fixed amounts they had to pay?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The criteria that was used by the Government in the allocation of these premises did not only take into consideration the possible premium that was being asked, because in some cases there was no premium offered at all, so therefore the criteria used by the Government in order to select the successful tenderers were based on the nature of the business, the employment generating that these facilities would facilitate, the vacating of existing premises, whether the business was a new or an existing business and these criteria were all used in order to be able to select that. There was an element of obviously taking the premium into account but it was not the only criteria.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In terms of creating employment, of the 10 at Lathbury Barracks that were allocated, eight were allocated as a store. Is that because they had a storekeeper or a warehouse manager or something and they created employment in that respect?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

They could have done. Obviously if additional storage meant possibly additional distribution facilities and therefore additional people being employed. As I said, employment was not the only criteria either.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the Lathbury Barracks, there was unit 28 which was not allocated. The unit at Europa Business Centre was not allocated. The one at Governor's Cottage was not allocated and there are three units at Harbours Walk that were not allocated and one at Harbour's Deck. Is that because nobody was interested in the units and if that was the case would the Government put this out to tender once again?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, the tender invited interested parties to apply for a specific unit and then put an order of preference. In some cases there was no interest actually expressed for a specific unit so what we have done is that we have instructed LPS to write to all those

that were not successful and offering them the empty units that are left, with the hope that some of these will be taken up. However, for example, in the case of Harbour's Deck, New Harbours, which is unit 61 that has not been allocated because the Government may be requiring this for its own use to relocate a particular organisation into that unit, so therefore it is pending that decision.

**NO. 1755 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPA POINT**

When do Government expect to commence and complete the improvements to Europa Point that were announced in the Budget of 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No date has as yet been set for commencing the improvements to Europa Point.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1755 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the intention of the Government to commence the project in this financial year?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There is a programme in place which we are now trying to put together which will meet the requirements that the Government want to see up in Europa Point. There may be some aspects of that that may actually commence this financial year but the project that we are looking at is very much an overall scheme for the whole area and therefore this will need to be phased in over a period of time.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

At the Budget of 2003 the Minister mentioned the provision of extensive car parking, the replacement or perhaps demolition of the existing structure which was there, which is a shop or something, and replacing that and improvements to the actual mound as well. Has the nature of the project changed or are the Government seeing it in the same way as it was in 2003?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The nature of the project is similar to what has been described but I would not want to commit the Government to any particular details of the scheme because it is still on the discussion and drawing board for possible changes.

**NO. 1756 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**UPPER ROCK**

Following the last Question Time in this House, can Government say on what date were the slopes of the Upper Rock last cleaned, by whom and at what cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The slopes on the Upper Rock are cleaned by Master Service (Gibraltar) Limited every Monday, Wednesday and Friday at a cost of £4,422.50p per month.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1756 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In the answer the Minister has given, the use of the word 'slopes' obviously does not mean the road or the hill, it means the actual slopes where there are trees and bushes and all that, is that what the Minister is referring to?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

ORAL

**NO. 1757 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CONFERENCE ASSISTANCE**

Can Government list the conferences that they have assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored since April 2004 inclusive, showing the dates of the conferences in question?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1757 of 2004**

**CONFERENCES WHICH THE GOVERNMENT HAVE ASSISTED WITH, SPONSORED  
OR CO-SPONSORED SINCE APRIL 2004 INCLUSIVE**

RIMS (Risk and Insurance Management Society) annual conference and exhibition, San Diego, USA, 18-21 April 2004.

Lloyds TSB Gibraltar Insurance Seminar, Caleta Hotel, 20 May 2004.

Luxembourg Rendezvous Viennial Risk Management and Risk Financing Conference and Exhibition, Luxembourg/Kirchberg, 12-13 May 2004.

AIRMIC (Association of Insurance and Risk Managers), Manchester International Convention Centre, Manchester, UK, 14-16 June 2004.

VCIA (Vermont Captive Insurance Association) annual conference and exhibition, Burlington, Vermont, USA, 10-12 August 2004.

Swiss independent portfolio manager's seminar, Finance Centre conference room, Europort, 9 September 2004.

Gibraltar Bankers' Association annual conference, Caleta Hotel, 29 September 2004.



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1757 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has given me a list which has seven conferences on it. Of the seven, three were in Gibraltar. I think that is the first time that conferences have been included in the list which are not in Gibraltar. Is this because the Government have attended the conferences themselves or they have assisted the organisers to actually hold the conference?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I raised the same issue yesterday myself when I saw this answer because it was prepared in my absence when I was unwell, but I think the interpretation that had been given to this by the Finance Centre Director was that if, for example, they were participating in an insurance conference and seminar and they had a stand and possibly participants from the Gibraltar Finance Centre participated as speakers or at a round table discussion or whatever, they felt that they had assisted in the conference. I do not think it implies any financial sponsorship as such. So therefore the answer may or may not be correct depending on ones interpretation of what one is trying to seek. There have not been any financial contributions in any of those.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The information I was trying to seek is the same, this question is normally one which comes up at every meeting of the House. Is it that the question has been handed to the Finance Centre Director to answer this time and before was answered by somebody else?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Not at all. I really do not understand his interpretation of this, the answer that I would have given for this was that there had not been any assistance in terms of financial assistance in any of these conferences. However, his interpretation on this occasion has been such, I did not want to change the answer because I was not sure but I did check yesterday and that was the answer that I was given, that their assistance had been in terms of participation in terms of stands or discussions, or speakers or whatever at that conference.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister amongst other points will see that the question makes no reference to the Finance Centre or to Finance Centre issues firstly. For example I know that the Calpe Conference which I think is organised by the Government and which took place within since April, the question says since April 2004, that conference is not on the list which the Minister has supplied me with.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well if I may suggest to the hon Member that I write to him with the information that he is seeking, which has always been traditionally what has always been replied and not the way it has been replied on this occasion. Let me say that when the question asked 'can Government', obviously that includes the Finance Centre as well.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I would be grateful if the Minister could write to me and clarify those points, and yes of course the Government includes the Finance Centre but obviously the other departments as well that may be involved in organising conferences.

ORAL

**NO. 1758 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

Who are the current owners of the land at Grand Parade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1759 to 1768 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1759 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

Who conducted the Geological Survey and the Topological Survey at Grand Parade that received a £60,000 grant from the Government as revealed at the last Question Time in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758 and 1760 to 1768 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1760 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

What were the conclusions of the Geological Survey and the Topological Survey of Grand Parade and will Government make these public?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758, 1759 and 1761 to 1768 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1761 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

What share, if any, of the £60,000 cost of the Geological Survey and Topological Survey of Grand Parade was not borne by the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758 to 1760 and 1762 to 1768 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1762 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

On what date were the results of the Geological Survey and the Topographical Survey of Grand Parade submitted to the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758 to 1761 and 1763 to 1768 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1763 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

On what date were proposals first made to the Government for the construction of an underground car park at Grand Parade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758 to 1762 and 1764 to 1768 of 2004.



ORAL

NO. 1764 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GRAND PARADE**

Who will own and operate the underground car park at Grand Parade when it is ready?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758 to 1763 and 1765 to 1768 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1765 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

What revenue will Government make as a result of agreeing to the construction of an underground car park at Grand Parade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758 to 1764 and 1766 to 1768 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1766 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

What will be the projected cost to the Government of the construction of an underground car park in Grand Parade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758 to 1765, 1767 and 1768 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1767 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

On what terms and conditions have Government agreed to the construction of an underground car park at Grand Parade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1758 to 1766 and 1768 of 2004.

**NO. 1768 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

On what date did the construction of an underground car park at Grand Parade go out to tender?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No concession has as yet been granted to any entity to own and operate an underground car park at Grand Parade. A particular company, Grand Developments Limited first made a proposal to Government in February 1999. They made an application for assistance under the Gibraltar Enterprise Scheme to carry out a geological survey and a topographical survey and to prepare a design for the project. A grant in the sum of £44,800 was given broken down as follows:-

|    |                      |         |
|----|----------------------|---------|
| 1. | Geological Survey    | £ 3,000 |
| 2. | Topographical Survey | £ 360   |
| 3. | Scheme Design        | £41,440 |

It is for the company to appoint its consultants, and their reports are for the use of the company and not for submission to Government.

The issue of potential revenue to Government from an underground car park at Grand Parade, or the costs – if any – to the Government do not as yet arise. The project has yet to be finalised, so it is premature to enquire about tenders for its construction.

The land at Grand Parade is owned by the Government.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1758 TO 1768 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There are a number of questions which the Minister has answered together so I will go through them with any supplementaries that may arise. The first one is the application for planning permission to construct a multi-storey underground car park appeared at the

beginning of August, I certainly do not recall having seen an application for planning permission from a company to construct something on land which is not theirs. Is this the first time that this has happened? Can the Minister say whether this is the case this time?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No this is not the case. An outline application can be submitted by any individual or company for a project which may be constructed on land that does not belong to it at the time of submitting the application. So there is nothing irregular about the application which the hon Member describes was submitted in August.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If one is a potential investor with a potential development scheme of some sort, the Government can enter into an agreement as landlord, as owner of the land, to sell the land or even to authorise the scheme or even to say that they will support the scheme in the DPC, but the Government are not the DPC and therefore cannot guarantee or agree to issue a planning permission. So it is not infrequent that people test whether a planning permit is likely to issue before they commit themselves legally and financially to pursue a project. It is not just the financial costs of the acquisition of the land, developing these projects to the stage of planning permission often takes quite a lot of expenditure in terms of fees and investigation, and developers like to know that at least so far as outline planning is concerned, because that is where issues of principle would need to be raised by DPC, so it is not unusual and it is certainly not unique to this case. It is inevitable.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Do we understand from that that there is already an agreement for the sale of the land?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is not an agreement yet, there is a proposal. They are still at the feasibility stage, the Government have indicated in principle that provided subject to surveys and subject to future operational methods, in other words, how are they going to operate the car park in the future, and subject to construction implementation approval. In other words, what degree of disruption is going to take place, for how long, to existing facilities whilst the project takes place. Subject to being satisfied on all of those things, which have not yet happened, the Government have indicated that in principle they would be willing to see an underground car park built in Grand Parade. Negotiations have started but they have certainly not been completed or I do not think anywhere near being completed.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I mentioned earlier that I had not seen this formula or this procedure before, because the normal practice, certainly since I have been shadowing this department, is that something comes out to tender, an area in the sea front or a plot of land, then companies submit a tender with proposals as to what they are going to build on it, then the Government select one of the tenderers. In this particular case, from what the Chief Minister is saying, this project will not go out to tender. If it proceeds it will be done by the company that submitted the proposal in 1999. Is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is the correct. The Government's policy, as the hon Member knows, is that disposal of Crown lands is normally done by tender but from the very beginning we have made it clear, back from 1996, that an exception would be made to projects which were substantial and in the economic or social interests of Gibraltar. If somebody comes with a project to spend many, many millions of pounds in building a multi-storey car park, one cannot turn round and say 'hang on, it is a jolly good idea, let me put it out to tender to see if we offer the idea to somebody else instead'. So if the project is large enough and unique enough and the idea of the developer rather than something that the Government want to achieve on that land, then an exception is made. In fact since 1996 there have been very few exceptions to that and I cannot presently think of one but I think there has been one in the past even though I cannot recall now what it is.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

One of the issues which arises from this, from an examination of the plans which were made public, is that under Grand Parade there are a series of World War II tunnels or tunnels of some kind which the Minister may have wanted to open to the public at some point as a tourism project of some heritage value, where would a project which involves the construction of an underground car park leave the tunnels and the facilities which are already there?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

My understanding is that the project does not actually impinge on any of these tunnels with the exception of Ragged Staff Tunnel which may be part of the actual underground car parking facility. However, this was sort of mentioned at the last meeting I had with the developers and they have not come back to me with a firm commitment as to whether they would or not be pursuing that option.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister mentioned that proposals were first put forward in February 1999 to the Government. Can the Minister explain what happened to them in the last six years, have they been on the shelf and the Government have finally decided that it is a good idea to have this project going ahead?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, during this time the company has been given clear decisions from the Government but obviously they have been looking at the feasibility of the project, the financing of the project, the actual structural requirements, the concerns expressed in respect of the tunnels, a number of issues that they have had to address during this time and that is the time that they have taken to come forward. They are now in the near completion stages of taking a decision and that is where we are.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

On the point of ownership, one of the questions related to who will own and operate the car park, I cannot recall the Minister's answer on that particular point. Is it that that has not been agreed between the Government and the company at this stage?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The principle of the matter is that the underground car park will be operated by the developer. However, the terms under which they will operate and for the purpose which they will operate it is still under final discussion, because one of the issues that obviously the Government are keen to address is facilitating parking facilities for those that live in the area, on an on-going basis and not find itself to have an underground car park where it is only for day visitors for example, who wish to use the car park. It is looking after the social interests of the area as well.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Just to establish the point, the land will be sold by the Government to the developer. That is to say, they will have to pay for it. It is not in exchange for building the car park and operating it and providing a facility that they will get the land for free.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Government are negotiating a premium for the lease of the land for a period of time, under normal practice.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I move on now to the questions on the survey of the land. The size of the area of the actual car park, is that the size of the whole area of Grand Parade as it is today?



**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well it depends what is meant by Grand Parade. If what is meant is the actual square, yes, it covers underground all areas with the exception of the area around the Cable Car where there are obviously foundations and things which have to be kept clear, and I think the Barbary Ape Kiosk in the corner which is not affected by the scheme.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Minister have with him, and if not if he could supply the information, the actual surface area which is involved of land? Both at ground level and then the levels that go beneath. In square metres or feet, what is the surface area of the land?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I have not got that information with me but I can tell him that the surface area which exists today will remain as is. In other words, what we see today will remain. Possibly with some alterations in some levels but the area as such will remain the same, and then there will be three levels underneath that, providing approximately 1,200 car parking spaces.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Would the Minister be willing to write to me and let me know what the actual surface area of the land is going to be?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government have no difficulty providing him with geographical information about Gibraltar, namely the square metres of the existing Grand Parade area, which I understand is what he is asking. My Colleague is in some doubt as to whether he is asking for the square metres of each floor of the proposed development, which I do not understand him to be asking. If he is, it is premature to give him that because it is still only a proposal but he can have that in due course as soon as it is fixed. In the meantime what we will give him is the superficial dimensions of the existing Grand Parade.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What we are after really is the plot of land which is going to be given to the developer to be able to build the car park, that surface area.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, it will be a plot of land on the surface. The surface has not been given to them, we will have to make the surface available to them to remove temporarily so that they can build underneath it, but the surface will remain a public piece of land, free car park. In other words, of course there will be disruption on our surface but we are not alienating the surface. So, the area that will be the subject matter of the agreement would be the area underneath our surface.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In square metres, presumably because they need to remove the surface in order to build the levels that go underneath it. That would be the square metre area that we are interested in having. The surface area of the project which would be the ceiling or the roof of the car park I suppose.

**HON S E LINARES:**

As a matter of interest, would this affect Tiny Tots Nursery?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON S E LINARES:**

When the Chief Minister says yes, that means that they will be given another allocation in order to use that surface area as well.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The question was not whether they will have to be permanently relocated. The question was whether they would be affected. The answer is that they will be affected, at least during the construction phase.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So the next subsequent question is are they going to be moved, reallocated?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I think there is need for a temporary relocation which the developers would have to undertake to do at their expense but the present proposal does not envisage any need for a permanent relocation.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Reverting to the original questions on the geological survey and the topographical survey. One of the questions asked whether the Government would be willing to make the conclusions of those surveys public?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

These surveys belong to the company, they do not belong to the Government. Therefore they have not even been made available to us. Obviously our own technical people would need to assess those surveys if they are meant to be part of the construction material and obviously those will be analysed in due course, but there is no need for them to submit any surveys to us at this stage.

ORAL

**NO. 1769 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MARINA BAY**

On what date was outline planning permission granted in respect of the Tradewinds development at Marina Bay?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1770 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1770 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MARINA BAY**

How many representations were made to the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the application for planning permission for the Tradewinds project at Marina Bay?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Outline planning permission was granted on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2004. No representations were received from the public.

ORAL

**NO. 1771 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ROCK HOTEL**

When was the environmental impact assessment in respect of “The Rock Gardens” project at the Rock Hotel submitted to the Government and on what date was planning permission granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Town Planner determined that no Environmental Impact Assessment was required for the project. Outline planning permission was granted on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2003.

**NO. 1772 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Do Government now have a target date for the publication of the draft Development Plan?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The target date is early 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1772 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say at what stage of preparations the project actually is at this moment in time?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, the draft has already been completed. I have actually read the draft as Chairman of the Development and Planning Commission, there have been some adjustments and alterations that are being made, there will be a draft that will be submitted to all members of the Development and Planning Commission in order to have their input and in fact other Government Departments as well. We intend to carry out a full environmental impact assessment study on the development plan to ensure that any areas which may be suggested or earmarked in any particular way in the plan, will be pointed out to us ahead of publication and then there will be public consultation before the document becomes valid and in place.

ORAL

**NO. 1773 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2004 and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Six meetings have taken place on the following dates:-

26<sup>th</sup> May 2004  
8<sup>th</sup> June 2004  
18<sup>th</sup> June 2004  
7<sup>th</sup> July 2004  
29<sup>th</sup> July 2004  
23<sup>rd</sup> September 2004



**NO. 1774 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MARINA BAY**

Can Government say whether outline planning permission has now been granted in respect of the application from Marina Bay Complex Limited to construct a multi-storey car park/commercial development and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Outline planning permission has not yet been granted.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1774 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether the Development and Planning Commission are actually looking at the project for some particular reason which has caused this delay in granting planning permission, or is it just a normal procedure?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The Government are not willing to give this sort of information in respect of the administrative stage of any particular application.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister in a position to say whether the fact that outline planning permission has not yet been granted is perhaps linked to any representations which have been made?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just clarify this because this is a matter of Government policy? The position is that the Government are not technically answerable in this House for the Development and Planning Commission, but nevertheless because the Minister is the Chairman, the Government's policy is to be as accountable as is proper in this House for the affairs of the DPC, even though we are not actually accountable at all as a Government. The DPC is not the Government, it is a separate statutory body, independent of the Government. As I say, as the Minister is the Chairman and our policy is for Elected Members of the Government to be accountable for everything that they do and participate in, we answer questions but going as far as it is proper to go, without offending the rights of individual citizens to confidentiality in the conduct of their affairs. So, for example, the hon Member has seen that in respect of DPC we answer questions about whether planning permission has been given or not, and we answer questions about the public participation in the process, about whether there had been any responses for example to the public consultation process, whether any member of the public has objected, and about whether the Town Planner has or has not ordered an environmental impact assessment. When it comes to the particular administration handling of a particular application, with a name and a project that can be identified, we think people are entitled to have their business with the Government administratively handled other than in the public gaze. The hon Member is entitled to the results of the process and to the Government's input into the process, but I think citizens are also entitled to confidentiality in their conduct of their affairs with the Government. So we draw the line and hon Members will see that there is a cluster of questions just coming up on the Order Paper, which have been clustered together because they fall on the wrong side of the line, where we think the hon Member is asking for details about where exactly a particular application now lies, and we think that that strays onto the wrong side of the line of where we think it is proper for us to account on this matter.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Then I will ask the two questions which the Chief Minister has said the Government are willing to answer in relation to these projects. That is, in relation to this particular one, whether any representations were made, which the Minister normally answers and the other question which he mentioned, whether any objections had been raised by anyone?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not have the information that the hon Member is seeking on this particular project and I cannot recall as I stand here the answer to these. I am happy to let him have the information but I will have to do so by writing to him.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If the Minister could write to us with that information I would be grateful.

ORAL

**NO. 1775 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the application for planning permission by Casemates Development Limited to erect three additional storeys?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Five.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1775 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister presumably is free to say whether these were supportive or whether there were objections.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There were five objections.

**NO. 1776 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration of the following and what representations, if any, have been received in each case:

- (a) 34 Cornwall's Lane – two additional flats and associated facilities;
- (b) British Lines Road – microwave antenna link station;
- (c) Units 7 and 8 Watergardens – take-away business Class A3;
- (d) 26-32 George's Lane – demolish existing building and construct five storey residential building with lock-up garages;
- (e) 14 John Mackintosh Square – refurbish existing building and add further accommodation at roof level;
- (f) B Block Europa Road – build an extension?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1777 to 1782 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1777 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

Can Government say at what stage is the application for planning permission at 11/15 Turnbull's Lane by Turnbull Enterprises Limited to extend the building and convert it to a hotel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1776 and 1778 to 1782 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1778 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration of the application for planning permission by Monaco Ocean Village Limited to construct a pontoon, and how many representations have been received in respect of this project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1776, 1777 and 1779 to 1782 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1779 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration of the application for planning permission by Monaco Ocean Village Limited to construct a wooden boardwalk next to Waterport Wharf from the Coachpark to Ocean Village with small cafes, and how many representations have been received in respect of this project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1776 to 1778 and 1780 to 1782 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1780 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration of the application for planning permission by Ocean Village (Gibraltar) Limited to add a Sea Aquarium at the Spa Building Ocean Village, and how many representations have been received in respect of this project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1776 to 1779, 1781 and 1782 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1781 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration of the application for planning permission for 65 residential units and car parking at Sir Herbert Miles Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1776 to 1780 and 1782 of 2004.

**NO. 1782 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration of the application by 21<sup>st</sup> Century Rock Limited to provide a funicular installation from Casemates to Rock Gun?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

As the Chief Minister has already said, the Government do not think that it is appropriate to provide in this House such details relating to the administrative handling of individual cases.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1776 TO 1782 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The asking of this particular question, at what stage the application is, is something that I have been doing when for example, previous Ministers used to answer these questions and if I recall their answer used to be that for example the development licence had been granted or that outline planning permission had been granted, at what stage the application was. Is this a new policy?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a new policy because of the extent to which the hon Member is taking, in effect he is asking for a report here on a quarterly basis of the conduct of the DPC's administrative business in every case in front of it. We do not think that is an appropriate exercise. There are elements of his questions which could have been answered, well in some of his questions there are elements that could have been answered but we do not have the information here and we will give to him. For example, in one or two of his questions I just heard read, he has asked whether representations have been received or not. That information is okay because that involves public participation in the process, and that information will be provided to him at the end of the day whether planning permission

has been granted or not. The Government are certainly willing to consider a system of gazetting planning permissions when they have been granted so that there is a public record of whether an application has been granted or not. That sort of system might be an improvement but I do not think we can deal with it on a case by case basis in this House. I do not think it is appropriate really for this House to be debating the affairs of individual commercial entities, as opposed to examining the system. The hon Member is free to ask us, given what our policy is about accounting for the DPC, whether we think the DPC works efficiently or whether we think that systems within the DPC can be improved. Questioning in all that area is fine. Seeking a case report on individual peoples applications I think is straying too far in the areas of Parliamentary scrutiny. The hon Member has said that initially that was not, when he was only asking about the major projects, and when this line of questioning started it was limited to the major commercial type projects and had not strayed into somebody wanting to build a balcony in George's Lane or whatever it is the question about George's Lane. If that is to be the extent of his interest then the Government have got to draw a line to make sure that individuals are given some measure of protection for the confidentiality of their affairs.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Chief Minister is correct, my Colleague has obtained for me the last copy of Hansard which is from January this year and there were questions asking at what stage, for example, was the consideration of the construction of two houses at the northern end of Both Worlds for instance, the question which was answered. There were other questions relating to different projects. Little Genoa at Catalan Bay for example.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The two houses at Catalan Bay raised major issues of Government policy. There are issues about development at the foot of that particular Rock face which raised substantial issues of Government policies and I think that would be legitimate. That raises issues not about that particular application but generally about the development of that area.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I have also realised that the question which relates to the funicular installation which is the cable car project from Casemates to Rock Gun, which has been tabled this time, was actually tabled in exactly the same way last time in January and an answer to the question was given. Perhaps if the Government make that distinction between private individuals wanting to put up a balcony and large projects, could they not answer those that relate to large projects and not the ones that relate to private individuals?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think having been forced into a policy decision by the extent of the hon Member's detailed interest, it would be very difficult for the Government to alter the application of the policy on a case by case basis, because there would be grey areas. I think there are

cases of development applications where it is perfectly legitimate for the hon Member to express an interest. For example, the funicular just to use the latest one that he has mentioned as an example, that is a matter worth debating in this House whether it is a good or a bad idea regardless of the planning process. The hon Member might wish to formulate his questions more generally in relation to what is Government policy or are the Government aware whether any planning issues arise from this project, which we could try and answer in terms of Government policy but without standing in the shoes of the DPC and without dealing with the question as a question on somebody's planning application in detail. So it is perfectly legitimate for the hon Member because these are projects that ultimately have got to be approved not just by the DPC but indeed by the Government themselves something like the funicular railway. That is a perfectly legitimate area for the hon Member to put questions to the Government about and I am sure he will be able, quite easily, to formulate the questions which get more or less the same information as he is seeking about them, without focusing the questions about being questions about at what stage is this in the DPC's consideration. As formulated the question actually asks us to give a snapshot of where the DPC's internal deliberations is on a particular issue. Not even just asking for a stage report. At what stage is the Development and Planning Commission's consideration? A proper answer to that question for example, might include 'well they are split, four of them think it is a good idea, three of them think it is not a bad idea. They have agreed to meet next week to see if they can thrash out their differences'. It is not the sort of area that we think it is appropriate to get in, but I am sure the hon Member in respect of the major economic type projects, these are some of the larger residential projects, I am sure can re-formulate his questions in a different language which will not incur on the Government's new policy. I accept it is a new policy.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the questions that have been tabled in this House for example, there are a number of them relating to Monaco Ocean Village, there is one relating to the funicular project which we have already mentioned, there is a total of five at least that relate to these large projects. There is in fact one or two questions where I actually bundled together the smaller projects which are essentially residential. The second point I want to make, when I have asked this type of question of the Development Appeals Tribunal, originally this was dealt with by the Hon Mr Britto, now it is the Hon Mr Vinet who deals with it, the answers that we were given in relation to the Development Appeals Tribunal was that a case was still under consideration, it was pending or it was waiting for information from the applicant or from the Government, simple short answers like that. I take the point the Chief Minister has made in relation to.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is still under consideration is not a particularly informative answer to the hon Member.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

No, but it included at what stage the consideration was, whether it was waiting for information from the Government or from the applicant. I understand that this is a new

policy and the Chief Minister has explained the situation well but given that there are a number of questions that relate to larger projects and not to smaller personal projects as it were, would the Government be willing to supply the answers to those questions in writing?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think having made the policy I do not think we should draw a distinction between writing or not writing. The hon Member raises the question of the microwave link and people living near it wanting to know about it. Well, that is taken care of by the fact that the Government have introduced a public consultation process. Whoever submitted this application has had to advertise it, and the neighbours as he call it, I would be very interested if I were a neighbour in this planning application, they have had their opportunity to, assuming that the advertising requirements are extensive enough, most people will have heard of it and will have expressed their views if they want to. I remit the hon Member to the last answer that I gave him to his previous supplementary which is that the Government do not want the burden of having to judge on each case, whether it is a large or a small project, whether it is a private individual that deserves protecting or a commercial operator that does not, in terms of confidentiality both are entitled to confidentiality. What we are trying to do is to strike the right balance between the proper level of accountability in this House and the protection of individuals. If the hon Member wants questions answered about specific projects, I think the best way for him to proceed would be either to strike the question in the context of has this been granted or not granted yet. Basic stage information like that is not too difficult. Has it been granted or has it not yet been granted? He will have noticed that those questions have been answered this morning a few moments ago. As to whether a particular application has been granted or not granted, that is all right, that does not reveal any sort of information, but if he wants a sort of an account of the issues in the internal discussion by the DPC, that is where we have a problem. I can see him nodding and shaking at different stages of my point. If that means that he can live with that distinction and that he can accommodate it by altering the wording of his questions, then there would not be a difficulty between us.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Certainly the questions will be altered but it is not that we are requesting an internal account of what is going on inside the DPC. It is simply that when this question was asked in the past the answer used to be the development licence has been granted, or the outline planning permission has been granted, there used to be a series of answers I used to get from the two Ministers that were responsible.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Now he has asked specific questions about a specific licence. If in another question he asks has this licence been granted and then in respect of another development he asks at what stage is the consideration, we have got to assume that there is an intended difference between the two questions. If he was just interested in respect of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Rock whether the licence has been granted, he would have formulated in the same

language as he did the previous questions. There is an assumption therefore that there is a difference of language. I do not know if that distinction used to take place originally, I do not recall it.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I then move on to some of the other issues that arise from the questions?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am delighted to say to the hon Member, we are willing to answer him in writing, these questions in relation to the ground rules that we are informally establishing now. So I think the Minister can write to him saying whether these applications that we have given him this answer to, have been granted yet or not granted yet.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1777, which is the one for a conversion to a hotel, could I make a general enquiry as to the process? That is to say, if somebody wants to set up or open a hotel, is planning permission all they need, or do they need anything extra from the Tourist Board?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think there are two aspects in this. One is obviously the planning, which will mean that they would have to be subjected to an application through the Development and Planning Commission. Then the other would be a possible change of use, which they would have to seek from Government as landlords.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Tourist Board itself would not need to have an input in this decision making, is that the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No they would not but it may be the case that for example, Land Property Services if they have a situation where an application is made for a change of use, it would come to Land Management which I chair myself, so therefore I would have an input in the matter.

ORAL

**NO. 1783 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID CERTIFICATES**

Can Government list the companies and projects that are in receipt of development aid, giving the name of the project, its location, the date the certificate was granted, and the amount?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1784 to 1787 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1784 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID CERTIFICATES**

How many development aid certificates were granted in the last financial year and in respect of what projects?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1783 and 1785 to 1787 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1785 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID CERTIFICATES**

Can Government list which companies in receipt of development aid certificates have used those certificates to conduct duty-free importations to Gibraltar, giving the name of the project, the date the certificate was used, and showing what was imported in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1783, 1784, 1786 and 1787 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1786 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID CERTIFICATES**

Can Government list the companies and projects which currently have development aid and have not used it all up by the tax year ending in June 2003, showing the amounts remaining in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1783 to 1785 and 1787 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1787 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DEVELOPMENT AID CERTIFICATES**

How many applications for development aid certificates in the last financial year have not been granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached. However, I take the opportunity just to point out that the information in respect of Development Aid applications, when these are granted these are Gazetted, so therefore the information is put in the public domain so most of this information is there.

### SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 1787

All 9 new applications for development aid certificates made in the 2003/04 financial year were granted.

The projects were as follows:-

#### APPLICATIONS UNDER DEVELOPMENT AID ORDINANCE

| PROJECT                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Construction of a six-storey building with parking on part of the ground floor and two executive suites on the sixth floor at site – 55 Line Wall Road                                                                            |
| 2. Installation of an oil and polluted liquid waste treatment plant with laboratory at North Mole                                                                                                                                    |
| 3. Construction of four blocks of apartments with fifty-four residences, plus landscaping gardens with swimming pool at Cormorant Wharf, Queensway                                                                                   |
| 4. Construction of four houses and forty-three apartments plus landscaped gardens and swimming pool at Gun and Ordnance Wharf                                                                                                        |
| 5. Redevelopment of 227/231 Main Street into a five storey building – commercial premises on ground floor, office or storage at 1 <sup>st</sup> floor and residential on 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> floor |
| 6. Residential development known as Europlaza of 157 units with 272 car parking spaces at Plot A Europort                                                                                                                            |
| 7. Construction of ten houses and thirteen apartments plus external works and swimming pool at Building A Royal Naval Hospital, Europa Road                                                                                          |
| 8. Conversion of the former Barrack Building at Town Range into 11 houses, offices, garages and car parking spaces                                                                                                                   |
| 9. Installation of replacement equipment to continue to offer a state of the art commercial mobile digital radio service                                                                                                             |

None of the applicants used their development aid certificates to import goods or materials into Gibraltar free of import duty.

Companies cannot have development aid that is “not used up” as aid is granted on a tax relief basis on completion of the project.

“cont...”

**“Contd Answer to Question 1787 of 2004”**

The projects that are presently in receipt of development aid are as follows:-

| Name of Company                           | Name of Project                                                                                                                                                                                 | Location                                       | Date of Certificate         | Amount |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Sharrock Shand Developments Ltd           | Conversion of former Barrack building into 11 houses, offices, garages and car parking spaces                                                                                                   | Town Range                                     | 1 <sup>st</sup> July 2003   | 40%    |
| Queensway Quay Development Co Ltd         | Construction of 10 houses and 13 apartments plus external works and swimming pool                                                                                                               | Building "A" Royal Naval Hospital, Europa Road | 1 <sup>st</sup> July 2003   | 40%    |
| Pebble Properties Limited                 | Construction of a residential development, to be known as Europlaza, of 157 units with 272 car parking spaces at Plot A.                                                                        | Europaort                                      | 1 <sup>st</sup> July 2003   | 40%    |
| 17/25 Giro's Passage Developments Limited | Construction of a six-storey office building with parking on part of the ground floor and 2 executive suites on the sixth floor                                                                 | 55 Line Wall Road                              | 1 <sup>st</sup> July 2003   | 60%    |
| Silverlake Limited                        | Redevelopment into five storey building comprising commercial premises on the ground floor, either commercial, office or storage at first floor and residential second, third and fourth floors | 227/231 Main Street                            | 1 <sup>st</sup> July 2003   | 40%    |
| Sand Key Properties                       | Construction of 12 residential flats on two floors                                                                                                                                              | 39 Glacis Road                                 | 6 <sup>th</sup> July 2004   | 40%    |
| Queensway Quay Marina Ltd                 | 19 Luxury houses – constructed on reclaimed land                                                                                                                                                | Reclaimed land                                 | 6 <sup>th</sup> July 2004   | 20%    |
| Taylor Woodrow (Gibraltar) Ltd            | Construction of 4 houses and external works                                                                                                                                                     | Sandpits Vaults                                | 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2004 | 20%    |
| Taylor Woodrow (Gibraltar) Ltd            | Construction of 20 apartments, swimming pool                                                                                                                                                    | Rock Hotel, Staff Quarters, Europa Road        | 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2004 | 20%    |
| International Casino Galtá Casino         | Essential structural repairs and internal alterations                                                                                                                                           | 7 Europa Road                                  | 2 <sup>nd</sup> August 2004 | 100%   |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1783 TO 1787 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The answer says there are nine applications for Development Aid and he has listed the nine of them. Then he also says that none of the applicants have used the Development Aid Certificates to import goods or materials into Gibraltar free of import duty. Does that also apply to building materials that they import?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1787, the Minister has supplied a table showing the projects that are currently receiving Development Aid. The last column on that table refers to the amount and it says 40 per cent on some, 60 per cent on others, 20 per cent on others, does that percentage relate to the cost of building the project?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That percentage refers to the actual amount of development aid that is being granted to the applicant in respect of the project.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the amount of the capital investment subject to development aid. That is the percentage of, yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the comment to the answer to Question No. 1787, it says companies cannot have development aid that is not used up as aid is granted on a tax relief basis on completion of the project, but not used up can also mean that they have not exhausted the amount of aid granted. That is to say, that since finishing the project their level of profits, which I think is what they are allowed to have free of tax. If a project costs say £1 million and they have 40 per cent, am I right in thinking that they do not get taxed until the profits have exceeded £400,000, is that correct? Then the Development Aid surely is used up when they have exhausted the £400,000 tax free element. It is difficult to understand why.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is the interpretation of the words 'used up', I do not know how else it is interpreted. That would have been my interpretation had I seen the question, yes, that is true. In other words, this is carried forward, this tax relief if we can call it that is carried forward and eventually it is all used up, to use the language of the question, and I suppose it is possible by looking at the files and the tax payers behind each of these companies, but it would have to be done on a one file at a time basis to see whether they had used any of theirs up yet and how many they still had left. It is possible, we would have to think about it whether that would be proper information to give away or whether it is the sort of information about a tax payer's tax affairs which the Income Tax Ordinance prohibits the publication of. It is something we will have to think carefully about before we give that information, but I understand what the information is that he is seeking and I suppose it is technically collatable.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Government not agree that of course it is relevant in terms of the Government's revenue, to what extent developers that are tax payers are going to start paying full tax or not paying full tax at some date in the future?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, if one were interested in a simple cash flow exercise, in other words, when will all this come back on stream? Yes, but I think in practice none of these companies ever pay any tax because these are companies that are in effect most of these are development they are not let out on future rental scheme. Most of these schemes are sold and the sale proceeds either exhaust or do not exhaust. In other words, the profit upon which tax might be payable either exhausts or does not exhaust the development aid relief. It is only when one has a company that is building for long-term rental that eventually there might be an income stream which is no longer sheltered by development aid. Actually, from the point of view of Government revenue and development aid, and income coming back on stream much more relevant than shelter from income tax, it is shelter from rates, because that does kick in later on as an income stream that is alienated. Rates income and all these new properties. Eventually that does come back on stream and that is a much more relevant future income stream issue than corporate taxation on profits by the developing company.

ORAL

**NO. 1788 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – COMPUTERS**

What was the value and number of computers imported into Gibraltar since March 2004 inclusive on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1791 and 1792 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1789 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SALE AND IMPORTATION OF COUNTERFEIT GOODS**

Who have Government consulted and on what dates when considering legislation against the sale and importation of counterfeit goods?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Government intend to introduce copyright and trade mark legislation shortly in response to EU obligations. This will address issues of counterfeit goods. Draft legislation is being finalised. The Government will then decide whether there should be a consultation process, and if so, what form this process should take.

ORAL

**NO. 1790 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Business Advisory Council met since it was set up?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1702,1747 and 1811 of 2004.

**NO. 1791 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES**

What was the value and number of private motor vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since March 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1788 and 1792 of 2004.

**NO. 1792 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – GOODS VEHICLES**

What was the value and number of goods vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since March 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 1792**

## (a) IMPORTATION OF PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES

| 2004<br>Month | Vehicles Imported By: |                        |                  |                       |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|               | Individuals           |                        | Licensed Dealers |                       |
|               | Number                | Value<br>(£ thousands) | Number           | Value<br>(£ millions) |
| March         | 22                    | 77.0                   | 664              | 7.4                   |
| April         | 25                    | 64.6                   | 593              | 7.1                   |
| May           | 23                    | 99.3                   | 791              | 9.9                   |
| June          | 21                    | 76.1                   | 568              | 7.1                   |
| July          | 21                    | 50.7                   | 644              | 7.9                   |
| August        | 20                    | 86.2                   | 883              | 8.8                   |

## (b) IMPORTATION OF GOODS VEHICLES

| 2004<br>Month | Vehicles Imported By: |                        |                  |                       |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
|               | Individuals           |                        | Licensed Dealers |                       |
|               | Number                | Value<br>(£ thousands) | Number           | Value<br>(£ millions) |
| March         | 1                     | -                      | 6                | 10                    |
| April         | 2                     | 9                      | 11               | 45                    |
| May           | 4                     | 16                     | 5                | 27                    |
| June          | 2                     | 1                      | 4                | 23                    |
| July          | 2                     | 2                      | 5                | 16                    |
| August        | 1                     | -                      | 3                | 34                    |

## (c) IMPORTATION OF COMPUTERS

| 2004<br>Month | Value of<br>Computers<br>£ |
|---------------|----------------------------|
| March         | 873,989                    |
| April         | 1,245,801                  |
| May           | 1,205,166                  |
| June          | 792,279                    |
| July          | 597,030                    |
| August        | 377,650                    |

It is not possible to provide the number of computers imported as it is individual components that are imported and not fully assembled computers.

ORAL

**NO. 1793 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties who have applied for Gibraltar Government funding since the last Question Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purposes for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1794 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1794 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties who have applied for EU funding since the last Question Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purposes for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

## SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 1794 OF 2004

### Answer to Question 1793 of 2004

Two projects have been so submitted. They are as follows:-

- (1) Request for £7,311 grant from Dorcas Fashion Designs for attending international fashion shows.
- (2) Request for £30,000 loan from Risso Bakery Ltd for a "Craft" bakery.

### Answer to Question 1794 of 2004

#### APPLICATIONS FOR EU FUNDING

Fifteen applications for EU Funding have been received since the last question time in the House. Twelve applications were for ERDF Funding under the Gibraltar Objective 2 Programme (2000-2006) and three were for ESF Funding under the Gibraltar Objective 3 Programme (2000-2006).

#### ESF PROJECTS

|                 |                                |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| CTC – Intake 10 | (Dept of Education & Training) |
| ESF             | £270,931 (45%)                 |
| GOG             | <u>£334,863</u> (55%)          |
|                 | £605,794                       |

*(Training Course in the Construction Trades)*

|                 |                                |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| CTC – Intake 11 | (Dept of Education & Training) |
| ESF             | £199,364 (45%)                 |
| GOG             | <u>£243,700</u> (55%)          |
|                 | £443,064                       |

*(Training Course in the Construction Trades)*

|           |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|
| ETTS 2004 | (Dept of Education & Training) |
| ESF       | £350,688 (45%)                 |
| GOG       | <u>£428,620</u> (55%)          |
|           | £779,308                       |

*(Training Course in the Engineering Discipline)*

Cont.....



**Cont'd Schedule to Question 1794 of 2004**

**ERDF PROJECTS**

| <b>Project Sponsor</b>            | <b>Status</b>       | <b>ERDF Funding</b> | <b>Purpose of Grant</b>                                                                   |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Car Clinic Phase II               | Approved            | £2,416.00           | Purchase of Equipment Import Duty.                                                        |
| Colours Hairdressers              | Approved            | £875.00             | Rent subsidy scheme (12 months) Plumbing Works.                                           |
| Grave Services                    | Approved            | £590.00             | Purchase of Equipment.                                                                    |
| Easi-Print                        | Approved            | £2,611.00           | Purchase of printing press and payment of freight, installation charges and Import Duty.  |
| Look Hair and Beauty              | Approved            | £2,843.00           | Construction of mezzanine floor.                                                          |
| Express Repairs                   | Approved            | £1,302.50           | Purchase of Key Cutting Equipment, Payment of Import Duty, Fitting-out works.             |
| Sandwich Bar                      | Under Consideration | £4,539.00           | Fixtures & Fittings, Equipment, Door & Fire Safety, Promotion & Advertising, Import Duty. |
| General Signage                   | Approved            | £4,345.00           | Purchase of Printer and Accessories and payment of Import Duty.                           |
| Risso Bakekry T/A Emmanuels       | Under Consideration | £19,340.00          | Building and renovation works and purchase of specialised equipment                       |
| Public Bus Infrastructure Phase I | Approved            | £162,500.00         | Improvements to Bus Stops and Temporary Bus Depot.                                        |
| Dietetic Health Clinic Phase II   | Approved            | £5,000.00           | Building works, Purchase of equipment Marketing and Advertising.                          |
| Pet Clinic                        | Approved            | £4,239.00           | Equipment for car wash Dog wash system Installation works Duty                            |
|                                   |                     | £210,600.50         |                                                                                           |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1793 AND 1794 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1794 which relates to EU funding, the first ERDF project shown on the list relates to an application that was approved involving the purchase of equipment, import duty. Is it that the Government refund the import duty or the EU refund the duty? How does that work?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, what would happen in this case would be that they would pay the import duty and we would reimburse that import duty but in the form of a loan or a grant or whatever has been approved under the scheme. So there would be no exemptions being issued at all, it would have to be paid and then reimbursed.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

It would be reimbursed from EU money not from Gibraltar Government funds?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well in the case of this particular application it is EU funds, yes.

ORAL

**NO. 1795 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FERRY ASSISTANCE SCHEME**

When was the last time any company benefited from the Ferry Assistance Scheme and for what purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1796 and 1797 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1796 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FERRY ASSISTANCE SCHEME**

What criteria does an applicant have to meet in order to benefit from the Ferry Assistance Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1795 and 1797 of 2004.

**NO. 1797 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 104 – SUBHEAD 1**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £185,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 in respect of Head 104 Sub-Head 1 for Airlines, Ferry and Hotel Assistance Schemes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Ferry Assistance Scheme consisted of providing a rebate for the ferry operator in respect of passenger tax paid by ferry passengers on the Gibraltar-Tangier route at a time when the route appeared to be precarious and the Government wanted to ensure a continuity of service. The rebate was necessary until the Government decided to amend the legislation that provided for the payment of passenger tax by ferry passengers by abolishing this tax for the time being.

The only company to benefit from this scheme was Turner's, the operator of the Gibraltar-Tangier ferry. The totality of the rebate paid to Turner was £87,921 in November 2003. No further payments have been made since then and none are envisaged.

The breakdown of £185,000 is as follows:

|                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Airline Assistance         | £ 3,153  |
| Ferry Passenger tax rebate | £ 87,921 |
| Ferry Terminal works       | £ 26,594 |
| Hotel Assistance           | £ 66,621 |

**NO. 1798 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FRONTIER STATISTICS**

Can Government say whether all the data for the Frontier Statistics Table that is supplied to the Opposition is collected at the frontier and tell the House who is responsible for gathering such data and for compiling it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

All the data for the Frontier Statistics Table supplied to Opposition Members is collected at the frontier and is gathered and compiled by Security and Immigration Limited.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1798 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister confirm that that data includes the cars, coaches and pedestrians coming into Gibraltar?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct. That includes everything that is included in the table that I supply the hon Member on a monthly basis.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister then explain why I was told at Budget time that coaches were counted at the coach park and not at the frontier?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There is a count of coaches at the coach park which is done by the Gibraltar Tourist Board in order to account for revenue and ticketing admissions that have to be paid by coaches on entering the coach park. There could be coaches coming in through the frontier that do not actually go into the coach park and therefore there may be a slight variation in numbers, but both are accountable differently. The figures that are supplied to him come from Security and Immigration which have the total figure.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am grateful for this information because it confirms the position with what I thought was the position in June or July when we discussed this during the Budget. I remember the explanation I was given at Budget time was that there were less coaches coming in to Gibraltar because the counting was being done at the coach park rather than at the frontier. We had a situation where the coaches were coming in to Gibraltar, dropping off tourists, driving around Gibraltar, picking up tourists and going back without being counted, but as I understand it now the position as he has explained it today and not as what was explained to me in June, which is that they are also counted at the frontier by Security and Immigration Limited.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

ORAL

**NO. 1799 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC – EU PROJECTS**

Can Government state how much of the £1.477 million estimated to be spent on EU projects by the GDC in 2004/2005 is expected to be met from EU funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1800 to 1802 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1800 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC – EU PROJECTS**

Can Government state how much of the £1.448 million forecast outturn spent on EU projects by the GDC in 2003/2004 was met from EU funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1799, 1801 and 1802 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1801 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC – EU PROJECTS**

Can Government state how much of the £1.469 million estimated to be spent on EU projects by the GDC in 2003/2004 was expected to be met from EU funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1799, 1800 and 1802 of 2004.

**NO. 1802 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC – EU PROJECTS**

Can Government state how much of the £1,461,833 spent on EU projects by the GDC in 2002/2003 was met from EU funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The answer in each case is 45 per cent, as this is the percentage grant rate given to the GDC in respect of EU projects.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1799 TO 1802 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister then explain why the revenue shown in the Accounts of the Gibraltar Development Corporation does not reflect that 45 per cent ratio?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid I do not have a copy of the Estimate Book in front of me to be able to verify what the hon Gentleman is saying.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well then, would the Minister agree that if he had a copy in front of him and he looked at page 121, he would see that in respect of 2002/2003 which is the subject of Question No. 1802, where the expenditure came to £1,461,833 the amount collected was £419,000, that the estimate for 2003/2004 was £550,000 when the total amount estimated came to £1.469 million and the forecast which actually was just below the estimate at £1.448 million actually shows that the contribution from the ESF was only £141,000? So there is no correlation to the 45 per cent that the Minister has said should be applying in the four figures quoted in the four questions.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I take the point that the hon Member is making. My understanding is that although 45 per cent is the contribution made by the European Union in respect of these EU projects, what actually may happen is that the receipt of these are not actually correlated to the expenditure on any particular year, in that claims that are submitted to the European Union will be done after the project has been finished. So therefore the actual receipt of the funds may come later. I can tell the hon Gentleman that there is a substantial amount of money owed to the Government in respect of EU funding in terms of the ESF projects because in the year set projects our applications actually go through the United Kingdom and not directly to Brussels. So therefore we are subjected to the timing and timetable of the Department of Trade and Industry in the UK, so therefore the funding when reimbursed to us as a receipt, which I assume is what appears in the Estimates, are well behind the expected time scale of the initial expenditure in the first place.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Minister is aware that the projects that we are talking about are training schemes by the Employment and Training Unit in the GDC. I am aware that in the Improvement and Development Fund it says one has to complete the project in order to be able to claim because if the project does not get completed one can not claim, but if there is a situation where the Construction Training Centre is spending £71,000 on EU projects then are they getting 45 per cent of £71,000 or are they not? Is the Minister conscious of the fact that I have actually raised this a number of years and been given the same kind of answer that it is delays and that it is sort of carried forward but I do not know how far into the future this is being carried but we always seem to have shortfalls every year.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I can tell the hon Member that that is exactly the situation and it was only recently that I asked that those within the EU Unit would bring exactly the accounting of all this because I cannot accept that certain claims that have been made quite some time ago should be delayed to the extent that they have. In fact, I have had correspondence with the Department of Trade and Industry in the UK who have assured me that it is nothing to do with our application, it is part of their own logistics in getting in because we just form part of a much bigger project within the UK. So therefore in order to compile all the information coming in from all different areas, we just have to wait. Although we are complying with the timetabling not everybody is so therefore we need to wait for this. I can tell the hon Member that the figure owed to us is in excess of £1 million as we speak today, and it is obviously something that was of concern to me having come into office into the Trade and Industry for the first time and finding this figure still outstanding, and actually looking into some of these going back to 1999, 1998 and I thought what is going on here? Is it something that we are not doing correct? Is it something that we are not submitting our application in proper order and we are not being informed? So we tackled the whole thing head on and this is the reply that we have had. Everything is in order but it is just a matter of, I understand that recently we have had correspondence from them saying that the matter now is being cleared because we are now reaching a

point where certain schemes have to be brought up. So the last 20 per cent apparently of the funds that are available in respect of a particular objective project need to be finalised fairly soon, so hopefully we will get this backlog up and running fairly soon.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

This sort of figure of about £1 million, would that be up to the end of the last financial year or would it be up to an earlier date than that? Does the Minister know?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The figure basically goes back I think to 1998/1999 and it goes up to last March.

ORAL

**NO. 1803 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**KONVER PROJECTS**

Can Government state of the £2,007,847 spent on Konver projects to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 how much was met by EU funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1804 and 1805 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1804 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**KONVER PROJECTS**

Can Government confirm that there has been no expenditure on Konver projects since 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1803 and 1805 of 2004.

**NO. 1805 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**KONVER PROJECTS**

Can Government list the Konver projects, with the cost of each in respect of which it expects to receive £900,000 from the EU in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Konver II Programme terminated on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2001, as the submission of claims in respect of eligible expenditure is concerned. There has, consequently, been no expenditure on Konver projects since then.

Up to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003, Government spent £5,919,492 on Konver projects, and of this £2,502,188 was met or is being met by EU funds.

The Government expect to receive £500,000 from the EU and not £900,000 as incorrectly stated in the Estimates for 2004/2005 this financial year. This amount refers to the Konver II Programme as a whole and not to any specific projects. It consists of the final 20 per cent payment from the EU in respect of the programme. The payment is still pending because the UK's final programme report has not yet been ratified by the EU Commission.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1803 TO 1805 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What the Minister says is the final 20 per cent payment, what he is saying is that we already received in the I&D Fund 80 per cent of the share of the £5.9 million, is that correct?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.



ORAL

**NO. 1806 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INTERREG PROJECTS**

Can Government state of the £12,920 spent on Interreg projects to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 how much was met from EU funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1807 of 2004.

**NO. 1807 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INTERREG PROJECTS**

Can Government state of the balance to complete of £1,800,000 on Interreg projects by the I&D Fund what is the allocation in respect of programmes (IIIA) Gibraltar/Morocco, (IIIB) Western Mediterranean, (IIIB) South West Europe and (IIIC) South?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Of the £12,920 spent on Interreg projects to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003, 50 per cent was met by EU funds.

Of the £1.8 million allowed for Interreg projects in the Improvement and Development Fund, the allocation in respect of each programme is as follows:

|                                             |          |
|---------------------------------------------|----------|
| Interreg IIIA Gibraltar/Morocco             | £567,568 |
| Interreg IIIB Western Mediterranean (MEDOC) | £565,364 |
| Interreg IIIB South West Europe (SUDOE)     | £565,364 |
| Interreg IIIC South                         | £101,558 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1806 AND 1807 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are these sums the sums that the projects will have budgeted inclusive of the Government of Gibraltar's contribution?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the EU share of this then 50 per cent of each of those sums?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It is.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are these projects that were in the Estimates this year then on-going already, have any of them started so far? Has any start been made in spending any of those sums?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes. The Gibraltar/Morocco and the Western Mediterranean and South West Europe are all on-going projects which have already initiated. The South (IIIC) has yet not commenced.

ORAL

**NO. 1808 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TQS**

Can Government state what were the “technical problems” referred to in answer to supplementary questions to Question No. 1029 of 2004 which have prevented TQS from completing the computerisation works it has undertaken on behalf of the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1809 of 2004.

**NO. 1809 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**TQS**

Can Government state when it is expected that TQS will be able to finalise the computerisation works it has undertaken on behalf of the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

It is difficult to state with precision exactly when TQS will finalise the computerisation works it is undertaking for the Government.

Five systems have already been developed and they are live. A further five are at different stages of development, and will come on stream as and when they are ready later this year and in 2005.

The Hansard for the session of this House at which Question No. 1029 of 2004 was answered is not yet available, so it is not possible to see precisely what exchanges were made in response to supplementary questions.

What I can say is that TQS have not yet prepared a system specification for one of the systems that they need to develop and until such time as this is ready, it will not be possible to progress this particular system.

The lack of a system specification for this programme may well have been described as a "technical problem" in answer to Question No. 1029 of 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1808 AND 1809 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say which is the system that is still without a system specification?#

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid I cannot with the information I have available in front of me but I will make it available to him if he so wishes.

**NO. 1810 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**COMPUTER HACKING**

Can Government say when they intend to specifically outlaw computer hacking in or from Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

No Sir.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1810 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether this is something that the Government would like to do?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government can say that it is something that they are considering the need to do and how it is best dealt with. It exists as a proposal but it is not yet decided how it will emerge or still less when it will emerge which is the purpose of the answer given to his specific question. I suspect it will emerge at some stage.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Chief Minister says that it exists as a proposal, does this mean that draft legislation is being considered or has it not got to that stage yet?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

A specific legislative proposal has not yet been put up to Ministers for policy consideration.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Do the Government consider that this is a matter which should be dealt with with some priority given that computer hacking is something that affected Government's own computers at one stage?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Lots of things are important and priorities, it does not mean that the Government rush in to do them immediately. Nor are the Government so naïve as to think that simply passing laws eliminates the problems which the hon Member imagines to exist. The Government have no evidence that there is computer hacking taking place from Gibraltar and therefore it is not urgent in the sense that there is no known ill known to be happening. I agree that if it were happening it would be an ill but it is not known to be happening and therefore it is not urgent in that sense. I suspect that if it were happening from Gibraltar then probably some of Gibraltar's existing laws may be sufficient to deal with the problem, although I accept in a much more clumsy way than specific legislation would enable the law enforcement agencies to do. So we are not arguing that there is not a need for it, or rather, we are not arguing that in the technological age in which we live introducing legislation would not be a worthwhile thing to do, we think it would be. Is it a priority in the sense that the Government think that there is a big problem in this area which legislation would snuff out and which needs to be snuffed out? The answer is that we have no such evidence. The hon Member is aware that it is going on and perhaps he would just like to bring it to our attention. So it will emerge in the ordinary course of the Government's legislative programme and I cannot honestly say that it will emerge in the sense of priority that the hon Member appears to think that it deserves.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the question of priority it is simply because one of the essential requirements for example, in relation to I remember the Electronic Commerce Directive and the Electronic Signatures Directive, was the question of computer security, that it was essential to have that framework first. In fact, implementing those two directives assumed that we had the framework for computer security already in place and we did not. I think it was in 2001 we implemented the Electronic Directives. Secondly on the question of whether it is happening, there was an occasion where the Government's own computers were open to hacking through Trojan viruses that were planted in them and I remember the Hon Mr Britto at the time issued a press statement on the subject. In relation to the third point, whether the existing law would cover it or not, I also recall asking the Hon Mr Britto that question specifically and the answer was that at the moment computer hacking in Gibraltar was not illegal. It is in that context that the question of priority arises. Do the Government not accept that at least in relation to the EU Framework of legislation which already exists, it is something that should be put into place?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am aware that the hon Member has these concerns. All the legislation in the world will not physically prevent the hacking of computers through the injection of viruses. The suggestion that even enforcement of legislation let alone the mere existence of legislation would protect anybody or add any layer of security against viruses which are inevitably done by people from outside Gibraltar which we could not reach anyway, I think is a non sequitur of logic. As to whether computer hacking is legal or not, that is I do not remember that my hon Colleague that he has mentioned having said so, but certainly it is not a legal opinion that I would rush to. It depends what one does. Whether computer hacking involves criminal damage to somebody else's property I would have thought is certainly arguable. Whether it is as part of the hacking one lifts somebody else's intellectual or just simple data information and whether that does not amount to theft of the information is also arguable. I would not concede, without proper research, that computer hacking in Gibraltar is not illegal. Whether it is appropriate for us to have a legal seminar on the point across the floor, but certainly I would not rush to that concession if indeed it has been made. Legislation making computer hacking in Gibraltar more explicitly illegal, if I could just put it that way, I do not think it is legal now, probably, but even if we accept that more specific legislation is desirable, that is not part of the security framework. In other words, the security frameworks required in relation to data protection is something which the onus is on the processor of the data. Yes, I got the impression perhaps I misunderstood the hon Member when he was suggesting that legislation to outlaw computer hacking was part of the framework of the security that it was assumed would be in place.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I will just clarify. The context in which I made those remarks, for example, in the United Kingdom they have the Misuse of Computers Act which makes it illegal for people to access computers to hack them, to change the data that is already contained in those computers. That is the context in which I made the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is the sort of legislation that would emerge when we get around to doing what he calls 'making hacking illegal legislation' in Gibraltar. That is the sort of legislation that would emerge.

**NO. 1811 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**E-BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the E-Business Advisory Council met since it was set up?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

The Port Advisory Council met 16 times as follows:

|      |   |                                                                                                                        |
|------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2000 | - | 10 <sup>th</sup> October, which is when it was launched                                                                |
| 2001 | - | 6 <sup>th</sup> February, 13 <sup>th</sup> March, 3 <sup>rd</sup> May, 2 <sup>nd</sup> August, 4 <sup>th</sup> October |
| 2002 | - | 24 <sup>th</sup> January, 19 <sup>th</sup> March, 2 <sup>nd</sup> July, 25 <sup>th</sup> September                     |
| 2003 | - | 13 <sup>th</sup> February, 29 <sup>th</sup> May, 24 <sup>th</sup> July                                                 |
| 2004 | - | 12 <sup>th</sup> February, 6 <sup>th</sup> May, 2 <sup>nd</sup> September                                              |

The E-Business Advisory Council met three times, on 9<sup>th</sup> March, 26<sup>th</sup> April and 8<sup>th</sup> July 2004.

The Business and Commerce Advisory Council met three times, on 4<sup>th</sup> March, 6<sup>th</sup> June and 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004.

The Tourism Advisory Council met twice since 19<sup>th</sup> February 2004, on 13<sup>th</sup> May and 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1812 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPUTER LANGUAGE RPG2**

Can Government state whether any Government employees are instructed on the use of the computer language RPG2?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

There are seven Government officers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1812 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

These are all seven employed in the IT Section of the Government, is that correct?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I do not know exactly where they are but I can tell the hon Member that one of the Higher Executive Officers in my own Department is one of them, and he pointed that out to me when we were answering the question, but I believe this language is now obsolete and no longer used.

ORAL

**NO. 1813 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ACTION PLAN E-EUROPE 2005**

Can Government state whether they have now filed with the European Commission their intention regarding the switchover from analogue to digital TV as part of Action Plan E-Europe 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 1814 of 2004.

**NO. 1814 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EU – ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS**

Can Government state whether they still intend to implement this calendar year the EU regulatory directives for the electronic communications sector?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS**

As I said in reply to Question Nos. 291 and 1066 of 2004, work on the transposition of the new regulatory package is at a very advanced stage and is expected to be completed soon. The Government intend to implement these directives this year.

The Government have not filed with the European Commission their intentions regarding the switchover from analogue to digital TV. There has been no change in this regard since the reply given to Question No. 1066 of 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1813 AND 1814 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Do the Government intend at any stage to file with the European Commission their intentions?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think that the Government will file this at some point in the future.

**NO. 1815 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SMITH DORRIEN BRIDGE**

Can Government state when was the last time that tests were carried out on Smith Dorrien Bridge to determine the condition of the bridge and the maximum load it could support and what were the results of the test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

All highway structures are routinely inspected, the frequency of such inspections being dependant on the type, size, configuration and exposure of the structure. Smith Dorrien Bridge is one such structure. The last routine inspection of this structure was undertaken in January.

This showed that the bridge remains in a good structural condition. Maintenance work is periodically carried out and of course this will continue to be the case.

ORAL

**NO. 1816 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DUDLEY WARD TUNNEL**

Can Government state whether there has been any progress with regard to their assessment of the full viability of their preferred option for the remedial works that will enable the re-opening of Dudley Ward Tunnel for vehicular traffic?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Following the Government's selection of their preferred option from the various alternatives submitted by the consultants, a programme of ground investigation works was initiated. Progress continues to be made in the undertaking of such work, the results of which will confirm or otherwise the viability and constructability of the preferred option. Such exploratory works additionally provide the necessary data for use in the design that will follow. Until such time as all the required data is obtained, we will not be in a position to confirm the full viability of the proposed works.

ORAL

**NO. 1817 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**

Can Government state whether they are now in a position to proceed with the tender for the sewage treatment plant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1819 and 1820 of 2004.



**NO. 1818 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**CEMETERY**

Can Government state whether they have now arrived at a decision regarding a programme of on-going embellishment, up-keep and maintenance of the cemetery?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

As in my answer to Question No. 690 of 2004 I reiterate that there is no specific embellishment scheme but that as part of the on-going up-keep and maintenance of the cemetery Government continue to look at various options that may enhance the state of the cemetery. In this context and as I stated in my contribution to the Budget Session in the House earlier this year, specific consideration is currently being given to the repaving of all pathways using pavia blocks. Design works is now at an advance stage and outline proposals will shortly be available for Ministerial consideration.

ORAL

**NO. 1819 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**

Can Government state whether it will be possible to obtain EU funding to meet part of the cost of the proposed Sewage Treatment Plant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1817 and 1820 of 2004.

**NO. 1820 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**

Can Government state whether the feasibility study on what is required to comply with EU requirements on sewage treatment has been completed and whether they propose to make the result of the study public?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Despite our best efforts, it has not been possible to secure EU funding for the proposed sewage treatment works. Funding was however obtained for the three studies undertaken to generate the necessary data required for the preparation of the tender, namely the Flow and Load Survey, the Sea Outfall Study and the main Sewer Study. The Main Sewer and Flow and Load Studies have now been concluded. The Sea Outfall Study was completed some time ago all but for a very small element which could not be undertaken without some essential data resulting from the Flow and Load Survey, this latter study having only very recently been completed.

Government have no intention at present to make public the results of any of these studies.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1817, 1819 and 1820 of 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say how much was obtained from EU funding for these studies?

**HON F VINET:**

I do not have that information with me at present, but I will happily forward this to the hon Member.

**NO. 1821 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state what areas of Gibraltar's public highways they resurfaced during the course of the quarter ended 30 September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

A section of Transport Road by the junction with South Pavilion Road was resurfaced between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1821 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In view that in answer to Question No. 693 the Minister said that there were no plans, could he then let me know what is the criteria that is used to resurface certain areas when there are no plans to do that, who takes the decision to do that?

**HON F VINET:**

That is a decision taken by the Highways Engineer.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister confirm then that there are no forward plans, no plans are agreed to resurface Gibraltar's public highways, they are just done at the whim of whoever is responsible?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the hon Member's supplementary raises the next question on the Order Paper.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In answer to Question No. 693 which covered the period forward looking for the quarter ended 30 September 2004, I was told that there were no plans to resurface any part or any area of Gibraltar's public highway. Now we learn today that the area of Transport Lane has been resurfaced. What I am asking is, are these decisions taken by the person responsible, without any consultation? Surely there must be forward plans to determine what areas are going to be resurfaced, well in advance of them taking place.

**HON F VINET:**

The fact that there may be no plans to resurface a particular part of the highway in relation to a particular quarter does not mean that the decision will be taken within that quarter to do so. In fact, in answer to the following questions, the hon Member will see that there are some forward planning issues.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it may be that my hon Friend has not understood the point that the hon Member was seeking. As I understand it was this. I think the hon Member is expressing surprise in the form of a question that there is not some planned, phased programme, almost a routine basis for this. The answer is that that does not exist. What does exist is a series of projects that the Highways Engineer would like to do and then the Government provide a sum of money, which we vote in the Improvement and Development Fund every year, and he has got to do what he can with the amount of money provided. If one goes and asks the Highways Engineers '*do you have road resurfacing projects that are ready and you would like to do and that you think need doing?*' I am sure he will say yes and give a very long list of them, but he has got to stick to the funding that is provided to him. Within that, he, I suspect in consultation with others not just he, they decide what prioritisation to give the projects within the funding available in a year. From time to time things arise as a matter of urgency which have to be done and jump the queue, but there is not a long programme with dates attached. There is a list of work that needs to be done and it gets done in accordance with the funding provision and the funding availability the Government make available each year from the Improvement and Development Fund. I think that is a more accurate description of how the system works than to suggest that there is no programme at all or to suggest that there is a particularly sophisticated one.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

What is the criteria that is used to resurface the area? Is there not a plan of the areas that are in greater need of resurfacing than others and those take priority?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the criteria is a mixture of aesthetics and safety. Some resurfacing works are safety driven and need to be done because the surface may have become unsafe.

Some resurfacing takes place because other works have been done in the area and has damaged, sewage works or something, other works to the highway. Some of it is done in connection with beautification schemes, but it is usually either safety or beautification. Obviously safety takes priority so if the Highways Engineer identifies a road the surface of which he thinks is unsafe, that would take priority over an expenditure motivated purely by a desire to beautify or to smarten up.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I would hate to pre-empt Question No. 1850, but I think it is important in the context of what has just been said and with that fresh in our minds, that I ask the Government how does all this fit in with the much vaunted programme for the resurfacing and maintenance of our roads, which once completed will lead the Government to amend our law so that people can sue the Government when they suffer accidents on our roads, to which the Chief Minister very recently referred in his Viewpoint interview and to which he has referred before?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, as the hon Member says he should not pre-empt the answer to Question No. 1850. I would have thought even he could be patient enough for another 40 minutes. If I answer him now it will almost certainly take us into the ground which I know he will want to cover in answer to Question No. 1850. So we can either deal with it now and withdraw that question or wait until that question comes up. In other words, we are just going to repeat ourselves.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I would much rather deal with it now because I would like us all to have fresh in our memories what the Chief Minister has just said about the absence of a programme for the refurbishment of the highways. I am sure in 40 minutes time all we will have is an argument about what he said 40 minutes ago.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well let us have the argument now, because it has not taken 40 minutes for him to forget what I have just said 40 seconds ago. I have not said that there was not a programme for the maintenance of the highway, I have said that there is a programme, there is a list of projects that the Highways Engineer wants to do and thinks needs doing, but he has to marry that with the annual amount of funding provided in the Improvement and Development Fund each year. That is what I have said. I specifically stood up to dispel the notion that there is not a programme rather than to deny or admit the lack of one. There is a programme but it is not a programme which is fully funded with dates on a progressive basis. The Government, which every year have to decide how to allocate capital resources to all the various demands on the Improvement and Development Fund, decide how much capital to allocate to the road resurfacing programme. That commitment, that quantity of resources that we allocate every year, is not driven by the

desire to put us as quickly as possible into a position where we shall be willing to change the law of Gibraltar to give citizens that slip on the highway the right to sue the Government for damages, which is the subject matter of Question No. 1850, and certainly I have no difficulty in admitting to the hon Member that when we say we will change the law when we think that the state of the highways is brought up to standard, that he should not read into that and we are working, busting a gut to do that as quickly as possible. In other words, we have not accelerated the amount of resources and the quantity of resources that we provide but nor will we wait until each last highway is done before changing the law when we come round to changing the law. In other words, at some given point we will take a view and we will say 'on the whole, even though there are still areas where the highway is not up to scratch, on the whole there has now been sufficient progress in highway investment to safely enable the law to be changed'. If we were to do it before then we would open the floodgates to a plethora of legal claims from which we admit we are presently taking shelter. If one believes that citizens should be free to sue the Government on every occasion that one suffers an accident on the highway, then it is fair to conclude that we are sheltering from that situation by not changing the law. We have not introduced the law ourselves, it has been the law for many years, for many decades, but certainly we are in no hurry to change the law so as not to remove that protection from the Government. We make no secret of that fact that at the end of the day it is not our money, it is the taxpayers money. I think before the protection is removed from the taxpayer, I think the Government have an obligation to ensure that the highways are in a state, more or less, where an accident will be a normal accident and not a result of decades of under-investment in our roads. That is the Government's position and it will remain the position. The hon Member can ask me periodically, I am sure he will, are the Government satisfied that we are now ready to change the law, and I will tell him what the Government's view is on each occasion. We are not there yet.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it fair then to say that road refurbishment so to speak is dealt with on the basis of safety and aesthetic need on the one hand, and alternatively, on the basis of a wish list which the Highways Engineer has of what he would want dealt with, with greater alacrity.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is not an unfair way of putting it. It is not necessarily 100 per cent accurate but yes, it is the gist of the situation. The hon Member should not underestimate the amount of progress that is made. He must not think of progress in that direction to be limited to when one sees roads being resurfaced. Every time a piece of Main Street is pedestrianised and resurfaced, Casemates, Mackintosh Square, these all contribute to renewal of parts of the public highway to which the laws that he refers apply. So it is not that it is limited to the resurfacing works done under the resurfacing sub-head. Much of the other urban regeneration, many of the sub-heads the Minister for Trade and Industry and the Minister for the Environment, some of their Heads in the Improvement and Development Fund for street beautification also deliver highway works.

ORAL

**NO. 1822 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's public highways they intend to resurface during the quarter ending 31 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 1823 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1823 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's public highways that they intend to resurface during the quarter ending 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Beautification and resurfacing works will shortly commence at Catalan Bay Village, from the junction with Sir Herbert Miles Road to the existing paved area. Beautification and repaving works will also shortly commence at Irish Town, from John Mackintosh Square to the junction with Market Lane and as part of the works Cloister Ramp will also be resurfaced. Both projects will be completed during the first quarter of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1824 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PARKING BAYS**

Can Government now provide the reason why parking on some of the bays reserved for disabled drivers are restricted to 12 hours a day?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The restriction of 12 hours has been imposed on those disabled bays that have been requested by users specifically for work related purposes. Such users do not reside within the said areas and will therefore not be making use of such bays outside working hours. This arrangements maximises the availability of parking in such areas.

ORAL

**NO. 1825 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**COMMUNITY PROJECTS**

Can Government state what was the size of the workforce of Community Projects as at close of business on 31 March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1826 and 1827 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1826 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**COMMUNITY PROJECTS**

Can Government state what was the size of the workforce of Community Projects as at close of business on 31 March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1825 and 1827 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1827 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**COMMUNITY PROJECTS**

Can Government state what is their policy regarding employment at Community Projects?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The workforce consisted of 175 plus six management staff and 167 plus six management staff as at the close of business on 31 March 2003 and 31 March 2004 respectively.

There is no specific policy regarding employment at Community Projects Limited.

ORAL

**NO. 1828 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of paying passengers that were transported by the Gibraltar Bus Company in April 2004 and what was the amount paid in fares by these passengers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1829 to 1833 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1829 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of paying passengers that were transported by the Gibraltar Bus Company in May 2004 and what was the amount paid in fares by these passengers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1828 and 1830 to 1833 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1830 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of paying passengers that were transported by the Gibraltar Bus Company in June 2004 and what was the amount paid in fares by these passengers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1828, 1829 and 1831 to 1833 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1831 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of paying passengers that were transported by the Gibraltar Bus Company in July 2004 and what was the amount paid in fares by these passengers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1828 to 1830, 1832 and 1833 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1832 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of paying passengers that were transported by the Gibraltar Bus Company in August 2004 and what was the amount paid in fares by these passengers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1828 to 1831 and 1833 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1833 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of paying passengers that were transported by the Gibraltar Bus Company in September 2004 and what was the amount paid in fares by these passengers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No 1833 of 2004**

The total number of passengers transported by the Gibraltar Bus Company in each month, from April to September, together with the corresponding revenue for each month is as follows:

| <b>MONTH</b> | <b>NO OF PASSENGERS</b> | <b>REVENUE</b> |
|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| April        | 36,269                  | £16,963        |
| May          | 104,414                 | £64,543        |
| June         | 117,884                 | £70,720        |
| July         | 128,478                 | £78,536        |
| August       | 140,699                 | £87,998        |
| September    | 118,841                 | £73,998        |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1828 TO 1833 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister confirm that the revenue is on a cash basis and not on an accrual basis?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The revenue is on a cash basis. The company only collects the money as people pay their fares as they board the bus.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I say this because as an example in September they carried 119,000 passengers and the revenue was £74,000 which is more than 60p per passenger. If somebody pays for a ticket for the whole year, that is shown as revenue in the month that they paid them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That distinction is not drawn by the accrual or cash issue. I do not think the company have started selling season tickets yet. I do not think there is any revenue in relation to season tickets. If £73,998 divided by 118,841 is more than 60p per ticket, unless there is a revenue from another source.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

As long as the Minister can confirm that that is what the passengers paid for during that month that is all I need. Thank you.

ORAL

**NO. 1834 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the frequency of the buses that service bus route No. 4 to cater for school opening hours?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1835 and 1836 of 2004.

ORAL

NO. 1835 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the frequency of the buses that service bus route No. 4 to cater for school closing hours?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question Nos. 1834 and 1836 of 2004.

**NO. 1836 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the frequency of the buses that service bus route No. 4 outside school opening and closing hours?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Bus route No. 4 operates the following schedule in the mornings to assist school children on their way to school. Travelling from Both Worlds towards town, buses leave at 08.05 am, 08.25 am and 08.45 am. These being regular scheduled times.

Travelling from Rosia towards town buses leave at 8.05, 8.20, 8.25 and 8.45. The 8.05, 8.25 and 8.45 as I have said, are regular scheduled times, whereas the 8.20 is an extra bus added to cater for the demand.

On the return trip buses leave at 15.25, 15.45, 16.05 and 16.25 arriving at Referendum House bus stop around 10 minutes later. At 15.48 an additional bus allocated to this route arrives at the Referendum House bus stop. The Company also deploys an additional bus at 15.45 to Orange Bastion to pick up its first passengers.

At all other times the bus operates at 20 minute intervals.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1834 TO 1836 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can Government confirm that they are satisfied that the frequency described is sufficient to meet demand at those times?



**HON F VINET:**

The frequency, as well as all other elements of the bus service, is continually monitored and improvements will be made as and where they culminate, but at present the company, I am informed, is satisfied with present arrangements.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I ask these questions because I have received a number of complaints as to the fact that the frequency is not sufficient, and there are times, there are only instances not general but instances, where it has been reported that people have had to wait in excess of an hour to get a bus on their way into town from the area of Bayside. I am not saying that this is general but more than one person has come to me to report this fact. Could the Minister ask the Gibraltar Bus Company to look into the matter?

**HON F VINET:**

I have had no knowledge of those instances referred to but I will certainly enquire from the Bus Company as to the reason.

ORAL

**NO. 1837 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS**

Can Government state how many vacant posts there are in Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners and for how long have they been unfilled?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1839 to 1841 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1838 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MOTOR VEHICLE CENTRE**

Can Government state whether the dispute involving Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department has been resolved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The driving and vehicle examiners have submitted a claim which Government continue to consider not to be reasonable or justified and it has therefore not been met. As a result, Examiners continue to decline to carry out certain of their responsibilities, this being despite the fact that these have been carried out in the past. The situation remains under review and Government will shortly be deciding on what action to take.

ORAL

**NO. 1839 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS**

Can Government state whether they intend to fill the current vacancies at Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1837, 1840 and 1841 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1840 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS**

Can Government explain how the vacant posts in Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners have recently been covered other than by supply workers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1837, 1839 and 1841 of 2004.

**NO. 1841 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS**

Can Government state whether persons that have provided supply cover for vacant posts at Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners will have priority in being considered for the permanent filling of the vacant posts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

There are presently five vacancies for refuse collectors which the company intends to fill. In January 2004 the company agreed that the complement of Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners should be 35 in number. Prior to January 2004 there had not been an established complement.

Cover work has traditionally been undertaken by a combination of employees of Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners and supply workers, this continues to be the practice today.

The supply cover workers will not have a categorical priority when being considered for filling the vacancies but there is no doubt that their experience due to having been given the chance to cover will afford them an advantage when facing the selection board.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1837 AND 1839 TO 1841 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Has a date been set by which time the five vacancies will be filled?

**HON F VINET:**

No.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is this likely to be soon, within six months? Can the Minister give an indication?

**HON F VINET:**

I cannot give an indication as to the precise dates. What I can say is that the Company does intend to fill them and I would assume it is sooner rather than later, but I cannot give a precise date.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When the Minister says that the complement of the company is now 35 and there was not one before. Was there not throughout a manning level per lorry? The Refuse collection vehicles.

**HON F VINET:**

From my recollection there was a manning level per lorry. I cannot recall what the exact number was.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact, is it not the case that when the refuse collection lorries are under-manned is when they need to bring in somebody to maintain that manning level?

**HON F VINET:**

There is a manning level for lorries and when there is a shortage supply workers are brought in.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, the Minister is confirming that the supply workers are not in relation to this complement of 35 but in relation to the manning level that the lorry requires to operate. For example, if it were to be five and somebody is missing for sickness or any other reason, then somebody is brought in so that the lorry goes out with five people. That is the case, is it?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When the Government say they have used the company's old employees as well as supply workers, is it that they bring people who are off duty in or that if a lorry goes out under-manned people are paid extra to cover the work of the missing bodies?

**HON F VINET:**

I believe it is a combination of the two.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So what is it, if nobody is available then the short-handed vehicle gets paid extra because they are doing the work of the people who are missing? Is that correct?

**HON F VINET:**

That is correct.



**NO. 1842 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**OESCO**

Can Government confirm whether the number of units of electricity projected to be purchased in the current financial year from OESCO is the same as in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1842 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister reveal whether it is more or less and the number of units that is projected to be purchased?

**HON F VINET:**

There is a 5.9 per cent reduction compared with the same period last year.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact, is it then that the Government estimate on page 125 in Appendix D, is that a reflection that they expect to pay the same amount for less electricity? In Appendix D the amount paid last year was £6.379 million and the budget for this year is £6.4 million. So if that includes an estimate which involves buying less electricity, it must follow that they are expecting to be paying more per unit.

**HON F VINET:**

It is not a question of the Government expecting to pay less or more per unit. Perhaps if I can give some background information to this it might be useful to the Opposition Member. During the financial year 2003/2004 the units purchased from OESCO totalled £73,283,410. During the first six months of 2003/2004, April to September both inclusive, the units purchased amounted to £37,770,890. During the current financial year, 2004/2005, during the same first six months the units purchased have been £35,551,390, which as I said represents a 5.9 per cent reduction for the same period last year. The availability of generators at each power station, and of course the electricity demand from consumers, dictates the production by each station.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am grateful for that information. Does it then mean in fact, that the figure that they put in the budget did not assume a reduction? It was just a figure put there based on what had been spent before?

**HON F VINET:**

In a way there is no scientific way of knowing what the final outcome will be because it depends on consumers, and how much demand there is or there is not from consumers.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That figure provided is of units purchased from OESCO, not necessarily of units of electricity used in Gibraltar generally, just purchased. So in effect Gibraltar may be using more electricity this year than last year but were purchasing less.

**HON F VINET:**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO. 1843 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SALE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state what was the amount of revenue collected from the sale of electricity in the current financial year to August and the amount billed in the same period?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The amount of revenue collected during the current financial year up to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2004 was £4,525,933.78p.

The amount billed during the same period was £4,865,124.85p.

**NO. 1844 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state what was the share of the electricity supplied to customers in the last financial year, which was purchased from OESCO, and the amount charged by the Gibraltar Electricity Authority to customers for supplying this electricity?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The share of the electricity supplied to customers in the last financial year 2003/2004 by OESCO was 56.7 per cent.

Customers are charged according to the tariff applicable to them. The tariff rates charged to customers is the same irrespective of the source of production.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1844 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

On the basis of that answer it would be a reasonable calculation to say that 56 per cent of the £11.3 million of sale of electricity to consumers would be the income obtained by the Authority from re-selling that electricity. Is that accurate?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, it would be correct to assume that 56.7 per cent of all the revenue might be attributed to units purchased from OESCO.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

How does the fact that we are purchasing less electricity from OESCO impact upon the fact that OESCO have been given permission to start a new engine, a third engine at its

power station down at the Europa Business Park? With all the environmental effects that that will have.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member may know that OESCO had a historical contractual right to establish a new engine, which was postponed at Government request for many years. When the contract came up for renewal, it was done on the basis of the additional contract because the increase in supply has been such that they were having problems programming the maintenance of their machines. The fact that they have got six or seven machines does not mean that they can all be running at the same time. There needs to be outages for maintenance of machines, outages for breakages of machines, and there is an end given time we have a certain percentage of generating capacity on line. So it is not just a question of whether they had generating deficiencies in terms of capacity, but rather the level that they were operating at. In other words, the percentage of their capacity that was constantly in use in order to supply demand simply did not allow them enough stand down time with their other machines, to maintain them and repair them et cetera. So that explains the need to give them a contract for an additional machine. Gibraltar as a whole, including our own machines, was approaching the level of safety, not safety in terms of safety, un-safety but rather of security I suppose would be a better word, of demand and supply. In other words, the less spare capacity one has the more exposed one is to power cuts and insufficiency of generation if something catastrophic happens to one of the machines. In other words, there is a margin, a buffer that has to be provided and the increase of consumption, the demand for electricity in Gibraltar rises every year by three or four per cent or something of that order, and that has absorbed most of the cushion that we had before, most of that buffer. So the creation of an additional machine with OESCO plus whether that restored part of the buffer and of course that is why we are now looking at the investment in an additional new generator capacity. Not only to renew equipment, which is reaching its end of life date, but indeed also to provide additional generating capacity which is now needed.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Am I able to read into that that OESCO will be operating only two machines at once, or will it in effect be operating all three at the same time but at different levels?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it really is not possible.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I accept of course that the Chief Minister cannot answer for OESCO but in its relationship with the Government.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not quite as simple. It is not just a question of the capacity, the number of machines and the capacity per machine. That is not how the industry works. In addition to the information I have already given about necessary spare capacity and downed capacity because of repairs and maintenance, there is also the question that these machines have an optimum operating level. In other words, they might be able to generate at such and such rate but I think from memory that they are at their most efficient in terms of fuel consumption and emissions if they operate at seventy odd per cent of capacity. So it is not just a question of multiplying the machines by the capacity of each machine, each machine has an optimum operating point which is lower than its maximum. So OESCO, concerned to save costs obviously, want to operate its machines as closely as possible to that optimum. There is a huge number of factors that combine to determine the number of machines, the size of the machines that Gibraltar needs to have in order to satisfy a demand, which I think is running at about 21 or 22 megawatts at peak times.

**NO. 1845 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state how many units of electricity were purchased from the MOD for £95,000 in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The number of units that could have been purchased from the MOD for £95,000 in the last financial year would have been approximately 1,047,670.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1845 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Why did the Minister say 'could have been purchased' rather than were purchased?

**HON F VINET:**

The reason is that we have had to extrapolate the number of units that could have been purchased for £95,000 simply because this amount does not reflect any actual payment. The actual payments to the MOD during the last financial year was £99,400.13.

ORAL

**NO. 1846 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government explain why the cost of the electricity purchased from MOD is estimated to increase threefold to £300,000 in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The estimated cost of purchasing electricity from the MOD is in the order of £300,000 per annum. The forecast outturn for the last financial year shows the actual payments made during that financial year. The reason for this is that payments are close to £254,000 was not made until after the end of that financial year.



**NO. 1847 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state what is the unit cost of the electricity provided by (a) MOD (b) OESCO and (c) produced by the Gibraltar Electricity Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Based on the overall amounts paid in recent times, the following are the approximate average costs per unit (kWh) of electricity provided by the following entities:-

|     |       |                     |
|-----|-------|---------------------|
| (a) | MOD   | 9.07 pence per unit |
| (b) | OESCO | 9.37 pence per unit |
| (c) | GEA   | 9.99 pence per unit |

**NO. 1848 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EUROPA INCINERATOR COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state what new activities Europa Incinerator Company Limited proposes to undertake in respect of which it applied for a disposal of waste licence in July 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

With the recent conversion of the Los Barrios tip from a purely landfill site to a recycling/landfill facility, our waste has now had to be separated before it can be transferred. Europa Incinerator Company Limited has now assumed some such responsibility and now receives and handles that waste that cannot now be mixed in with the domestic refuse. The Licence applied for and obtained allows them to handle such waste which includes bulky items of furniture and large plastic items.

**NO. 1849 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WASTE DISPOSAL – COLLECTION POINTS**

Given the answers provided to Question No. 682 of 2004 and the photographs (taken on two separate dates in the area of Calpe and Willis' Road) and sent to the Minister for the Environment, will the Government now act to take action to avoid the unsightly accumulation of rubbish at open refuse collection points which, as can be seen, attract rodents, cats, apes and other animals, by redesigning these collection points in a manner that will allow for rubbish to be deposited in collection points which cannot be easily accessed by animals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The position remains as explained in answer to Question No. 682 of 2004 and there are no immediate plans to change the system designed and introduced by the GSLP when it was in Government. Nevertheless, the matter remains under constant review.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1849 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful to the Minister for indicating that the matter remains under constant review. As I pointed out last time, there was a manifesto commitment on the part of not him in 1996 but certainly his party colleagues, and I know that they are not answerable for their past manifesto commitments because they have been re-elected subsequently whether or not they complied with them. To deal with these unsightlinesses, and this is something that we all agree with, it is something that we all want resolved, what I am asking the Minister to do and I am urging him to do is to act to contain these rubbish areas, such that stray cats, monkeys and the like do not have access to them. I realise that many of these refuse collection points in town are in areas where we have vehicle thoroughfares. Those are actually not the ones most affected by animals ripping open their contents. It is in the areas at the base of the Upper Town and higher parts of the Upper Town where the apes are actually attacking these refuse points, strewing the rubbish everywhere, there are photographs that are attached to the question to prove that. Can I persuade the Minister to somehow go back to his Department and ask them

to look at a potential way of resolving this? I have already proposed what I think is the way of resolving it, which is to encase these rubbish collection points into small huts. They are already surrounded by walls, all they need is a small roof-like structure and a door. Can I persuade him to do that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We had a lengthy discussion about this and we do agree that there is a problem here. The answer is not intended to give the impression that we do not, and indeed to one side the novel technique of attaching photographs to Parliamentary questions, the mind boggles to where that might lead. Anyway, leaving that question to one side, indeed there was a better photograph I saw recently in the Chronicle or one of the other newspapers. There was a photograph actually of apes doing precisely what the question suggests that they do. So it is not that we do not acknowledge that there is a problem but identifying the problem is easier than finding a solution that does not make the systems unusable to use or harder to use for the users, harder to use for the refuse collectors, more of a health hazard in terms of confined spaces. The answer to his question is yes, the Minister will do as he suggests which is to ensure that his officials continue to try and find a viable, workable course of action that if not eliminates at least diminishes to the greatest possible extent the spectacle of having wild animals rummaging through household refuse and scattering it about. They have not come up with an answer yet, at least if they have they have not put it up to the Minister or to Ministers generally to make a policy decision on it, but it remains under review. It means what I interpret by the answer, remains under constant review, means that they are seeking a solution and might one day soon come up with one and we will hasten to share it with him when they do.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for the Chief Minister's interpretation because of course, the answer I was given was the position remains as explained in Question No. 682, the matter remains under constant review. In Question No. 682 it started with there are no plans to change that system and then reminded us all that it was a GSLP system.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The system set up for collection points is different to what we subsequently went on to discuss in supplementaries to that question, which is much what we are discussing now. We discussed the lids and covers and all of that sort of thing which does not go to the system of central collection points.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just remind the Minister that this is not just an issue of unsightliness, although in some areas, in particular where there is access to an egress from the Upper Rock, our tourists are also seeing this, but there is a serious issue here as to hygiene. Children play in the area in which I have taken photographs and I admit it is the area very close to

my house when I saw that accumulation, children play just there. The plastic bags are ripped open in that area, apes are in that area and they are very wild animals and they have been known not yet to bite any child but certainly to chase them and attack them, and to keep this matter more than just under constant review but to try and do something positive about dealing with this issue as soon as possible.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not interpreted the hon Member's intervention on this subject, either on this occasion or on the last occasion, as politically opportunistic. That is not the basis with which I have dealt with his interventions. Let me say that dealing with the problem is not just a question of dealing with the rubbish, it is also a question of dealing with the animals themselves and can something be done about preventing the apes from wandering down. We are told that they do that because there are too many of them, which requires them to be culled, but every time we propose culling the apes the Leader of the Opposition accuses me of murder. Let me also say that there is a refuse collection point which relates to my house in Irish Town or round the corner in Fish Market Road, into which apes do not stray, which very often does not look dissimilar to that. So it actually does not require apes and rodents to have a central collection point looking something like that. Although I have to say that these are particularly bad and obviously it suggests that bags have been consciously ripped open by presumably apes. I have not assumed that the hon Member ripped the bags up himself in order to facilitate the photographs so that he could then bring them. That thought had not crossed my mind, I hasten to add.

ORAL

**NO. 1850 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PUBLIC HIGHWAYS**

When (giving a specific date if possible) do Government expect that they will be satisfied with the state of the highways such that they will be ready to amend the law in order to ensure that Gibraltar law is in keeping with UK law on the Government's public liability for defects on the highway, given that the Chief Minister has stated that this is only "a small way away"?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

I refer the hon Member to the reply given by the Chief Minister in reply to Question No. 1821.

**NO. 1851 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY – AIR QUALITY**

Can Government now state where they have determined they will site the equipment to enable the Environmental Agency to monitor continually and properly air quality in Gibraltar and when any monitoring station or stations for this purpose will commence operations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

A preliminary assessment of air quality within Gibraltar commissioned by Government in 2003, concluded that in order to fulfil our obligations under the Public Health (Air Quality Limit Values) Rules and the Public Health (Air Quality) (Ozone) Rules, which transpose the EU Air Quality Framework Directive and subsequent three Daughter Directives, two monitoring stations would be required.

The first of these should monitor nitrous oxide, sulphur dioxide, particulates (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>25</sub>) lead, carbon monoxide and benzene and be located “at a roadside location on a major road and close to key power generation point sources”. The second should monitor ozone and nitrous oxides and be located at a “suburban/rural background location”.

Government have accepted these recommendations and the two monitoring stations have now been ordered. It is planned to site the first of these stations at Rosia Road, possibly within the Gibraltar Electricity Authority compound at the north end of Rosia Road. A number of technical matters are still being considered before a final decision is made. This location, or an alternate one in the vicinity, would fulfil the above-mentioned criteria in that it would be at a major road (Rosia Road) and close to power generation point sources (MOD and OESCO Generating Stations). The second monitoring station will be located at Bleak House car park as a “suburban background location”.

These sites have been selected in consultation with the Environmental Agency, representatives of the consultants who carried out the preliminary assessment of air quality and the suppliers of the monitoring stations as being the best available locations.

As previously stated, the monitoring stations have now been ordered and we are aiming to start monitoring by the beginning of the year. This, I am told, is a very tight deadline

since the equipment cannot be bought off the shelf, but must be manufactured to our precise specification, it also has to be fully commissioned in UK and then transported, installed and again commissioned here in Gibraltar before monitoring can begin. However we are working hard to try and meet our target.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1851 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Government, once they have set up these stations, be publishing the information collected from them?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, as I have indicated on a number of occasions in this House, the results of the air quality monitoring will be published in a specified website.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Given that the report to which the Government referred, has already indicated that based on the situation in the UK and other European countries, it is likely that with the new methodology for monitoring particulate matter, that PM<sub>10</sub> which is a carcinogen will be exceeded in Gibraltar, what action do the Government intend to take if those are the results of their first monitoring process?

**HON F VINET:**

If that were the case, we would have to seek the advice of the Environmental Agency.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is the advice. In a report prepared by the Ombudsman in Case CS-57, the Ombudsman was given sight of the very Environmental Agency Air Quality Report dated December 1998, and it is that report that indicates that the PM<sub>10</sub> is likely to be exceeded. So surely, given that six years have passed since the Government have been told that when it simply changes the methodology for measuring air quality, and bring it up to date, the PM<sub>10</sub> is likely to be exceeded, surely the Government will have in place a programme of what to do. Or do they not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

When it has been established that it will be exceeded, by that time the Government will most certainly have a plan in place, yes.



**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Ombudsman has already found that the complainant's grievance in that case, relating to the measuring and monitoring of pollutants in Gibraltar, was sustained. To an extent the Ombudsman has already found that there are serious issues to concern the Government, even before the air quality monitoring station is put in place. In paragraph 22 of his report, which has been laid in this House already, the Ombudsman says that the complainant's concerns that the Agency was deliberately misleading him were also valid when comparing the advice given to him and the advice given to the Ministry for the Environment. Those are very serious findings of the Ombudsman, which is a body that I know the Chief Minister respects. Given those findings are already there, and they have been there for some time, have the Government not already taken a decision on what they will do when the PM<sub>10</sub> is found to be exceeded?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the hon Member is confusing the subject matter of the complaint. The maladministration found in that case was, in effect failure to monitor in accordance with the directive which already requires the monitoring to take place. That was the subject matter of the Ombudsman's Report. In other words, that a directive by which Gibraltar is bound, required Gibraltar to have started monitoring some time ago, and indeed we are still not in compliance with that because we still have not started monitoring. This is one of the things that we are late on the scene about. That was the subject matter of the Ombudsman's complaint. That was a sustained case, the sustained case by the Ombudsman, and the Government are dealing with it. We have accelerated, as the Minister has explained to extraordinary lengths in his answer, the Government are dealing with that. We cannot comply with it any faster than we can get the equipment here. He can ask if he likes why we did not start sooner, but now that we have started this is the quickest that we can do it. By the end of the year and we are not certain that even that is viable. The issue of whether there is in fact in Gibraltar exceeded any of the European Union Directive parameters for various substances in the atmosphere, is a wholly different issue, where the Ombudsman has not said anything of the nature that the hon Member has said, and the Environmental Agency Report to which he is referring, speculates and prognosticates that it will be likely to exceed. That is a hypothesis that has yet to be established. If it turns out to be a correct hypothesis and when measured that is in excess of the European Union Directive parameters, which may or may not be the case, then the European Directive says what has to be done about it. This is not a matter of Government domestic policy or choice or whether we want to be a good or a bad Government, or whether we respect or do not respect the Ombudsman or whether we monitor. The hon Member should not assume however, it is a legal obligation, exactly, but to obey what?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

To abate.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. That is what the hon Member has got to be a bit more careful with, because the hon Member should not assume that the regime established by the directive is that each and every moment of exceeding by each and every scheduled substance requires acts to be taken. In respect of some of them I recall the regime is to monitor and to see whether it is a passing event or whether it is a sustained, and depending on the seriousness of the substance I think there are different degrees of strictness of the way one can react. So it is not just an absolute issue of whether the reading is exceeded on each of them one has to immediately eliminate the source, the source may not be eliminatable. The hon Member says what are the plans, but very often the source cannot be eliminated overnight. So I think it is important that the administration of the directive, which at the moment I admit is completely deficient in the sense that we are not monitoring, the absence of monitoring does not lead to deficient administration if in fact there is no exceeding, but we do not know whether there is exceeding of the substance. We think that there is not because at the end of the day the hon Member will remember that the European Union Directive only requires one of these monitoring stations every 25 square kilometres of territory. If we were in England, or in Spain, or in Germany, we would not have our own station because there is one in La Linea which is not 25 kilometres away. So if we were part of Spain, or if both we and La Linea were part of the United Kingdom, there would be a monitoring station in La Linea and we would certainly not have one. Now, the La Linea monitoring station, which is the one that covers Gibraltar but for the fact that we are in a different Member State and want to have our own, does not indicate readings in breach of the territory. It would be most unusual for La Linea's atmospheric temperature to be less polluted than ours, given that they suffer in the direct path of prevailing wind, downstream in a westerly from the Refinery. I am sure the hon Member has often driven round the Bay and seen how it all blows over La Linea except in a north-easterly wind, which thankfully are rare, they do not blow in our direction. So it would be most unusual, I do not say impossible, I suppose one could have a locality in Gibraltar which is particular, but if it would be most surprising if the La Linea monitoring station were not already picking up a situation in La Linea which ours were going to pick up in relation to Gibraltar, given that the requirement of the directive is one for every 25 square kilometres. It is not impossible but we would be very surprised if our micro environment here were more polluted than the one in La Linea, but we will wait to see, we may be wrong.

ORAL

**NO. 1852 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government confirm that building debris continues to be dumped at the East Side reclamation area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Yes. The rubble tip located in the eastern reclamation area continues to accept builders' rubble.

**NO. 1853 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Have Government identified an alternative site to be used for the dumping of builders' debris when the East Side Reclamation area is no longer available?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Several sites remain under consideration. No final decision has yet been made.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1853 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of these possible alternative sites, is it something that would need preparatory work? What I am trying to establish is whether one needs a decision a certain time ahead of when one needs to be using it?

**HON F VINET:**

I can answer that supplementary by explaining that we are looking for sites where the reclamation will be able to be put to some useful purpose for development. The areas being considered by the Government are as follows. I believe I may have given this answer in a previous meeting of the House. The area of the decommissioned MOD water storage tanks north of Dudley Ward Tunnel, the area to the northwest of the runway, the area between jetties and other areas within the Port.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, my Colleague made a slip of the tongue which I think prevented the Leader of the Opposition from understanding the first part of his answer in which he meant to say that the Government were finding a way of making the rubble useful by applying it to reclamation rather than making the reclamation useful, which I think is what he said. In

other words, the finding of a site that is a reclamation site, that rubble builds something rather than is dumped.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If they identify such a site, would it not make sense therefore to move there as soon as that is available, given that presumably they are not getting any advantage any more out of the existing site? The existing site is not getting any bigger by virtue of the building rubble that is being put there, is it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is getting taller. It is getting quite frightening to drive round there. This is not a question of seeking advantage. Let me say to the hon Members that this is one of our more intractable problems, because even the three sites that my Colleague has mentioned, would not be solutions for very long. The filling-in of any one of those three sites, even the filling-in of all three of those sites, would probably provide for not more than a year's worth of rubble tipping. Now that we are more environmentally conscious than we used to be, all of us, for example the whole area of coastline on this side of the Rock from say Rosia Bay all the way round Europa Point up to Shirley's Cove near the Caleta Palace, all on the other side, all that is untouchable in terms of reclamation, it is the last remaining virgin rock coastline of Gibraltar. It really is a big, big problem which I know the Technical Services Department has been struggling for three or four years now looking for a viable long-term, something that is rather going to be like the East Side, something that will provide several years rather than just for several months, and we have not come up with a solution yet.

**NO. 1854 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INTEGRATED POLLUTION PREVENTION AND CONTROL DIRECTIVE**

Will the Government confirm that in complying with the requirements of the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive the best available technology required in respect of any new electricity generating engine to be used in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The formulation of the question is somewhat confusing.

I can confirm that any new generating plant installed for the Government of Gibraltar will conform to the relevant regulations and directives appertaining to the type of plant to be installed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1854 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Leader of the House remembers that we have had this debate before. I am pleased that he does because he will recall that the last time that we had this debate his position was that he did not like the phrase 'best available technology' because that implied, to use his words, that I suppose we would have to go to NASA or something, but we will be going for the sort of technology that communities of our size are using in Western Europe for the generation of their electricity. What I was keen to get the Government to confirm, is that the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive does actually require best available technology and this is the phraseology used within the directive. In fact in answer to Question No. 13 of 2004 the Chief Minister told me that I was asking about the types of standard which were not yet implemented in Gibraltar, but he will recall that two days later when dealing with another issue, in fact it was confirmed that that directive had been transposed in Gibraltar. So can I just ask the Minister to confirm that in his view now the definition of 'best available technology' does not mean the costliest most advanced technology but a necessary balance between what is available with regard to the cost, and what is the best pollution prevention option open to the operator, not necessarily the Government.

**HON F VINET:**

As I have already said, whenever a new generating plant will conform to the relevant regulations and directives.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does that include any new engine to be started by OESCO, given that its third engine scheduled to commence operations in this calendar year, has not yet been started?

**HON F VINET:**

If that is covered by the directive the answer is yes.

**NO. 1855 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CEPSA REFINERY**

What measures did the Government take to ensure that the emissions of the recent fire at the CEPSA refinery were monitored and were not toxic to the general public in Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The fire incident at the refinery was monitored. Given the direction of the fire and the distance no measures were taken.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1855 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What emissions were detected coming from the fire in Gibraltar, if any?

**HON F VINET:**

None were detected.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that because we have not got the equipment to monitor air quality in Gibraltar, even in these circumstances?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer to the question is that no measures were taken. Therefore if no measures were taken, when he asks again were any detected, I suppose he must only be referring did we smell anything. I mean, it was not monitored, no equipment was deployed, it was



not thought to be necessary. It is not that we have readings, if we had I would give him the results, but there were not any readings taken. I do not know what he means, perhaps I am misunderstanding his supplementary. We have admitted that no readings were taken and therefore we could not have detected anything.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think that the obvious issue is this. There was a fire in the refinery. It appears from the answer provided that somebody looked up and said 'oh the smoke seems to be going in the other direction, no need to take any action'. Now, as I understand it although I wish things were as simple as that, there could have been emissions resulting from that fire which are not visible to the naked eye, and which despite the plethora of the dark smoke going in another direction might have been toxic to the general public in Gibraltar. Did we monitor that or did we not monitor that, and is that because we have not got the equipment and it is coming and we will be able to answer the next one?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether the scenario that he has described is physically possible. In other words, whether it is possible for smoke to blow in one direction and toxic fumes to blow in the opposite direction, I do not know. A more credible way of describing the risk might be to say, what if the wind had suddenly changed and then we would have had both the smoke and the toxic. That is a more credible threat that he could articulate his point around. It is by the grace of God that the wind is blowing in the other direction. Even then it could suddenly change I suppose. The refinery is in Spain. Whatever we may think of Spain politically it is not a third world backward country. It is a Member of the European Community, responsible to comply with exactly the same directives as we comply with and to measure air monitoring in the same way as we do with the same responsibilities to their local populations as we have to ours. If there had been any toxicity of the sort that the hon Member is describing, the Spanish would have identified it for themselves and had there been any danger to surrounding populations, I do not suppose they dislike us so much that they would not have given us advance warning. I do not think it is part of their plan to exterminate us and therefore I assume, we are not living on an island, this is not in Mars, if there had been the sort of danger that the hon Member is formulating his questions around the hypothesis of, then we would have been informed by the responsible party which is Spain. This community has neither the size nor the resources, financial or technical, to measure the atmosphere for everything in it that might conceivably be a risk to us at any time from whatever source. At the end of the day that is not the way, there have been fires in the refinery before. What went up in the refinery was a petrol bowser. In the days of the hon Members in Government, I remember that a whole tanker exploded in the refinery and there was a huge fire. I do not suppose any measurements were taken then, or any measures taken then. That was a hugely larger fire. By the way I do not know if our monitoring station measures for the sort of things that he fears might be found in fires. There is a list of substances, as he knows, in the directive for which the monitoring station will monitor in the future. It is not everything but that is not the position. At the moment we have no standing atmospheric measurement facility. I understand that the Environmental Agency have hand-held equipment for some of the more basic rudimentary things, but it is not a hugely deployable resource in the circumstances which the hon Member is describing.

So the political answer to his question is no, that it was not felt necessary to take particular precautions in that situation, and to a certain extent we do rely on the responsibility of the neighbour to pass information, because at the end of the day what we need to know is also what they need to tell their own public in the immediate vicinity.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that, I think that deals really with the issue of whether there was any monitoring taking place or not quite exhaustively. Can I just take the Chief Minister up on this issue of the level of monitoring and the standard of monitoring across the way. He will recall that in the not too recent past, when there was an emission which was not a smokey emission that was visible from Acerinox, it was only reported when the German monitoring station picked it up. Although those in the area of Acerinox et cetera and all the professionals there knew, no statements had been made to the general public in that respect. He may also be aware, as I am, that the Bucket Brigade has not yet made its results public but that those results of its monitoring in the area apparently are very worrying and not gratifying. So it is in that context, that I am trying to seek this information and I trust that in future we will be in a position to monitor this type of event, if only with our then standing air quality monitoring stations which will monitor, as I understand it the Minister can correct me if I am wrong, all the types of emissions that would be dangerous to health and which are identified.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister said nothing of the sort. The hon Member is going to be very disappointed if he thinks that that is what the air monitoring station will do. Look, towns of 28,000 people on the planet do not each have their radioactivity monitoring facilities, and as he knows from the long answer that the Minister gave him in answer to Question No. 1851, my understanding of it is that radioactivity is not one of the issues that is monitored.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I did not mean that we would be monitoring for radioactivity. For the type of explosion that occurred at the oil refinery, the type of emission that would come from that would be monitored by air quality stations because that would monitor for benzene et cetera, et cetera.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, those are the things that it would monitor but I misunderstood the hon Member. I thought he was suggesting that had we had our monitoring station at the time of the Acerinox, we rather than the Swiss would have caught the Spaniards out. That is not the point that he was making. Well, we all look forward to our monitoring station, I agree. It will be a useful addition to our facilities.

ORAL

**NO. 1856 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EU GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS TRADING SYSTEM**

When do Government expect to publish legislation to transpose into law in Gibraltar the directive establishing the EU Greenhouse Gas Emissions Trading System?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government expect to publish legislation to transpose into law in Gibraltar the directive establishing a scheme for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Allowance Trading within the Community by the end of the year.

**NO. 1857 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WATER FRAMEWORK DIRECTIVE**

When do Government expect to publish legislation to transpose into law in Gibraltar the Water Framework Directive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Regulation transposing the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) was published on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1857 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The hon Gentleman will know that this question was posed before that and I have not yet actually seen the Gazette. He will excuse me if I am about to in my supplementary in any way raise an issue which has already been dealt with in legislation, but it is true and fair to say that both of these directives are now well outside their transitional period. Is there a particular reason why it has taken Government time to transpose these pieces of legislation? Do they involve a large measure of expense on the part of the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think it is that long overdue frankly, I think the United Kingdom themselves have only put it in recently. I do not know, if he has got the directive there he might be able to point out what the due date is. I do not think it is particularly long overdue. There has been an issue in the past, these things come past No. 6 where we filter them for political issues as opposed to issues to do with the subject matter of the directive which are dealt with in the Department, and there was an issue about something, I cannot remember the name of it now, the water table administration or something. The directive creates a river basin authority, in other words, they were river basin based rather than national territory based and we were concerned that that should not, in our case, lead to Spain exercising any pretext of the Water Directive and the water basin which was regional, to

take responsibility as to the water basin, and we were able to save that and we have got our own river basin, it is called the river basin but it is not limited to rivers, confusing. That was the only political issue that I was aware of and I do not think that that delayed transposition in itself because this arose pretty early on. So I do not think we are particularly late.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just take it from that, that when I see the published Regulation, I will see that Gibraltar will have its own River Basin Authority?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I think the Regulation is drafted on that basis, which has been accepted by the UK who I think, I am not sure whether there is a notification requirement, but in any case the United Kingdom Environmental Department, whatever it is called, has accepted that we are our own River Basin Authority and will notify accordingly. Absolutely.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Which rivers come within the ambit of the Authority?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I did say misnomer, river basin does not mean just rivers. Gibraltar has got its own water table and surface water, and underground water, all of which are included in the definition of River Basin Authority. We have got the aquifers in the politically sensitive so called disputed ground and all that. There are important political issues in this directive.

**NO. 1858 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**RGP – CM'S PROTECTION**

What has the cost of members of the RGP accompanying the Chief Minister when he has travelled abroad on each occasion in the past eighteen months that the Chief Minister has been accompanied by members of the RGP outside Gibraltar, whether on official business or personal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not appropriate to give the information in respect of each occasion and would probably in any case be too difficult to get the information together. The overall cost for the past 18 months has been £28,306.60.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1858 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Obviously that cost to the taxpayer sometimes occurs when the Chief Minister is travelling outside Gibraltar on personal business. Does he consider that to be an appropriate way to spend taxpayers money?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am sorry that the hon Member does not think that the safety of the Chief Minister of Gibraltar is worth £28,306.60 over an 18 month period, but that to one side, the Chief Minister does not cease to be the Chief Minister by virtue of the nature of the business that he is conducting. I have never heard the proposition put by anybody that is subject to personal protection policies that their personal protection is lifted depending on whether he is going privately, socially or on official business. It is a distinction that anybody involved in the field of security and protection provision would regard as wholly irrelevant. What I can tell the hon Member are two things. First of all that there has been no change in the policy of the circumstances in which the Chief Minister is provided with personal protection when travelling abroad, since I have come into office there has

been no change. In other words, the principle that is applied to me is the principle that has been applied to the previous Chief Ministers. Secondly, that these decisions and judgements are not made by me. I do not ask the RGP to provide me with personal protection, there is a long standing policy and they make the decision. I think that their decisions frankly, and their judgements are very well made and I think it would be wholly inappropriate for the Chief Minister of Gibraltar to be wandering around in Spain without any measure of personal protection, which in Spain is afforded even to local mayors.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Chief Minister then telling this House in the course of his intervention that he feels that he needs that protection in Gibraltar and outside Gibraltar?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What the Chief Minister has said to the House is exactly what he has said to the House. I do not think I have used any words which are too long for anybody to understand and there is no need for the hon Member to re-interpret, still less to ask me to repeat what it is that I have said. What I have said is what I have said. If he chooses to misinterpret it or misrepresent it or misquote it, that is a problem for him and not a problem for me. What I can tell him is that there has been no change in the policy. If the hon Member is trying to insinuate that there has been a change in the policy, he is mistaken. Now, he may not approve of the Chief Minister of Gibraltar going to Spain for personal purposes. If that is the point then I do not agree with him. I think it is entirely appropriate for the Chief Minister, yes, because the hon Member may say if he did not go to Spain on personal jaunts then there would be no need to provide him with personal protection. Of course that would be a view.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order. I have not said that I do not believe that the Chief Minister should not go to Spain on personal jaunts. I have not said that. The point of order is that the Chief Minister has said that I said that. I have not said that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister has not said that he has said that. The Chief Minister has said that that is what he might think. So, points of order are not a procedure whereby the hon Member has a right to interrupt me. I think the correct procedure is that he should identify what the point of order is so that the Chair can decide whether or not his intervention raises a point of order, but of course if he splurges it out before explaining the point of order, then his purpose is served. That is not in accordance with the Rules of the House.

So I really have nothing to add. I think that this is entirely appropriate, it is entirely correct, I am delighted with the level of personal protection that I receive. Whether or not I need personal protection is not a judgement for me, just as it has not been a

judgement for previous Chief Ministers but the hon Member should be aware that the purpose of personal protection is not just, perhaps not even, to protect the Chief Minister from assassination or things of that sort. The purpose of personal protection is also to protect the subject of the personal protection from embarrassing situations that are embarrassing because of the nature of the office that he holds. It is not just about personal security. It is about protecting the office holder from embarrassing situations that might not be embarrassing for any normal citizen but could be embarrassing if it happens to somebody who holds this office. So the answer to the hon Member is that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I would not want the Chief Minister for one moment to think that simply because of the holder of the post, I do not think the Chief Minister of Gibraltar is deserving of protection if his physical integrity is in any way going to be under attack, but can I just ask him to confirm that in fact although he insisted the policy has not changed since 1996 when he took office, that in fact the Chief Minister of Gibraltar from 1988 to 1996 did not have a bodyguard. So in fact in 1996 things did change. Does he accept that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I do not, I think it is wholly untrue, and before the hon Member is prompted by things whispered in his ear, he should be careful. When the previous Chief Minister visited Morocco, he was accompanied by a full deployment of personal bodyguards, and when the previous Chief Minister, now the Leader of the Opposition sitting next to him, went for a holiday to the Marbella Club in Marbella, he was accompanied there by personal protection officers. So what the hon Member says is wholly untrue. Now it may be that the previous Chief Minister of Gibraltar did not enjoy going to Spain for personal reasons as much as I enjoy it, and therefore the need for him to have personal protection officers in Spain may have been less in quantum, but that is a product of the frequency with which we have each chosen to go to Spain and not a variation of the principle.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

From 1988 to 1996 the Chief Minister did not have with him every day a bodyguard in Gibraltar all the time. Whilst this Chief Minister has a policy to have a bodyguard with him in Gibraltar all the time. That is a change in policy, is it not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the previous Chief Minister may have chosen not to have had a personal protection officer in Gibraltar, which itself was a departure from the then established position which is that Chief Ministers before that had had it. I simply chose to follow the established precedent and not the practice of my immediate predecessor. Look, there are many things that this Chief Minister and this Government do differently from the previous Members opposite and we do not necessarily regard the conduct and precedents set by the previous Members opposite as being worth following. Much is done differently. Amongst that I think that the office of the Chief Minister deserves that sort of



consideration, as happens with the Mayor of La Linea, the Mayor of Los Barrios. I am not saying that I do it just because they do it, but this is not science made in Gibraltar. This is generally the practice and I do not see why we should seek to downgrade the status of the office of Chief Minister in that way. Having said that let me tell the hon Member, I do not know if the previous Chief Minister used to walk the streets as frequently as I do, but let me tell him that there are often situations where the Chief Minister could be put in an embarrassing situation when he does that. Let me tell him that in the case of Gibraltar, I choose to dispense with the personal protection officer when I am off duty. I do not feel threatened, there is no area of Gibraltar where I do not feel free to go by myself at any time of the day or night, and therefore this is a question of the office and not of me. So that when I am deposited at home, at whatever time I get home, if I then go out in the evening or at the weekends I go out on Saturday mornings onto Main Street with my wife, I have no personal protection officer for that. That is a matter of choice, I would be entitled to have it if I wanted to, I choose not to do it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can we take it from what the Chief Minister has said that our newly appointed Mayor will soon also be enjoying a PPO to ensure that he is also at the same level of the mayors of the Campo?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I assume the question is a joke.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Like the answers.

ORAL

**NO. 1859 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM'S VISITS OVERSEAS**

Can the Government state what is the total number of occasions on which the Chief Minister has travelled to the United Kingdom in the past 12 months and what has been the total cost of travel and accommodation in respect of such travel both in respect of the Chief Minister and those who have travelled with him, giving a breakdown per trip?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1860 of 2004.

**NO. 1860 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROSPECT UNION'S TORQUAY CONFERENCE**

Can the Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attendance by the Chief Minister at the Prospect Union's Torquay conference in May 2004 giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1859**

The information requested is in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question No. 1860**

In respect of the Torquay conference the Chief Minister was accompanied by his Press & Media Director and one of his Private Secretaries. The total costs were:

|               |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|
| Air Fares     | £2,651.30       |
| Accommodation | £ 969.22        |
| Other         | <u>£ 373.60</u> |
|               | £3,994.12       |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1859 AND 1860 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister tell us how many people travelled with him to the Conservative Party Conference last year? Is it the same body that travelled with him to the Committee of 24?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot remember who came to the Conservative Party Conference with me last year, but usually because it coincides with the trip to New York, it is the same people. That is the usual practice but I cannot remember who came with me last year. Usually it is the Chief Secretary because he is the one who comes with me to New York, and normally we go from one to the other.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is the column who tells me who it was, the central column tells me, is that right?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

MD is Media Director?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The bracket after PS, how should I interpret that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is the Private Secretary for Legal Affairs, Mr John Reyes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

And the P?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are several Ps on the page. The P by the word is Private Secretary, the P in brackets after PS is the Private Secretary for Policy and Projects, Mr Figueras.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What is the CS?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Chief Secretary.

ORAL

**NO. 1861 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government confirm whether in the information provided regarding PAYE tax payable by private sector employers, those employees who have short term contracts with different employers in a given tax year are treated as different individuals in arriving at the total number of employees involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1862 of 2004.

**NO. 1862 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government state whether the figure of 2,600 employees in respect of whom PAYE was deducted for the year 2001/2002 by MOD, persons in receipt of an MOD pension are included, and if so, can they state the breakdown between pensioners and persons still in employment and the relevant amount deducted for PAYE from each group?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER****Answer to Question No. 1861**

I can confirm that for the purposes of the statistical information provided in this House regarding the Income Tax Office database, total number of employees is the total number of PAYE deduction cards received.

**Answer to Question No. 1862**

I can also confirm that MOD pensioners are included. The analysis requested is as follows:

|                   | <b>Approximate No.</b> | <b>Approximate Tax Deducted</b> |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>Pensioners</b> | 1500                   | £0.3 million                    |
| <b>Employees</b>  | 1100                   | £4.0 million                    |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1861 AND 1862 OF 2004****HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the answer confirming the information in Question No. 1861, the result of that means of course that the changes in the numbers that are given as employees in respect of whom the tax has been collected by the private sector does not necessarily



show that there are more employees from one year to the next. It could be movement between employers. If an employee spends the whole year with the same employer as opposed to having more than one job in a year, the apparent numbers of employees go up, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, this is why the Government do not use the PAYE statistics as being the principal source of statistics for numbers of jobs, absolutely. If an employee, never mind about moving from one job to the other, if an employee is doing three jobs at the same time it would appear three times, because there would be a different card sent in by each of his three employers and that will appear as three job appearances. This is why the hon Member may notice that when this information is given in answers, I think the recent practice has been to refer to the phrase 'employee/deduction cards', to signal the fact.

ORAL

**NO. 1863 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of September 2004 how many companies, in each tax year 1995/1996 to 2003/2004 had been assessed for company tax, and what were the amounts of tax payable and paid in respect of each tax year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1864 and 1865 of 2004.

**NO. 1864 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of September 2004 how many companies had been assessed by the Commissioner of Income Tax without having made a return of taxable profit:

- (a) above £35,000; and
- (b) below £35,000

for each of the tax years 1998/1999 to 2003/2004, what was the tax assessed and paid in each case and for each category and each year and what were the amounts assessed and paid by qualifying companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1863 and 1865 of 2004.

**NO. 1865 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of September 2004 how many companies had declared taxable profits:

- (a) above £35,000; and
- (b) below £35,000

for each of the tax years 1998/1999 to 2003/2004, what was the tax assessed and paid in each category and can Government state in each category and for each year how many were qualifying companies and what were the amounts of tax assessed and paid by such companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The very substantial amount of statistical information that the hon Member has requested is contained in the schedule attached.

### **Answer to Question 1863**

|             | 1995/96 | 1996/97 | 1997/98 | 1998/99 | 1999/00 | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 |
|-------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|             | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      | £m      |
| Assessed    | 15.8    | 15.6    | 19.8    | 25.4    | 88.7    | 27.1    | 27.1    | 29.7    | 25.4    |
| Discharged  | 5.6     | 4.9     | 9.0     | 12.3    | 74.2    | 13.7    | 12.0    | 14.3    | 9.1     |
|             | 10.2    | 10.7    | 10.8    | 13.1    | 14.5    | 13.4    | 15.1    | 15.4    | 16.3    |
| Paid        | 9.5     | 10.3    | 10.3    | 12.5    | 13.6    | 12.8    | 13.6    | 12.6    | 15.1    |
| Outstanding | 0.7     | 0.4     | 0.5     | 0.6     | 0.9     | 0.6     | 1.5     | 2.8     | 1.2     |

### **Answer to Question 1864**

#### **COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

| Year of Assessment | 1998/99 | 1999/00 | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                    | £       | £       | £       | £       | £       | £       |

##### **Under £35,000**

|                                         |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| No of Companies assessed                | 797  | 632  | 374  | 425  | 532  | 549  |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax Payable) | 1.6m | 1m   | 0.7m | 0.9m | 1.4m | 1.4m |
| Total Paid                              | 1.2m | 0.7m | 0.3m | 0.3m | 0.4m | 0.3m |

##### **Over £35,000**

|                                         |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| No of Companies                         | 46   | 38   | 12   | 22   | 31   | 39   |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 2.8m | 2.9m | 0.4m | 0.6m | 1.3m | 2.7m |
| Total Paid                              | 2.8m | 2.5m | 0.1m | 0.3m | 0.8m | 2.1m |

#### **QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

##### **Under £35,000**

|                                         |    |      |     |    |     |   |
|-----------------------------------------|----|------|-----|----|-----|---|
| No of Companies assessed                | 7  | 11   | 9   | 7  | 15  | - |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 9k | 11k  | 11k | 3k | 21k | - |
| Total Paid                              | 1k | 0.7k | -   | -  | 1k  | - |

##### **Over £35,000**

|                                         |     |     |     |    |      |   |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|------|---|
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 18k | 22k | 11k | 6k | 0.2m | - |
| Total Paid                              | -   | -   | 9k  | -  | -    | - |

|                          |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No of Companies assessed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 7 | - |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Cont'd.....

## Answer to Question 1865

### Answer to Question 1865

#### COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES

| Year of Assessment | 1998/99 | 1999/00 | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 | 2003/04 |
|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                    | £       | £       | £       | £       | £       | £       |

##### Under £35,000

|                                         |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| No of Companies assessed                | 201  | 270  | 335  | 367  | 304  | 229  |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax Payable) | 0.5m | 0.5m | 0.8m | 0.9m | 0.8m | 0.5m |
| Total Paid                              | 0.5m | 0.5m | 0.7m | 0.9m | 0.7m | 0.4m |

##### Over £35,000

|                                         |      |      |       |       |       |       |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| No of Companies                         | 64   | 79   | 121   | 105   | 107   | 95    |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 5.4m | 8.4m | 10.3m | 11.6m | 12.8m | 16.2m |
| Total Paid                              | 5.2m | 8.3m | 10.3m | 11.1m | 11.5m | 16.0m |

#### QUALIFYING COMPANIES

##### Under £35,000

|                                         |    |    |    |    |      |      |
|-----------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|------|------|
| No of Companies assessed                | 5  | 8  | 5  | 7  | 1    | 1    |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 2k | 4k | 2k | 4k | 0.2k | 0.1k |
| Total Paid                              | 2k | 4k | 2k | 3k | 0.2k | 0.1k |

##### Over £35,000

|                                         |      |      |      |      |      |   |
|-----------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|---|
| No of Companies assessed                | 9    | 16   | 22   | 19   | 5    | - |
| Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable) | 0.9m | 0.9m | 1.4m | 1.2m | 165k | - |
| Total Paid                              | 0.9m | 0.9m | 1.4m | 1.1m | 165k | - |

ORAL

**NO. 1866 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – LOW INCOME EARNERS**

Can Government state whether anyone has yet received the low income earners tax credit announced in the 2001 budget?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1867 and 1868 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1867 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – LOW INCOME EARNERS**

Can Government confirm whether the low income earners tax credit applies only in respect of assessable income that is earned, as opposed to investment income?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1866 and 1868 of 2004.



**NO. 1868 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – LOW INCOME EARNERS**

Will Government be able to assess the effect of the tax reduction once the low income earners tax credit has been applied to all eligible tax payers for the tax year 2001/2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Four hundred individuals in respect of each of the years of assessment 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 have now, through the Tax Credit allowed on their assessments, benefited from the Low Income Earner's Tax Credit announced in the Government's 2001 Budget.

Since April 2004 when the hon Member last sought information on the Tax Credit there has been acceleration in the issue of PAYE assessments. It is therefore expected that substantially more individuals will obtain the benefit of the Tax Credit in the coming months.

Assessable income, for all the purposes of the Income Tax Ordinance and subsidiary legislation, includes earned and unearned income.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1866 TO 1868 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am aware that assessable income means both. The reason for the question is that the Chief Minister described it as low income earners and therefore I wondered whether the fact that it was earners as opposed to recipients for example, meant that it was limited to income earned by working and not investment income.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It does not mean that, otherwise one could have a situation where somebody could have a huge unearned income, a low earned income, and he would get this and may be a millionaire.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That was not the point that I was making. The point I was making is not whether the investment income would be discounted but whether the investment income would be eligible. That is to say, if somebody has no earned income and it is all investment income, do they still get the low income earners?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I completely misunderstood as I think the drafter of the answer has. I think the answer is not but I would have to check that. In other words, if one has no earned income but unearned income only and it is below the threshold, can one get the tax credit. I am not sure what the answer to that is, I think not but I would have to check.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well in fact the original question, Question No. 1867, was in fact asking precisely that because the title of the credit is Low Income Earners Credit and therefore I wondered, it was not very clear at Budget time but in April it seemed to raise a point. In terms of the 400 that have been able to obtain the credit for 2001/2002 and 2002/2003, I assume that these are in fact more or less the same people and that their assessments have been done for the two years. Is that the likely answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe that that is the case. They have been done for two years at a time.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Question No. 1868 I do not think has been answered, which was to say when the exercise was completed would the Government be in a position to give an answer on the total cost of this?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, if by the effect of the tax reduction he means will the Government be able to compute the cost to the Government of the give-away, the answer is I suppose so, yes. I will have to check whether the computer is set up but as it is a tax credit, in other words it comes off the tax bill, one literally multiplies by the number of people. Except I suppose there may be a number of people who get part credits.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Will the Government note that I am just signalling it so that if it something that needs to be done, if the Government have got no objection to doing it, then it should be done so

that we do not find that when I ask retrospectively for the information that it is not possible to do because it was not envisaged? So that is the point of the question.

ORAL

**NO. 1869 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 INDIVIDUALS**

Can Government state as at the end of September 2004 what was the number of High Net Worth or Category 2 Individuals with a tax liability of £10,000 or less in respect of each of the tax years 1995/1996 to 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1870 to 1872 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1870 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 INDIVIDUALS**

Can Government state what was the amount payable, paid and outstanding as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 for each tax year 1995/1996 to 2003/2004 by High Net Worth or Category 2 Individuals with a liability to tax of £10,000 or less?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1869, 1871 and 1872 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1871 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 INDIVIDUALS**

Can Government state what was the amount payable, paid and outstanding as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 for each tax year 1995/1996 to 2003/2004 by High Net Worth or Category 2 Individuals with a liability to tax of more than £10,000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1869, 1870 and 1872 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1872 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CATEGORY 2 INDIVIDUALS**

Can Government state as at the end of September 2004 what was the number of High Net Worth or Category 2 Individuals with a tax liability of more than £10,000 in respect of each of the tax years 1995/1996 to 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information sought regarding the assessment and collection of tax payable by High Net Worth and Category 2 Individuals for the years 1995/1996 to 2002/2003 is contained in the schedule attached.

Answer to Question 1872.

|                                               | 1995/96 | 1996/97 | 1997/98 | 1998/99 | 1999/00 | 2000/01 | 2001/02 | 2002/03 |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Individuals with liability of £10,000 or less | 48      | 56      | 72      | 84      | 109     | 141     | 152     | 151     |
|                                               | £M      | £M      | £M      | £M      | £M      | £M      | £M      | £M      |
| Tax Payable                                   | 0.49    | 0.57    | 0.72    | 0.83    | 0.97    | 1.21    | 1.35    | 1.44    |
| Tax Paid                                      | 0.41    | 0.49    | 0.68    | 0.79    | 0.89    | 1.13    | 1.28    | 1.35    |
| Outstanding                                   | 0.08    | 0.08    | 0.04    | 0.04    | 0.08    | 0.08    | 0.07    | 0.09    |

|                                               | 7    | 19   | 39   | 41   | 31   | 38   | 39   | 36   |
|-----------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Individuals with liability of £10,000 or more | 7    | 19   | 39   | 41   | 31   | 38   | 39   | 36   |
|                                               | £M   | £M   | £M   | £M   | £M   | £M   | £M   | £M   |
| Tax Payable                                   | 0.14 | 0.39 | 0.78 | 0.82 | 0.61 | 0.72 | 0.70 | 0.65 |
| Tax Paid                                      | 0.10 | 0.17 | 0.29 | 0.38 | 0.43 | 0.49 | 0.46 | 0.55 |
| Outstanding                                   | 0.04 | 0.22 | 0.49 | 0.44 | 0.18 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.10 |



## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1869 TO 1872 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I note that the 1995/1996 figures show no change for the tax payable although some change to the tax paid which shows that even now it is still possible to collect from as far back as that. There are changes in the tax payable from 1996/1997 on. Is there any way of getting an indication of how far back they go in identifying that there are people who are liable? I can understand that the thing may not be paid on time and may be paid late but I would have thought, knowing how many people are in the category, it would immediately tell the numbers that would be liable to pay.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not intimately familiar with the mechanics of how this is administered but of course, we can have a tally of the number of certificates issued so we know how many certificates are in issue and that number I suppose can be given. In fact I think it is sought in another question, but not everybody sort of remains live so to speak, some people go away and do not pay any more. So there is the number who pay, albeit late, who regardless of when they pay is not necessarily 100 per cent of the number of certificates in issue. In other words, people may just disappear from the scene without handing in their certificates.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I understand that but if I may give the Chief Minister an example. In the answer he gave me to Question No. 1432 for example, there were 21 shown for 1996/1997 who were liable to pay £430,000 and they had paid £110,000 in April this year for the year 1996/1997 which is going back quite a long way. I would not be surprised to see changes in the last couple of years but we are going back to 1996/1997. On this occasion the numbers liable are down from 21 to 19, the amount that is payable is down from £430,000 to £390,000 and the amount collected is up from £110,000 to £170,000. Now I can understand that since my last question six months ago £60,000 has been collected which is good that it should be possible to collect £60,000 going back to 1996/1997 but what I cannot understand are the other changes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am afraid I cannot help him with that except by speculating that if the number of people have gone down it may be that during the interim period the Commissioner has been able to establish that some outstanding certificates are not here at all or may even have been surrendered. I know that there is a clean-up exercise going on right now to try and get down to the real and try to eliminate redundant certificates still in issue.

ORAL

**NO. 1873 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

As at the end of September 2004 how many employers had not yet returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate and what is the estimated number of employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1874 to 1880 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1874 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

As at the end of September 2004 how many employers had not yet returned their 2003/2004 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate and what is the estimated number of employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1873 and 1875 to 1880 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1875 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

As at the end of September 2004 how many of the employers who had returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate had not paid the full amount PAYE deducted and what was the shortfall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1873, 1874 and 1876 to 1880 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1876 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

As at the end of September 2004 how many of the employers who had returned their 2003/2004 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate had not paid the full amount of PAYE deducted and what was the shortfall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1873 to 1875 and 1877 to 1880 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1877 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

As at the end of September 2004 how many employers had returned their 2003/2004 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate and what was the total amount of tax deducted and the number of employees involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1873 to 1876 and 1878 to 1880 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1878 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government now state what was the amount of tax collected in PAYE in the financial year 2003/2004 by areas of employment as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government Owned/Joint Venture Companies; and
- (d) Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1873 to 1877, 1879 and 1880 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1879 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Based on the 2002/2003 Employers Annual Statement Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 what was the PAYE payable by area of employment and number of employees as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government Owned/Joint Venture Companies; and
- (d) Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1873 to 1878 and 1880 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1880 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Based on the 2003/2004 Employers Annual Statement Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 what was the PAYE payable by area of employment as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government Owned/Joint Venture Companies; and
- (d) Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Although I am going to give a full answer, I am sending a copy of it to the hon Member so that he does not have to make a note of all the information I am going to read out.

**Answer to Question No. 1873**

As at 30 September 2004, 305 employers had not yet returned their 2002/2003 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate. The estimated number of employees deduction cards affected is 511.

**Answer to Question No. 1874**

As at 30 September 2004, 555 employers had not yet returned their 2003/2004 Employer's Declaration and PAYE Certificate. The estimated number of employees deduction cards affected is approximately 6700.

**Answer to Question No. 1875**

Based on the 2002/2003 annual PAYE Employer's Return received at the Income Tax Office by the 30 September 2004, 170 such employers owed PAYE totalling £1.7 million.

**Answer to Question No. 1876**

Based on the 2003/2004 Annual PAYE Employer's Return received at the Income Tax Office by the 30 September 2004, 296 such employers owed PAYE tax totalling £4.1 million.

**Answer to Question No. 1877**

A total of 1527 returns for the year 2003/2004 had been received at the Income Tax Office by the 6 October 2004. The total PAYE tax deducted and payable was £41.4 million. The PAYE Deduction Cards are presently being inputted into the database and it is not possible to provide a figure of the cards received to date.

**Answer to Question No. 1878**

Following reconciliation of the Income Tax Office records and Treasury Books I can confirm that the figures as provided by Question No. 1418 of 2004 are final and conclusive.

Cont'd.....

**Answer to Question No. 1879**

Based on the 2002/2003 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 6 October 2004 the information sought is as follows:

|                                                     | £million         | Approximate No. of<br>Employees/Deduction Cards |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| (a) MOD                                             | 4.7              | 2650                                            |
| (b) Gibraltar Government                            | 21.1             | 6050                                            |
| (c) Government Owned and<br>Joint Venture Companies | 3.1              | 700                                             |
| (d) Private Sector Employment                       | 32.7             | 16800                                           |
|                                                     | <hr/> <hr/> 61.6 | <hr/> <hr/> 26200                               |

**Answer to Question No. 1880**

Given that 555 Employers' PAYE Declaration and Certificates for the tax year 2003/2004 have not yet been returned, any figures produced of PAYE payable would not be accurate enough to give meaningful information of the breakdown of PAYE payable by the different sectors which the question seeks. I would therefore invite the hon Member to seek this information at a later Question Time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1873 TO 1880 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I know that in fact the 555 seems to be higher than has been the case now for a number of years in terms of the returns normally by October which is when we have the Question Time. In fact I think the Principal Auditor in the Accounts that have been tabled today commented in respect of last year's figures that they were up on the preceding year. Do Government have any idea why this should be happening?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I do not have any idea why it is happening and I have not yet had a report to me that the situation is getting worse, I have not actually read the Auditor's Report myself yet but accepting the hon Member's analysis without checking it, accepting it as being correct, it seems as if employers are taking longer to send in their returns. Certainly, if that were the case, then the Government would wish something to be done about it because ultimately it affects cash flow. It does not ultimately necessarily affect revenue but certainly cash flow and with it the possibility of having to draw down on facilities unnecessarily and things of that sort.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I also note in fact, from comparison with similar questions put in other years that also in respect of the 2002/2003 returns which in the answer that I was given in March this year there were 310 employers who had not returned, and the figure now is 305 which means they only had five in the last six months. That again, I think the Government should note seems to be a slower rate of return than has been the case when I have asked in respect of previous years and the improvement after six months.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is that six months or twelve months?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Six months. We are talking about the previous financial year and when I asked in March this year, Question No. 1423, the answer was 310 had not yet returned. So only five have done it in the last six months. At that rate we will be in the next election.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am grateful to the hon Member for his analysis. I will certainly take it up.

**NO. 1881 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**HARBOUR VIEWS**

Can Government state whether they still expect to commence this calendar year the remedial works to the podium at Harbour Views?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is unlikely that the works will physically commence this calendar year. The Government remain in discussions with the new management committee of Harbour Views as to the nature of the works to be undertaken. The works then have to be specified and put out to tender. Indeed, since this answer was printed, I can tell the hon Member that I actually met with the Harbour Views, I was not aware that there was a meeting in my diary for yesterday lunch time, and they have now agreed with the previous Committee's choice of the options for works available, so that is now firm and in the bag. So the Government are now in a position, as of lunch time yesterday, to start the process of specification and tendering. It is now just a question of how long that takes rather than any discussion. In other words, the discussion part of the answer has been overtaken by events.

**NO. 1882 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – CHILTON COURT**

Can Government state when they intend to start allocating the housing units in Chilton Court?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Housing units at Chilton Court have not yet been transferred by MOD to the Government. This is not scheduled to occur until April 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1882 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

When I asked a previous question in the House a few months ago concerning Chilton Court, I asked the Chief Minister if Government would consider allocating some of the ground floor flats in Chilton Court for the elderly in Gibraltar, his answer was that they would consider that but that his preferred choice would be that the houses for the elderly would be allocated from the new second home for the elderly built in the same or similar style as Bishop Canilla. What worries me, and I will ask the Government now, do they share my concern that homes for the elderly are taking far too long? If Chilton Court allocation is going to take that long and the Chief Minister suggested that he would consider allocating some of the ground floor flats for the elderly, it is a concern.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not share the hon Member's somewhat ungenerous assessment that housing for the elderly is taking too long. Indeed we were the only party with a manifesto commitment to build Bishop Canilla when we built it. So to say to the only party that has ever built specialist housing of this sort that it is taking too long to build its second batch, coming from the benches of a party that never did it in the eight years that they were in office, I think is unduly harsh a judgement on our performance but the Government obviously share his analysis that these are a good thing and that more are required and that is

evident by the fact that we have moved on to build the second batch, which in fact is a much greater number than Bishop Canilla. I think Bishop Canilla was 86 or 90 and here we are talking of 140. So it is a very large second dose of specialist and sheltered, specially designed, wardened housing for the elderly. Now, all that is a different issue to the one that I think is at the root of the hon Member's question which is, I think what he has said is capable of being interpreted as meaning regardless of the new specialist housing, which I note to boot he thinks is taking too long, should the Government not use ground floor accommodation in all its housing stock for the elderly. Given that every time a flat stays empty on a ground floor, it is a useful opportunity to put an elderly person there who may not get one of the new houses, there are only 140 of them, there may be more than 140 demand. I see the virtue of that, I do. If the Government are going to allocate these houses I think it would be sensible to pencil in so to speak, the ground floor ones for any elderly person that may anyway in any case be destined or scheduled to get a house, even if it means advancing their entitlement by a few months. I agree with that analysis and having said that I agree with that analysis of his I should also add that the Government have not yet made a decision as to how and to whom and for what purpose the Chilton Court flats will be allocated. There are several possibilities. One possibility is to just use it for people on the waiting list. Another possibility is to use it to decant people from pre-War housing in the Upper Town so that that can then be sold off to this scheme that the hon Member knows that the Government have of selling off old stock housing cheaply to low income home earners which they can then fix themselves. There are some blocks of Government houses in the Upper Town that are substantially vacant but may have one or two tenants left in it. One possibility, and I only lay it before the House as a possibility and not as something that has been decided, is that these flats at Chilton Court offer the possibility of re-housing those one or two tenants so that the whole pre-War house can then be sold off to buyers, to home owners. The main message is that a decision has not yet been taken.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Of course I would remind Government that Chilton Court will only have, if my memory serves me right, 33 apartments. This seems to be a small number of available apartments to solve what I consider to be a very big housing problem. My point being that it is taking far too long.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the hon Member just wants the last word I am very happy to concede it to him. There is not a question there, I will not suggest to answer. Look, in my opinion the size of the housing problem is not measured by the number of people on the housing waiting list, because even if there was only one person on the housing waiting list, to that person the problem of homelessness is the same as it is to the 300 others that he might be accompanied by. Therefore, when he says that the housing problem is too big, the Government's policy is to provide housing on acceptable terms to as many people as possible. We do not say 150 to 200 waiting list is acceptable, 300 is too big, as if there were something magical about the 200 figure. In other words, 199 can be made to suffer but 203 people are too many. That is not the Government's view. That is not how we measure the size of the housing problem in Gibraltar. We just take the view that there is a continuing demand for housing that needs to be satisfied and the Government

cannot let up until the demand has been satisfied and that is our approach to it. As to whether he thinks we are taking too long, that is another issue. I have heard that argument before in respect of new building but I have not heard it used before in respect of Government rental stock, where we are the only Government really to have significantly contributed to the available stock through the building of new flats. Fine, I accept that it was a general comment in relation to housing generally and not specifically.



**NO. 1883 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – LOW COST UNITS**

Have Government proposed to any developer to date that as a condition of obtaining a development site they have to build low cost housing units, what does this cost amount to in the case of a 3RKB and 4RKB unit and what is the respective floor areas of such units?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government have begun to deploy this policy. It has featured, for example, in the Eastside Project negotiations. It is too early to give the other details which he seeks.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1883 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I get the impression, and I will try after my supplementary comment to put it into a question so that I adhere to Standing Orders, I get the impression that the Government come up with a lot of schemes and make comments to the effect that they are very advanced, that they have reached a very advanced stage. What I would like to ask the Chief Minister, is it not a reasonable question to ask what is the likely cost of these units, if the impression given to me in the past is that these things are in a very, very advanced stage? Surely he ought to know that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not recognise in the hon Member's statement, whether he converts it into a question or not, the reality is that the Government have not made many statements about the subject matter of this question which is getting developers as part of their grant, to build low cost housing. That is a statement in our manifesto and in the Budget speech that it would be done. It is being done but he has to understand that the leading process for these developments is a long time and that no projects have been announced since those statements were made. The one major housing project which is under negotiation

includes this element, so I know he thinks that we announce lots of things and do not do enough. It is not a judgement let me say which I share but I know that he is of that view, but I do not think that this is an example of it. This is not an example of it. He cannot yet point to a development that has proceeded since we adopted this policy and which has not included a requirement to provide affordable housing. Now, entirely hypothetically, which we should not be incurring in Question Time as he knows from Standing Orders, but whilst we are permitted by the Chair to engage in hypotheses in Question Time, let me tell him that what the Government mean by this is not that the developer should have to subsidise the housing but rather that they have to sell it at cost. In other words, that they are not allowed to make a profit on it so that there is affordable low cost housing meaning that there is housing which does not have a land cost element to it, which does not have a developer's profit cost built into it and therefore can be sold at the cheapest possible price which can be no less than the cost of construction. That is what it means and that is how it will emerge when the first example of that emerges. So that is the answer to his hypothetical question of what does low cost mean. If the Government then want to make it more accessible to people than selling it to them at the cost of construction with no land element included, that is a matter for the Government. We can then offer the 50/50 scheme or some other such scheme to make it cheaper for the buyer but we cannot expect a developer to sell for less than the cost of construction. Enough that we require him to make an investment with no possibility of a return. That is the sense in which the private sector can be made to contribute to the affordable housing scheme policy.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not a fact that although the Chief Minister has today used affordable and low cost as if they were interchangeable.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I have not used affordable, they used it. Well, I may have done this afternoon.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Now, that is what I mean, in the last five seconds. I was going to remind the Chief Minister, perhaps he will agree with me, that in fact in a previous question when we were asking about low cost and affordable, what he told us was that the affordable element was on the basis that different people would be able to afford different shares in a house. That is what affordable meant. When the Government said they would be providing affordable housing and I asked them what affordable means, they said that that depends on how much money one has got, different people can afford different things. That is what the question was and the record of Hansard that is already published will show them that was the answer at the time. So therefore, putting the concept of affordable now that it has been defined on one side, would it not be reasonable to expect that if the Government say to a developer 'I want you to build as part of the deal x number of low cost housing', the Government presumably would have a specification. It would not just be that they are sold at what it costs because.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course the Government have a specification.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Right. Therefore that specification has an order of cost attached to it. Otherwise if one just says to the developer 'build what you like and as long as you do not charge a profit', well selling at cost price and producing low cost houses are not the same thing. Would the Chief Minister not agree?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Absolutely I agree and that is exactly the situation so that is not the nature of the question. When the Government engage in negotiations with developers, for example in the context of the Eastside development, the requirement would be that they build and sell at cost housing to specifications dictated by the Government and to a category of purchasers specified by the Government. The hon Member is entirely right in the first part of his question too, that the Government have said that affordable is not, affordability is subjective, one can afford what one can afford. The Government cannot affect the cost of construction in Gibraltar. What we can do is find other means of allowing access to home ownership by people who cannot even afford the cost price. The way that we have done it is that we have modified their 50/50 scheme to have a formula of so many times household income and allowing the buyer to buy whatever share that provides even if it is less than 50 per cent. In other words, one will always be able to buy some share, it may not be 50 per cent if one can not afford it, but one will be able to access home ownership by purchasing a smaller percentage, in other words a percentage that one can afford. That is our way of closing the gap between affordability and cost. Obviously it will not close it for everybody but it will certainly allow access to many people who would not have access if it were a strict 50/50 albeit at cost. The previous examples of home ownership have been 50/50 on the basis of a developer's profit. That was the Westside experience for which they are responsible and which was a very significant contribution to the concept of home ownership. What has happened since to alter the ground rules which made that a viable scheme at that time, is that the costs of construction have risen much faster than earnings. In other words the gap of affordability is getting wider. So therefore we have to deal with it in a way that is relevant to closing that gap. The only way we have come up with is instead of being a 50/50 it is a variable percentage home ownership scheme. That is the way that we plan to do it. None of which is intended to disagree, I think the hon Member's analysis is entirely correct.

**NO. 1884 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**LEISURE CENTRE – KINGS BASTION**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether there are any new developments as to the long-standing promised conversion of Kings Bastion to a Leisure Centre, since a Leisure Centre was promised in their Manifesto of 1996?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I notice the glee and the frequency with which the hon Lady likes to remind us all that we have been in breach of this particular manifesto commitment since 1996, despite which the electorate nonetheless re-elect us. I shudder to think what their electoral fate will be when we go to the electorate with all our manifesto commitments honoured, if they re-elect us notwithstanding the fact that we do not provide something.

The position remains as explained to the hon Lady when she last asked this question in this House. Government fully expect to implement this manifesto commitment during this term of office.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1884 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Chief Minister say, because in answer to Question No. 46 of 2004 he said that if the negotiations with the MOD, which are referred to in the question, can be brought about to an end quickly, the answer to the question is yes. If on the other hand the negotiations have not come to a favourable conclusion quickly, then the answer is that we will peel that aspect of the project away from it and proceed around those negotiations. Can the Chief Minister say whether he will peel away the part which belongs to the MOD or not? He did say that if that occurred it would change the nature of the project.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is that the hon Lady has the answer to her question already then. I said that one thing would happen if we successfully concluded the MOD negotiation and that another thing would happen if we did not successfully negotiate through the MOD negotiations. She knows that since we said that we have successfully concluded the MOD negotiation on the lands deal. Yes, she does know the answer because the lands deal includes the football ground which was an essential part of the question that she was alluding to last time. In other words, yes, she obviously does not remember the use that she is making of references to earlier questions. The possibilities were this. The Kings Bastion is already in Government hands. There are development proposals for the area of Navy 1, the one nearest the generating station. Had we not done a deal with the MOD which included transferring the Navy 1 to us, we would have had to carry on and do the leisure centre in isolation, which we could do because it is ours already, but if we did have the Navy 1 we could include it in the context of a wider negotiation in the context of the development of the surrounding in Navy 1 area. The MOD lands deal has now been done, and as she will have noticed it includes the transfer of the Navy 1. So one of the two options that she herself described has occurred. Therefore the answer is that there is no need to peel off.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Have the Government already come to a preferred option of whether the leisure centre will be run by the Government or run by the private sector?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I cannot answer the question if she uses the word 'run', but if she means operated for the account of, then the answer is it will be operated for the account of the Government. In other words, we may not run it ourselves but it will not be a private venture. Either the Government run it or contract somebody to run it for the Government, but it will not be a private sector venture once it is up and running.

ORAL

**NO. 1885 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PROMOTION OF HERITAGE**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the forecast outturn of £20,000 in respect of Promotion of Heritage issues for the financial year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Cont'd. Answer to Question 1885 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 1885**

|                              |                   |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Meals & Receptions           | £ 1,192.49        |
| Printing                     | £ 3,522.00        |
| Lectures (Rita Benitez Mota) | £ 888.31          |
| Grants (Mr Seruya)           | £ 5,000.00        |
| Accommodation                | £ 187.00          |
| Insurance                    | £ 2,000.00        |
| Moorish Castle - Consultancy | £ 3,750.00        |
| Air fares and transport      | £ 2,690.57        |
|                              | <u>£19,230.37</u> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1885 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There is a grant of £5,000 to an individual, can the Chief Minister say what that was for?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It says Mr Serruya there in brackets, I think that is a gentleman who wrote a book about the Royal Gibraltar Regiment's uniforms or Gibraltar Defence Force or something like that.



ORAL

**NO. 1886 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**EUROPORT – PARKING FACILITIES**

Can the Government confirm how many car parking spaces they have bought from the developers of Europlaza which will be used for persons accessing the Europort Hospital and what category of persons will be able to use them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1887 and 1888 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1887 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**EUROPORT – PARKING FACILITIES**

Can Government state how much they have paid the developers of Europlaza for the provision of car parking spaces to be used for the Hospital at the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1886 and 1888 of 2004.

**NO. 1888 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**EUROPORT – PARKING FACILITIES**

Can Government confirm how many car parking spaces will be available at the Europort Hospital, and who will have access to them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The hon Lady has perfected the technique of asking and answering her own questions. In one question she says can the Government confirm how many car parking spaces they have bought from the developers of Europlaza which will be used for persons accessing the Europort Hospital? In the very next question she asks what category of persons will be allowed to use the car parks? The answer, as she rightly identifies herself, are persons accessing the Europort Hospital.

The number of parking spaces that Government have agreed to purchase is 85. They are intended for use as public car parking for visitors to the hospital. No decision has yet been taken about how that will work.

The value applicable to this transaction is £650,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1886 TO 1888 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

How is the value made up?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure I understand the question. It is the agreed value of the asset that the Government are purchasing. I think it is based on cost. It is the cost to the developer of producing that floor which they are just going to hand to the Government.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will that consideration be paid by the Government in cash to the developer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, that is why the words 'the value applicable to this transaction' have been used rather than just the cost. There is a possibility that this consideration will be paid in the form of a discount from a premium due on another project. So it is a cost to the Government whether it is actually paid in cash or deducted from a sum that is otherwise payable to the Government, is just a book keeping issue. Suffice it to say that the cost to the Government, whether through payment or through failure to collect, is £650,000.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Has that premium already been agreed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The quid pro quo with the developer, can the Chief Minister say what exactly is the other deal that they have come with the developer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It hardly arises as a supplementary to this question. No I cannot. I can but I will not, it is not appropriate.

**NO. 1889 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Can the Government state what plans they have, if any, for the buildings of St Bernard's Hospital once it is transferred to the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The matter is currently under consideration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1889 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Chief Minister says 'under consideration' does that mean that they are talking to private developers?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No it does not. It means that the Government now have a unique opportunity to regenerate a large area of the Upper Town, which is the area of St Bernard's Hospital and the area of the adjoining vacant Police Barracks buildings. These sites together represent a large percentage by area of the Upper Town. It is therefore a once in a lifetime opportunity to use that as an opportunity to regenerate the Upper Town and repopulate it, and that the Government wish to consider how that is best done as an internal policy matter, not in negotiation with anybody else. There are many competing interests. I think I have revealed in this House before today that one of the uses that is a front runner for part of the St Bernard's Hospital building is as further homes for the elderly, not as in Bishop Canilla but as in residential home, but there are other areas. One of the things that need to be decided is which building should be demolished. Obviously the historic Colonial Hospital should not be demolished and I have never heard anybody suggest that the Mackintosh Wing should be demolished, but there is a whole lot of outline ramshackle buildings that have been attached over the years and therefore the question is which if any of those should be demolished and do what with

the space. There is a unique opportunity now because of the two sites being side by side, to take a holistic approach to the regeneration of that whole part of the Upper Town. I think that needs to be carefully considered. Indeed not only carefully considered by the Government but the Government envisage a public consultation process with interested groups to seek their input into that decision.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Assuming that the Chief Minister uses the word 'holistic' starting with a 'w' and not an 'h' he will recall that parts of the Police Barracks area are still tenanted. Is there any advance plan as to what will happen to the tenants who still remain there?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not consider myself to be a master of the English tongue, but I do not think there is any version of the word 'holistic' which starts with a 'w'. I think even when it means in whole it is still spelt with an 'h' at the front and not with a 'w'. Assuming that we mean that, I am not sure I have understood the hon Member's question. Holistic means taking into account the whole of the area available and what is the best use of the space, what mix of uses to put in. Housing – should housing be private or public, should it be developed by the Government or developed by the private sector? In addition to housing should there be other uses? I have already mentioned one, the possibility of the school St Bernard's School. There are those who advocate that.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

My question was not what the project would entail. That is for a consultation process later. What is going to happen to the people who are still tenants of the Police Barracks area because there are still a lot of families in the block closest to the hospital?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is not at the moment in my definition of the site that is available for holistic. It may become available. The Government may try to seek to persuade those families to relocate, voluntarily if they want to. If they do not want to they could stay and then we would be talking about, I think the hon Member is describing the Inspectors Block as it is called. Yes, the one in which there are tenants. In other words the most northerly blocks, those are called the Inspectors Block. The ones that are vacant I think are called just the Police Barracks. Fine, either we have St Bernard's Hospital site and the Old Police Barracks plus or minus the two blocks which are presently occupied, depending on whether the tenants are interested or are not interested in being re-housed. That would be their choice, certainly the Government would not force them to be re-housed if they would prefer to stay there.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I assume we are still on Question No. 1889. If we are I would like to ask a supplementary question which I hope I will be allowed to introduce at this point. As reference is made to the question of transferral of the whole, both the patients, the staff, the equipment from St Bernard's Hospital to the new hospital at Europort, how long do Government expect this operation to take? I think the question is important, because if we are being told that the hospital will be operational as from 1<sup>st</sup> February, and if it is going to take three months then they should be starting now.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not clear. Is that a supplementary question to how long it is going to take to migrate one medical facility to another, or is it a question about the fact that we should start now deciding what the future use is for St Bernard's Hospital site?

**HON C A BRUZON:**

It is simply a question that I am attempting to be allowed to ask as a supplementary, because reference is made to the question of once it is transferred to the Europort Building. As we have been allowed to talk about things that are not directly connected, I think my colleague has introduced an important issue concerning the Old Police Barracks, I am now trying to ask a question which I think is important. It somehow may be indirectly connected with Question No. 1889. That is, what was said in the first part of the Chief Minister's comment, I want to know how long will the move take from St Bernard's to the new hospital?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a health service question rather than a property management question, all right I understand now. Well, it is certainly a very wide supplementary but still. The position is that the migration process is gradual, so he can ask me how long it will take to complete, because one of the issues that arises when migrating a hospital from one site to another is that one cannot discontinue the provision of facilities. One cannot say no one can have an X-ray because for the next three days we are dismantling the X-ray from St Bernard's and carrying it down to the new hospital. That is why migration of hospital facilities from one site to another is such a complex thing. One can never be without any of the facilities so one ends up for a period of time with having facilities in two places not in one. That said, I hope he has understood that it is a gradual phased thing this migration transfer, I think the actual migration process takes I think somewhere between four and six weeks.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

When the Hon Mr Britto said, I think, correct me if I am wrong, that the hospital would be fully operational in February, what does that mean then? That the two hospitals will be working together but that the new hospital will not be fully operational.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It means that the new hospital will be fully operational by 1<sup>st</sup> February. That is the current target date, well I would call it more than a target date, that is the current expectation.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So the migration is finished then in February or would the migration have started then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We can express the same view in fifteen different ways until the hon Members are satisfied that we are not being clever with language. The new hospital will not be fully operational if all that had happened by 1<sup>st</sup> February was that the migration process had just started. It might be partly operational but it would not be fully operational.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, because the migration process should not really start until the new hospital is fully operational , I imagine?

**MR SPEAKER:**

I think we have gone a far distance from what the question started off with, next question.



ORAL

**NO. 1890 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Can the Government state how much they can expect the hospital within the Europort Building to cost them once they have concluded the financial deal with the Royal Bank of Scotland (Gibraltar) Ltd?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1891 of 2004.

**NO. 1891 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – NEW HOSPITAL**

Has any additional work been carried out during the current year on the Europort Building conversion for the hospital, and if so, what is the additional cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not yet possible to provide the information requested since the final cost of construction has not yet been certified under the Construction Contract. I think there have been additional works however. That is the sort of non financial part which I can answer. For example, I think it has been this calendar year, not this financial year but interpreting his question as meaning calendar year I am aware, for example, that the location of the mortuary (I think we have discussed this in the House before) has moved from the basement to the ground floor. I know that there was a cost attached to that but I cannot tell him what that cost was yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1890 AND 1891 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The question really is in the context of the cost figure that was given at the time of the Estimates. So I would not know whether that element was already reflected in that cost figure.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I am really trying to find out is if that figure has changed, if the figure that was given at the Estimates has changed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think that it will have changed by virtue of additional works but it may not be cast in stone because remember that the administration of a building contract is in the hands of the architect who has to certify. He goes certifying on a monthly basis during the course of the construction but then he has to do a final certification and until he does that one does not know what the cost of the construction contract is. Even in respect of works that had already been certified and covered under monthly certificates before. The Government have a ball park figure, which I would prefer not to publicised at this stage, of what we think the current level is but it would not be any figure on which he could rely. He could at best only regard it as our current ball park estimation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the Chief Minister is reluctant to give that figure, does that mean that it is not the figure that he quoted before which was something like £54 million? When I asked about the rent shown in the Estimates the Chief Minister will recall that I was told that this was in relation to a cost of the project of £54 million.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is confusion here in the hon Member's mind. His question relates to the costs of conversion of the hospital. The other figure, the figure that he has mentioned which I do not from memory recognise but if that is the figure that I mentioned, that must have included things that are not cost of conversion. For example, the cost of acquisition of the building originally might take the figure up to that order, but without now having in front of me a note of how that figure that I mentioned is constituted, I hate to commit myself to whether that particular figure has risen or fallen. Let me put it this way, I have not been advised since the Budget Session that the nature of the financial exposure to this project has altered substantially.

**NO. 1892 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**TRANS-BORDER INSTITUTE**

Can Government state what is the current state of affairs in relation to the Trans-border Institute after the sacking of Mr Oda and whether Government had any say in the matter?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The status of the Trans-border Institute remains as it has always been. Mr Oda is the representative of the Spanish side. We are no more entitled to a say in their choice of their representative than they are in the choice of ours – who is Mr Clive Finlayson.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1892 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The Government give up £20,000 to Knightsfield Holdings for the Trans-border Institute and the sacking of Mr Oda was one which he was an employee, because I do not reckon that there is another employee other than Mr Oda who is organising every function to do with the Trans-border Institute. Knightsfield Holdings get £20,000 give it to the Trans-border Institute and surely either Mr Finlayson who is the one in charge of Knightsfield Holding or Government actually who give in £20,000 have a say as to not a representative but an employee, because he was employed by the Trans-border Institute.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

First of all let me say that I am delighted that the hon Member has finally subscribed to the principle of cross-border Institute and is now interested in its affairs. Secondly, the Government's voted funds do not go towards his salary. It goes towards the organisation of events. Mr Oda is not the Government's employee, he is the Spanish designated representative. We have Mr Clive Finlayson of Knightsfield Holdings. If, in the unlikely event that the Government of Gibraltar should want to sack Mr Finlayson, if

indeed that is what has happened to Mr Oda, but in the unlikely event that the Government should wish to sack Mr Finlayson I would not expect the hon Member to be arguing that the Mayor of Tarifa should have a say in that. Now, I have a personal view about what has happened to Mr Oda and if I am correctly discerning from his question what the hon Member's view on the matter is, and I think we probably coincide as to the view, but it is not an issue in which the Government of Gibraltar have been consulted. Were it a matter in which we felt that we had a say as equal partners, which is what we are in the Trans-border Institute, we would not have allowed it to happen.

**HON S E LINARES:**

As a matter of record, is the fact that I ask about the Trans-border Institute does not mean that I am in favour or against the Trans-border Institute. I have not indicated either way. It is just that it is £20,000 that comes from the Estimates of Expenditure which I am interested and which I think the whole of the Opposition is interested to know exactly.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not for his salary.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No but it is to do with the Government putting into the Trans-border Institute, whether it is for salaries or for functions, for conferences, for whatever, the Government do give in £20,000 to this Institute and this is my interest. Where does the money go and how is it spent? That is why I am asking the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is fully entitled to question the Government about how public funds are spent, but I do not accept that for the purposes of this issue it makes no difference whether Gibraltar public funds go towards paying Mr Oda's salary or not. If Gibraltar public funds went to entertain Mr Oda's salary, then I think the Gibraltar Government would be entitled to a say about how anybody employed with those funds is treated as a matter of decency and propriety, but if the Gibraltar public funds are not used for salaries but used to sponsor Trans-border Institute events in Gibraltar, and Mr Oda is not an employee of the Government of Gibraltar or the Gibraltar Government's designated person in the Trans-border Institute, in other words, Mr Oda is the Mancomunidad's equivalent of our Mr Finlayson in the Institute. Therefore in those circumstances we do not think it raises an issue for it. Let me say that as I recognised when I spoke in the Sociedad Marisol or whatever they are called, some dinner that I went to a few months ago in the Casino Calpe where I noticed that Mr Oda was present, I took the opportunity to comment on this issue and to thank him for his hard work and to recognise the huge role that he has played in the creation of the Trans-border Institute and its works. So we are certainly no supporters of any maltreatment of Mr Oda, which is not to say that we are in a position to prevent it. The answer to the hon Member's question in any event is that we were not consulted. Either because we were not entitled or out of courtesy or for

any other reason, we were not consulted. Indeed, we read about it in the newspapers like him.

ORAL

**NO. 1893 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Of the companies wound up by the Court further to the petitions advertised on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> July 2004, how many were trading at the time that the petitions were filed and of those, how many employees did each of them have registered at the ETB at the time?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

According to the records at the Employment Service, two were still active (trading) at the time, although none had any employees. The director of one of these companies was still under contract.

ORAL

**NO. 1894 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY**

How much money has been collected in import duty as a result of the enactment of the Development Aid (Amendment) Ordinance 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1895 of 2004.



**NO. 1895 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY**

What was the amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since April 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No import duty has been collected following the enactment of the 2004 amendment to the Development Aid Ordinance.

The import duty collected on building materials are:

|           |         |
|-----------|---------|
| April     | £29,336 |
| May       | £39,921 |
| June      | £46,675 |
| July      | £26,252 |
| August    | £28,593 |
| September | £44,409 |

**NO. 1896 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

Can Government say whether there are any more Tercentenary events planned for outside Gibraltar and if so what are they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There are no more Tercentenary events as such, but the Gibraltar Day this year, which is an annual event, will have a Tercentenary theme to it, however there would have been a Gibraltar Day whether it would have been the Tercentenary or not, that is why I say it is not really a Tercentenary event. This Tercentenary year Gibraltar will participate for the first time in The Lord Mayors Show in the City of London and also the Philatelic Exhibition at the invitation of the Royal Philatelic Society on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2004. I do not know whether that makes them Tercentenary events but they are two things that might not be happening were it not for the Tercentenary.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1896 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister tell the House which of those events, if we can classify them as Tercentenary events, is the one that the Foreign Secretary may attend?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, as far as I am aware he has not offered to sit on the Gibraltar float in the Lord Mayors Show and unless without my knowledge he has done so, I am aware that he has been invited and the event which I think in his mind is the one that he would accept attending is the Gibraltar Day, which is the Gibraltar Tercentenary Day in London this year. So it is a Tercentenary event but I just did not want the hon Members to come back to me saying 'ah, well that is not a Tercentenary event because it happens every year'. It would happen every year but not in this Tercentenary format. So for example, the changes are this year that there is no dinner but a larger reception.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Will there be separate receptions for the Finance Centre and for the Tourism industry as well?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

ORAL

**NO. 1897 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the Tercentenary Gibraltar-American Council event that took place at the Lotos Club, New York, in June this year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1898 of 2004.

**NO. 1898 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENTS**

How many persons attended the Tercentenary Gibraltar-American Council event at the Lotos Club, New York, in June this year and who were they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The total cost was \$4,034.92. Eighty-two persons attended. Mrs Franklin D Roosevelt Jnr, chairperson of the Gibraltar-American Council, presided. Members of the Council attended as did several ambassadors, one former member of Congress. The former United States Commissioner of Internal Revenues, the President of the American Foreign Policy council, historian Arthur Schlesinger Jnr., and editor of the Wall Street Journal and Mrs Anne Eisenhower-Flotti, granddaughter of President Eisenhower, amongst those eighty-two. Also attending were two United Nations ambassadors and three high-ranking officials of the United Nations Secretariat, and of course yours truly the Chief Minister.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1897 AND 1898 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I thank the Chief Minister because that is a comprehensive list. I do not think he has given me the eighty-two people in that summary but can he say who the ambassadors were, what country they were from?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

One of them was the Chairman of the Committee of 24. The other I cannot remember but certainly the Chairman of the Committee of 24 was one of them, who is from I cannot remember either. I think it was St Lucia but I may be wrong.

**NO. 1899 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 105 – ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, INDUSTRY AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

Can Government give a breakdown of the following forecast outturns for 2003/2004:

- (a) £67,000 Head 105 Sub-head 1 EU Interreg 2000/2006 programme;
- (b) £187,000 Head 105 Sub-head 2 EU Objective II 2000/2006 programme;
- (c) £138,000 Head 105 Sub-head 6 Upper Rock Improvements and Maintenance;
- (d) £282,000 Head 105 Sub-head 7 Beaches Improvements and Maintenance;
- (e) £1,457,000 Head 105 Sub-head 9 Tourist beautification projects;
- (f) £254,000 Head 105 Sub-head 10 Other development projects?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1900 to 1906 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1900 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 104, SUBHEAD 5**

Can Government give a breakdown of the £206,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 in respect of Head 104 Sub-head 5 for Port Infrastructure facilities and equipment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1899 and 1901 to 1906 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1901 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 105 – SUBHEAD 3**

Can Government give a breakdown of the £107,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 in respect of Head 105 Sub-head 3 Gibraltar Enterprise Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1899, 1900 and 1902 to 1906 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1902 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 6D, SUBHEAD 4(b)**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £27,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 in respect of marketing and Official Visits of the Ship Registry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1899 to 1901 and 1903 to 1906 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1903 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8-A, SUBHEAD 20**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £43,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 at Head 8-A 20 Research, Development Studies and Professional Fees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1899 to 1902 and 1904 to 1906 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1904 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8-A, SUBHEAD 16**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the £352,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 at Head 8-A 16 Government Lobbying, Hospitality and Travel showing in addition official travel by the Chief Minister, by Government Ministers, by Civil Servants and by GDC employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1899 to 1903, 1905 and 1906 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1905 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8-A, SUBHEAD 15**

Can Government give a breakdown of the £840,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 at Head 8-A 15 Private Sector fees for legal advice showing the legal firm or lawyer that the amounts were paid to, the date of payment and in respect of what?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1899 to 1904 and 1906 of 2004.

**NO. 1906 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8-A, SUBHEAD 8(d)**

Can Government give a breakdown of the £50,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 at head 8-A 8(d) Private Sector fees for legal drafting showing the legal firm or lawyer that the amounts were paid to, the date of payment and in respect of what?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question Nos. 1899 to 1902**

The Government do not think it appropriate to give all this information. It is simply too voluminous. The hon Member is, in effect, asking Government to publish a Nominal Ledger of all the transactions processed during a financial year which the Government are not willing to do. However, if he wants a subtotal in respect of any particular item of expenditure I will endeavour to obtain that information for him.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1903 to 1906**

This is more possible in respect of Question Nos. 1903 to 1906 in respect of which I now give him a schedule setting out the breakdowns in respect of those questions which do not amount to a Nominal Ledger type request. Several pages there of breakdown of those Heads which are in effect single item Heads, like legal fees and things like that, he has got a list there of the cases, but where he asks for a breakdown of a Sub-head, which includes many different things, it is in effect a Nominal Ledger and the only way one could in effect do it is to give him copies of the Government's books in that respect.

**CONT'D ANSWER TO QUESTION 1906****Answer to Question 1905**

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u>                                       | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| May-03      | Hassans         | The Agrani Project                                | £ 12,525.00   |
| Jun-03      | Hassans         | 30 Cornwalls court, planning appeal & enforcement | £ 15,000.00   |
| Jun-03      | Hassans         | 53 Europa Road                                    | £ 430.00      |
| Jul-03      | Hassans         | Elderly care handbook & disciplinary procedure    | £ 1,000       |
| Oct-03      | Hassans         | Argani Satellite communications                   | £ 3,000.00    |
| Dec-03      | Hassans         | Moreno 2000 Ltd                                   | £ 2,610.00    |
| Dec-03      | Hassans         | CTS application for Telecom licence               | £ 500.00      |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u>                                   | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|
| May-03      | White & Case    | The Kennel Club                               | £ 7,293.32    |
| Jun-03      | White & Case    | State Aids/Tax Financial Services             | £ 1,187.20    |
| Jun-03      | White & Case    | State Aids/Tax Financial Services             | £ 3,639.87    |
| Jul-03      | White & Case    | State Aids/Tax Financial Services             | £ 1,421.28    |
| Jun-03      | White & Case    | EU Law & Policy regarding taxation            | £ 735.00      |
| Aug-03      | White & Case    | State Aids/Tax Financial Services             | £ 1,508.31    |
| Sep-03      | White & Case    | Services Rendered, June 03                    | £ 6,026.34    |
| Oct-03      | White & Case    | Services Rendered, July & August 03           | £ 1,296.51    |
| Jan-04      | White & Case    | Professional Services, September & October 03 | £ 12,173.64   |
| Jan-04      | White & Case    | Professional services, January 04             | £ 802.00      |
| Jan-04      | White & Case    | Professional Services, November 03            | £ 5,095.17    |
| Mar-04      | White & Case    | Professional Services, December 03            | £ 4,119.47    |
| Jun-03      | White & Case    | Professional Services, February & March 03    | £ 4,242.71    |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u>                    | <u>Case</u>                                     | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| May-03      | Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton | Tax Reform & ECJ State issues & Aviation issues | £ 101,343.47  |
| Jun-03      | Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton | Telecommunications & Datatronix                 | £ 8,873.80    |
| Feb-04      | Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton | Professional Services, 1/2/03 to 21/10/03       | £ 93,424.03   |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u>         | <u>Case</u>                          | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Jun-03      | Triay, Stagnetto, Neish | Luis Gilbert Vs HMAG                 | £ 26,434.00   |
| Aug-03      | Triay, Stagnetto, Neish | Island Project, Queensway Quay       | £ 16,200.00   |
| Aug-03      | Triay, Stagnetto, Neish | MH Bland & Co Ltd                    | £ 87,346.55   |
| Oct-03      | Triay, Stagnetto, Neish | Tender for Buses                     | £ 920.00      |
| Dec-03      | Triay, Stagnetto, Neish | Steelmac Vs HM General for Gibraltar | £ 17,000.00   |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u>  | <u>Case</u>                        | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Jul-03      | Mr David Vaughan | Challenge to the savings directive | £ 7,100.00    |

Cont'd.....

**CONT'D ANSWER TO QUESTION 1906****Cont'd Answer to Question 1905**

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u>                                    | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Aug-03      | Mr M Llamas     | GKI Vs FCI, Challenge to the savings directive | £ 26,520.00   |
| Nov-03      | Mr M Llamas     | GFA Vs UEFA                                    | £ 9,860.00    |
| Feb-04      | Mr M Llamas     | Gib Olympic Committee Vs IOC                   | £ 13,785.00   |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u>        | <u>Case</u>              | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Aug-03      | Mr Beloff & Mr Herberg | Male Juries in Gibraltar | £ 57,500.00   |
| Nov-03      | Mr Beloff              | GFA Vs UEFA              | £ 45,413.69   |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u>                          | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| Aug-03      | Raymond Pilley  | Extradition proceedings, Mr R Soneji | £ 5,000.00    |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u>                                                      | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Sep-03      | Attias & Levy   | Steelmac Vs HM AG's Chambers                                     | £ 15,890.00   |
| Sep-03      | Attias & Levy   | Repossession Unit 3 Superport                                    | £ 6,104.00    |
| Oct-03      | Attias & Levy   | Edgar Smart trading as Julian Ent Ltd appeal icw Tobacco licence | £ 310.00      |
| Dec-03      | Attias & Levy   | Rock financial services, Investor compensation scheme ordinance  | £ 12,420.00   |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u>                                                        | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Sep-03      | Triay & Triay   | Gib Elec Authority & Ecclesal Ltd Trade Licensing Authority appeal | £ 66,280.00   |
| Nov-03      | Triay & Triay   | Legal advice for Minister for Housing icw Panorama article         | £ 1,216.00    |
| Dec-03      | Triay & Triay   | Gibraltar Coinage, Professional Services                           | £ 6,015.00    |
| Jan-04      | Triay & Triay   | Preparation of draft agreement for Gib Sports Authority            | £ 10,425.00   |
| Feb-04      | Triay & Triay   | Moreno 2000 Vs Collector of Customs                                | £ 9,568.00    |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u> | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Sep-03      | GFA             | GFA Vs UEFA | £ 3,394.59    |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u>      | <u>Case</u>                                          | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Oct-03      | Charles A Gomez & Co | Extradition proceedings, R Soneji                    | £ 5,640.00    |
| Feb-04      | Charles A Gomez & Co | Professional services, Independence of Gib Judiciary | £ 2,250.00    |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u>           | <u>Case</u>           | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Oct-03      | Sector Corporate Services | Gibraltar Bus Company | £ 521.00      |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u> | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|
| Nov-03      | Mr A Lewis      | GFA Vs UEFA | £ 8,974.35    |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u>     | <u>Case</u>               | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Nov-03      | De Pfyffer Associes | GFA Vs UEFA               | £ 28,627.09   |
| Feb-04      | De Pfyffer Associes | Gib Olympic Comite Vs IOC | £ 19,838.79   |

Cont'd.....

**CONT'D ANSWER TO QUESTION 1906**

**Cont'd Answer to Question 1905**

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u>               | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Dec-03      | KPMG            | Flights icw EU tax Reform | £ 54.50       |

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Law Firm</u> | <u>Case</u>           | <u>Amount</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Feb-04      | Quest Services  | Louis Gilbert Vs HMAG | £ 360.00      |

**Total: £839,414.68**

Cont'd.....



**CONT'D ANSWER TO QUESTION 1906**

**Answer to Question 1906**

| <b>Lawyer/Legal Firm</b> | <b>Description</b>            | <b>Date Payment</b> | <b>Amount</b>                          |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------------|
| KPMG                     | Tax Reform                    | May 2003            | £ 2,812.00                             |
| Allen & Overy            | Tax Reform                    | October 2003        | £ 8,172.30                             |
| Allen & Overy            | Tax Reform                    | November 2003       | £ 1,049.24                             |
| Hassans                  | Tax Reform                    | May 2003            | £ 2,420.05                             |
| Michael Llamas           | Consumer Credit               | May 2003            | £ 6,630.00                             |
| Michael Llamas           | Competition Regulation        | July 2003           | £ 4,420.00                             |
| Michael Llamas           | Eurovote                      | July 2003           | £ 1,785.00                             |
| Michael Llamas           | Electronic Communications     | January 2004        | £18,000.00                             |
| Michael Llamas           | Advice EU Legislative Matters | January 2004        | <u>£ 4,930.00</u><br><u>£50,218.59</u> |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1899 TO 1906 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1902 for example, which is £27,000 and relates to official travel by the Ship Registry, how is that particular entry different to official travel by Ministers or by the Chief Minister or similar questions which have been asked and answered?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I suspect only because the way that information is kept. I appreciate it relates to the same subject matter – travel, but there is obviously not a separate Sub-head. I do not know, it must be mixed up with other things. The information has not been provided to me even in supplementary information form. What question number was that specific one?

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Question No. 1902. The way I would imagine this happened is when figures are put in the Estimates there is a breakdown of that figure somewhere.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I shall ask, I will find out whether that particular item is one that might have been provided and it has just been lumped in with the ones that could not be provided.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 1903, there is an item of expenditure there for £5,200.50p in respect of the revision of General Orders. Can the Chief Minister tell the House who is carrying out that revision and who the sum was paid to?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am speaking from background information because this is a project that the Chief Secretary is engaged in and not me, but I think it is being done on a consultancy basis by a retired Senior Civil Servant. I do not mind telling him privately who it is, I do not think it is appropriate to name him across the floor of the House.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of this revision of General Orders is it that there is a Government policy as to what they want to see changed in General Orders and that is why it is being revised?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not Government at a political level certainly. This is an exercise that the Chief Secretary is running with, I am not myself personally aware, policy decisions will have to be obtained but we certainly do not have any Ministerial input into that. I do not know what the proposed changes are and indeed whether the Government will agree with them or not. In any event I suppose they will have to be negotiated or discussed with the Trade Unions involved. So this is something that is, I suppose, at an internal proposal stage.

**NO. 1907 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 106 – PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND ESSENTIAL SERVICES**

Can Government give a breakdown of the following forecast outturns for 2003/2004:

- (a) £144,000 Head 106 Sub-head 1 Government furniture and equipment;
- (b) £1,265,000 Head 106 Sub-head 2 government buildings, works and structures;
- (c) £285,000 Head 106 Sub-head 5 Government computerisation programme;
- (d) £81,000 Head 106 Sub-head 10 Gibraltar Broadcasting Corporation equipment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1908 and 1909 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1908 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8-A, SUBHEADS 21 AND 22**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the following forecast outturn for 2003/2004:

- (a) £188,000 Head 8 – A 21 National Day;
- (b) £166,000 Head 8 – A 22 2004 Tercentenary?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1907 and 1909 of 2004.

**NO. 1909 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HEAD 8-A, SUBHEADS 4(d), 4(e) AND 8(e)**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the following forecast outturn figures for the financial year 2003/2004:

- (a) £17,000 Head 8 – A 4(d) Official entertainment;
- (b) £15,000 Head 8 – A 4(e) Visiting delegations and Government receptions;
- (c) £8,000 Head 8 – A 8(e) Publications?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I apologise for dealing with these questions separately because frankly they could have been tagged on to the last batch because the answer given is the same one. I cannot tell him why they have been separately bundled. Again these are items which require simply too minute and voluminous detail which the Government could only really give by publishing its Nominal Ledgers of all items charged to the general subheads. That would not be appropriate, but I repeat the offer that if the hon Member wants to know how much money has been spent on any particular item, then I will endeavour to have that information obtained for him. For example, I think he understands what I am offering, if there is one item of buildings or works or one item of furniture in the sense how much has been spent on No. 6, that pulling information out can be done.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1907 TO 1909 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to certainly the others, certainly in relation to Question No. 1908, the breakdown of the forecast outturn in relation for National Day. It is a question I have asked three times in successive years and they were answered once by the hon Lady and the other times I am not sure by who, but that breakdown has certainly been provided to the Opposition several times in the past.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, that particular item has been provided in very general form, not as a breakdown of a forecast outturn. There are dozens and dozens, not to say hundreds of small items go up to make that and it may be that in the past somebody has just lumped these together and converted it into five or six heads and said so much on catering, so much on this and so much on that. The hon Member should understand, as I am sure he does, that the Civil Service has five days to get answers together for these questions and that in effect what all these questions call for is for a compilation of a Government accounting book keeping process on dates chosen by the hon Members in the formulation of their questions. The Government system is geared up to provide information in the way that we do it in the House at Budget time and in the Accounts. To provide breakdowns requires either giving the Nominal Ledgers over to the hon Members or alternatively, for somebody to sit down and analyse those Nominal Ledgers, condense the information into in effect new generic subheads and on this occasion he has asked this in respect of more than a dozen heads and subheads. I think in the past when the question has been answered it has been the only item that he has asked for a breakdown of, National Day. If he is particularly interested in the National Day one, I will try and get that pulled out for him and then see if there is some form of condensed version that can be provided to him. The only other thing that the Government could do is print out the computer Nominal Ledgers and just pass them over, but that is literally giving him copies of the Government's accounting books. That is what the Government's accounting books are.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the course of that answer the Chief Minister said that we were asking for this information on a particular day, as if the Government were being asked what is the expenditure as at September this year or anything else. This is the forecast outturn presented with the Estimates and therefore if the Government have spent £285,000 on computers in the last financial year, what is the difficulty in saying what was bought for that £285,000?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I can repeat everything that I have just said if he would like me to, but I know that he has understood it. The Government can press a button and produce this information but what emerges from the printer is the Nominal Ledger for this item which could run into dozens and dozens of pages. That is tantamount, in the days of non-computerisation, to saying to the hon Members 'here are the books of account of the Government'. Not the Government's accounts audited by the Principal Auditor, not the Estimates, not the Forecast Outturn broken down as the law requires into the subheads that it is broken down, but in effect here are the Government's ledgers and we do not think it is appropriate to do that. I think no Government in the world is required to publish its books. What Governments are required to publish is the audited accounts of the Government of Gibraltar and the Estimates in the form required by law. The hon Members through their questions in effect require the publication of the Government's books of account and we just do not think it is appropriate or reasonable.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, I do not know about that but in time we will find that it is not unusual that when we were debating the Estimates for any one of those items where there are rows of Civil Servants behind them with masses of papers, to be given a breakdown of what it was that the House was voting the money for. In fact, what we had is a question about the result of last year where there are a number of items that exceeded the original estimates. If one is spending £1.25 million on Government buildings it should not be too difficult to identify. Not down to the last screw and say two pence for putting a screw in this door, three pennies for putting a washer on a tap.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is how the information exists.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but presumably in asking for a breakdown, if it is the word 'breakdown' that is causing a problem then perhaps we will find a different word to use instead of breakdown there. I would have thought that to go from one extreme of having to identify every nut and washer that has been used out of the £1.25 million to be able to say 'well look, £500,000 was spent on painting Varyl Begg blocks'. One can say that without having to say of which so much was for paint, so much was for scaffolding, so much was for labour.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Then they should ask the questions in a different form.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Will the Chief Minister not consider looking back at previous questions and he will find that breakdowns have not caused the same sort of breakdown of the Civil Service on previous occasions.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

These answers are not new and the Hon Dr Garcia will recognise that I have given him these answers before and that there are some Heads for which I have not given him a breakdown and there are some Heads for which I have given him a breakdown, exactly as I have done today. This is not the first time that the hon Members hear the answer that this is too voluminous and in effect requires the publication of the Government's Nominal Ledgers, and that I offer to give subtotals. This is a standard response that he has had over several Question Times now, going back I do not know how long but several times ago. That aspect of it is not new. Now, I accept, which is why we make the offer that I make in the second half of my question, that there are some Heads that



lend themselves more than others to the condensation of the information. For example, it may be that the Government buildings is one of them. If all the hon Member wants to know is on which buildings did the Government spend and how much was it on each building, well that question can be answered. It requires a little bit of administrative effort but it is certainly capable of being answered, I would have thought within five days. If he asks for a breakdown without specifying what breakdown he wants, then we have to assume that he wants whatever breakdown the Government have. Whatever breakdown the Government have is the Nominal Ledger. In other words, in his terminology every last screw and every last nail.

ORAL

**NO. 1910 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY**

How much import duty has been collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from April 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1911 of 2004.

**NO. 1911 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY**

How much revenue has been collected from import duty on computer products on a monthly basis since the new rate of 6 per cent took effect?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1910**

The amount of import duty collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from April 2004 is as follows:

|                |            |
|----------------|------------|
| April 2004     | £13,264.98 |
| May 2004       | £11,292.58 |
| June 2004      | £15,432.54 |
| July 2004      | £11,273.72 |
| August 2004    | £11,580.90 |
| September 2004 | £11,530.92 |

**Answer to Question No. 1911**

The amount of revenue collected from import duty on computer products on a monthly basis since the new rate of 6 per cent took effect is as follows:

|                |            |
|----------------|------------|
| July 2004      | £42,153.05 |
| August 2004    | £30,686.65 |
| September 2004 | £46,331.67 |

ORAL

**NO. 1912 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government state if there has been any further response to the current offer for sale of Government 50 per cent share of the co-ownership homes with a 5 per cent uplift, giving the same breakdown as was given in answer to Question No. 1136 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested is in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1912**

|                           | <b>Total Letters Sent</b> | <b>Total sum of Government share</b> | <b>Replies Received "Yes"</b> | <b>Total sum of Government share</b> | <b>Replies Received "No"</b> | <b>Total sum of Government share</b> | <b>No Replies received yet share</b> | <b>Total sum of Government</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Brympton                  | 36                        | £1,014,815.46                        | 9                             | £241,976.81                          | 2                            | £51,840.00                           | 25                                   | £720,998.65                    |
| Harbour Views             | 400                       | £8,264,284.06                        | 39                            | £765,905.03                          | 52                           | £1,072,632.61                        | 309                                  | £6,425,746.42                  |
| Montagu Crescent          | 152                       | £4,022,567.45                        | 20                            | £532,446.34                          | 11                           | £287,798.53                          | 121                                  | £3,202,322.58                  |
| Montagu Gardens           | 307                       | £8,983,003.71                        | 22                            | £646,480.77                          | 31                           | £900,595.75                          | 254                                  | £7,435,927.19                  |
| Sir William Jackson Grove | 167                       | £3,197,602.59                        | 15                            | £257,619.21                          | 13                           | £240,943.43                          | 139                                  | £2,699,039.95                  |
| Westview Park             | 82                        | £1,848,982.94                        | 14                            | £303,320.07                          | 8                            | £181,570.32                          | 60                                   | £1,364,092.55                  |
|                           | <b>* 1144</b>             | <b>£27,331,256.21</b>                | <b>119</b>                    | <b>£2,747,748.23</b>                 | <b>117</b>                   | <b>£2,735,380.64</b>                 | <b>908</b>                           | <b>£21,848,127.34</b>          |

\* Includes amendments to database to record minor errors detected since previous report

**Cont Answer to Question 1912**

| <b><u>Estate</u></b>             | <b><u>Number of Completions</u></b> | <b><u>Funds received</u></b> |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Brympton</b>                  | 8                                   | £213,176.81                  |
| <b>Harbour Views</b>             | 22                                  | £420,990.16                  |
| <b>Montagu Crescent</b>          | 10                                  | £292,216.32                  |
| <b>Montagu Gardens</b>           | 8                                   | £237,233.07                  |
| <b>Sir William Jackson Grove</b> | 5                                   | £83,742.15                   |
| <b>Westview Park</b>             | 5                                   | £106,579.82                  |
|                                  | <b>58</b>                           | <b>£1,353,938.33</b>         |

ORAL

**NO. 1913 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES OMBUDSMAN**

Given the answer to Question Nos. 446 of 2004 and 1254 of 2004, what progress has been made by the Government in relation to the possibility of establishing a Financial Services Ombudsman?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are not currently engaged in this possible policy initiative. The question of progress does not therefore currently arise.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1913 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister will no doubt be aware, because I made a cross reference to the earlier questions, that in this question he did tell me in January that this was a matter which was being considered. Am I to take his answer now as a determination of the issue in that it is no longer being considered or simply that this is not an issue that is being driven as a priority?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know if there is anybody beavering away at a proposal. I am not and no proposals have been put up to me. If there is somebody working on this somewhere on the lower echelons of Government I cannot tell him, but it is not something that the Government at a more senior or Ministerial level is actively engaged in. I know that lots of people would like to see it and I also know that lots of people do not want to see it if they have got to pay for it. I suspect it is something that will happen at some stage but it would be wrong of me to give him the impression that the show is on the road so to speak because that is not the situation at the moment. It might change.

ORAL

**NO. 1914 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCE CENTRE**

What was the cost of the reception, giving a breakdown, hosted by the Chief Minister at the Finance Centre offices at Europort on the occasion of the retirement of Mr Brian Morris?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The cost of the reception hosted by the Chief Minister at the Finance Centre offices at Europort on the occasion of the retirement of Mr Brian Morris was £900.



**NO. 1915 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****FINANCIAL SERVICES**

In relation to financial services, can the Chief Minister give the dates in the months of April to September 2004 when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business relating to Financial Services, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited, the names of any officials or other persons travelling with the Chief Minister and a breakdown of the cost of each visit?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

## Chief Minister Trips – Finance

|                                                            | <b>Air Fares &amp; Travel</b> | <b>Accommodation</b>   | <b>Other</b>       |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
|                                                            | <b>£</b>                      | <b>£</b>               | <b>£</b>           |
| 14/06/2004 Michael Llamas & Beating Retreat<br>CM/CS/PS(L) | 5,551.59                      | 2,526.55               | -                  |
| 14/07/2004 Brussels<br>CM/CS/PS(L)                         | 3,276.94                      | 1,518.58               | -                  |
| 06/09/2004 Brussels<br>CM/CS                               | -                             | Not yet billed         | -                  |
| 22/09/2004 Brussels<br>CM/CS/PS(L)                         | -                             | Not yet billed         | -                  |
|                                                            | <b><u>8,828.53</u></b>        | <b><u>4,045.13</u></b> | <b><u>0.00</u></b> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1915 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister to just repeat in relation to the first read-out, the total. I have a note that he said £5,000 but I did not get the rest of it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am not prepared to read it out again but I am happy to give him a copy of the answer so that he can do his arithmetic in his own time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Even better. I see that this question has solicited a response which provides information as to travel which was not provided in answer to Question No. 1859 which was an all-encompassing question which did not discriminate between his travel in respect of financial services or otherwise. Am I correct to say that in order to have the correct answer to Question No. 1859 I am to read both of these schedules together and those will show me all the travel in the past twelve months, including in relation to financial services from April to September 2004?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, what it shows is that the hon Member has got to understand the nature of the questions that he asks. Question No. 1859 asked for the Chief Minister's travel to the United Kingdom, which this question does not.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do appreciate it even though I have asked that question, because as the Chief Minister himself has indicated the first item of expenditure in this Head relates to a trip to the United Kingdom, which is not provided for in the answer provided to Question No. 1859. So in those circumstances am I right to assume that I need to consider that particular trip as part of what should have been the answer to Question No. 1859 if this House is not to be misled?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, he does not have to assume that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case, how should I interpret the reference in this answer to a trip obviously to the United Kingdom as the Chief Minister himself has indicated, which is not referred to in the schedule that I was given in answer to Question No. 1859?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I do not know without consulting my diary whether in fact my trip on 14<sup>th</sup> June was to the United Kingdom or was to Brussels. I am thrown by the reference to Beating of the Retreat in the explanations, but I certainly recall going to Brussels in June because that is when we did the deal with the DG competition. So it may be that all those four trips were to Brussels and not any of them to London.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case, seeing that this question relates to financial services, has the Chief Minister only travelled to Brussels in relation to financial services in the past months since April?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

According to those of my officials who put this information together, apparently so.

ORAL

**NO. 1916 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can the Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attendance at the International Monetary Fund's 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Workshop on the IMF's Co-ordinated Portfolio Investment Survey for small Economies with International Finance Centres held in Guernsey on 25<sup>th</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> May 2004, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1917 to 1923 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1917 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can the Government state when they were invited to attend the International Monetary Fund's 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Workshop on the IMF's Co-ordinated Portfolio Investment Survey for Small Economies with International Finance Centres held in Guernsey on 25<sup>th</sup> to 27<sup>th</sup> May 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1916 and 1918 to 1923 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1918 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can the Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attendance at the International Investment Offshore Fund & Product Awards held at the Victoria Park Plaza in London on Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> May 2004 giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1916, 1917 and 1919 to 1923 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1919 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can the Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attendance at the Association of Insurance Risk Managers held between 14<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> June at the Manchester International Convention Centre giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation and the names of any private sector firms who accepted the Government's invitation to use the Government's stand as their base for the duration of the conference?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1916 to 1918 and 1920 to 1923 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1920 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can the Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attendance at the Vermont Captive Insurance Association annual conference and exhibition held in Burlington, Vermont, USA between 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> August 2004 giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1916 to 1919 and 1921 to 1923 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1921 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can the Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attendance at the OECD Global Forum on Taxation hosted by the German Government and held in Berlin between 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> June 2004 giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1916 to 1920, 1922 and 1923 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1922 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can the Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attendance at the Luxembourg Rendez-Vous risk management and risk financing conference held in Luxembourg between 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> May 2004, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1916 to 1921 and 1923 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1923 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attending all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the months of April to September 2004, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1923**

**Answer to Question 1916**

Mr Guy Canessa, Marketing and Liaison Officer of the Finance Centre attended the IMF's 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Workshop held in Guernsey on 25<sup>th</sup> – 27<sup>th</sup> May 2004. The workshop was funded by the Bank of Japan. The Finance Centre incurred the following expenses:

|                                                |                |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Hotel at Gatwick airport for 1 night (24/5/04) | £ 59.66        |
| Subsistence for 1 night (Outer London)         | £ 45.33        |
| Travel Expenses                                | £ 16.00        |
| Total:                                         | <u>£120.99</u> |

**Answer to Question 1917**

The International Monetary Fund extended an invitation in writing to the Financial Services Commission on 22 March 2004. The Invitation was passed on to the Government of Gibraltar by the Financial Services Commissioner at that time.

**Answer to Question 1918**

Government did not attend on this occasion and therefore no cost was involved.

**Answer to Question 1919**

The Finance Centre attended the Association of Insurance Risk Managers International Convention (AIRMIC) in Manchester held between 14<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> June 2004.

The following 2 (two) persons made up the Government delegation:

|               |                               |
|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Joseph Macano | Director Licensing Unit       |
| Guy Canessa   | Marketing and Liaison Officer |

Cont'd.....

### **Answer to Question 1923**

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Exhibition Costs | £4,944.00       |
| Flights          | £ 401.00        |
| Accommodation    | £ 538.00        |
| Subsistence      | £ 324.00        |
| Travel Expenses  | £ 58.00         |
| Courier          | <u>£ 229.00</u> |
| Total:           | £6,494.00       |

The Gibraltar stand displayed materials provided by a number of Gibraltar insurance related companies.

In addition a Gibraltar accountancy firm used the stand for part of one of the days to introduce UK clients to insurance services in Gibraltar.

### **Answer to Question 1920**

The Finance Centre attended the Vermont Captive Insurance Association (VCIA) annual Conference and exhibition held in Burlington, Vermont, USA between 10<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> August 2004.

The following 2 (two) persons made up the Government delegation:

|               |                               |
|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Joseph Macano | Director Licensing Unit       |
| Guy Canessa   | Marketing and Liaison Officer |

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Exhibition Costs | £1,246.00       |
| Flights          | £3,486.00       |
| Accommodation    | £1,002.00       |
| Subsistence      | £ 448.00        |
| Travel Expenses  | £ 148.00        |
| Courier          | <u>£ 746.00</u> |
| Total:           | £7,076.00       |

Cont.....

**Answer to Question 1923**

**Answer to Question 1921**

Mr James Tipping, Finance Centre Director, attended the OECD Global Forum on Taxation hosted by the German Government and held in Berlin between 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> June 2004.

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                                              |                 |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Flights                                      | £ 279.00        |
| Accommodation                                | £ 165.00        |
| Taxis (Malaga transfer et cetera) & Expenses | <u>£ 247.00</u> |
| Total:                                       | £ 691.00        |

**Answer to Question 1922**

The Finance Centre attended the Luxembourg Rendez-Vous Risk Management exhibition in Luxembourg between 12<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> May 2004.

The following 3 (three) persons made up the Government delegation:

|                 |                         |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| James Tipping   | Finance Centre Director |
| Joseph Macano   | Director Licensing Unit |
| Sabrina Ramagge | Executive Officer       |

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Exhibition Costs | £4,097.00       |
| Flights          | £ 730.00        |
| Accommodation    | £ 856.00        |
| Subsistence      | £ 566.00        |
| Courier          | £ 587.00        |
| Expenses         | <u>£ 589.00</u> |
| Total:           | £7,425.00       |

Cont'd.....

### Answer to Question 1923

### Answer to Question 1923

The Finance Centre attended the Risk and Insurance Management Society exhibition and conference held in San Diego, USA between 18<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2004.

The following 4 (four) persons made up the Government delegation:

|               |                                     |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| James Tipping | Finance Centre Director             |
| Joseph Macano | Director Licensing Unit             |
| Guy Canessa   | Marketing and Liaison Officer       |
| Chris Collins | Head of Insurance Supervision (FSC) |

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Exhibition Costs | £ 2,303.00      |
| Flights          | £14,218.00      |
| Accommodation    | £ 2,958.00      |
| Subsistence      | £ 304.00        |
| Courier          | £ 1,330.00      |
| Expenses         | <u>£ 953.00</u> |
| Total:           | £22,066.00      |

The Finance Centre attended the Association of Insurance Risk Managers International Convention (AIRMIC) in Manchester held between 14<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> June 2004.

The following 2 (two) persons made up the Government delegation:

|               |                               |
|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Joseph Macano | Director Licensing Unit       |
| Guy Canessa   | Marketing and Liaison Officer |

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Exhibition Costs | £4,944.00       |
| Flights          | £ 401.00        |
| Accommodation    | £ 538.00        |
| Subsistence      | £ 324.00        |
| Travel Expenses  | £ 58.00         |
| Courier          | <u>£ 229.00</u> |
| Total:           | £6,494.00       |

Cont'd.....

### Answer to Question 1923

The Finance Centre attended the Luxembourg Rendez-Vous Risk Management exhibition in Luxembourg between 12<sup>th</sup> – 13<sup>th</sup> May 2004.

The following 3 (three) persons made up the Government delegation:

|                 |                         |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| James Tipping   | Finance Centre Director |
| Joseph Macano   | Director Licensing Unit |
| Sabrina Ramagge | Executive Officer       |

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Exhibition Costs | £4,097.00       |
| Flights          | £ 730.00        |
| Accommodation    | £ 856.00        |
| Subsistence      | £ 566.00        |
| Courier          | £ 587.00        |
| Expenses         | <u>£ 589.00</u> |
| Total:           | £7,425.00       |

The Finance Centre attended the Vermont Captive Insurance Association (VCIA) annual Conference and exhibition held in Burlington, Vermont, USA between 10<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> August 2004.

The following 2 (two) persons made up the Government delegation:

|               |                               |
|---------------|-------------------------------|
| Joseph Macano | Director Licensing Unit       |
| Guy Canessa   | Marketing and Liaison Officer |

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:

|                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Exhibition Costs | £1,246.00       |
| Flights          | £3,486.00       |
| Accommodation    | £1,002.00       |
| Subsistence      | £ 448.00        |
| Travel Expenses  | £ 148.00        |
| Courier          | <u>£ 746.00</u> |
| Total:           | £7,076.00       |

Cont'd.....



### **Answer to Question 1923**

The Finance Centre also attended the following conferences held in Gibraltar.

#### **Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> May 2004**

Lloyds TSB – Gibraltar Insurance Seminar held at the Caleta Hotel. The Chief Minister and Finance Centre Director attended as speakers. There was no cost to Government.

#### **Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2004**

Swiss Independent Portfolio Managers Seminar held at the Finance Centre conference room. The Finance Centre Director made a presentation. There was no cost to Government.

#### **Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> September 2004**

Gibraltar Bankers Association Annual Conference held at the Caleta Hotel. The Chief Minister attended as speaker. James Tipping, Joseph Macano and Guy Canessa were also in attendance. There was no cost to Government.

ORAL

**NO. 1924 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCE CENTRE NEWSLETTER**

Can the Government give the cost of producing and printing the Finance Centre Newsletter?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1925 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1925 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL PRESS VISIT**

Can the Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of the financial press visit to Gibraltar organised by the Government and held between 22<sup>nd</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> June 2004 giving details of all the events organised as part of the said visit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached schedule.

The Finance Centre produces four newsletters per year. The last issue had a print run of 3,500 at a cost of £1,809 (printing and design).

No other costs are involved as the Finance Centre provides all the content.

### Answer to Question 1925/2004

The costs of the event organised for the visit of the UK financial press held between 22<sup>nd</sup> – 24<sup>th</sup> June 2004 were as follows:

|           |                                                                                                                    |            |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
|           | 11 (Eleven) Journalists                                                                                            |            |
|           | Accommodation at the Elliott Hotel                                                                                 | £ 2,156.00 |
|           | Flights                                                                                                            | £ 1,327.00 |
|           | Coach Transfers and Rock Tour                                                                                      | £ 351.00   |
| 22/6/04 - | Reception at Elliott Hotel to meet members of Finance Centre, Finance Centre Council and Government Media Director | £ 518.00   |
| 23/6/04 - | Presentation held at Finance Centre – Coffee Break                                                                 | £ 37.00    |
| -         | Lunch at 'La Mamela Restaurant'                                                                                    | £ 453.00   |
| -         | Dinner at 'Claus on the Rock'                                                                                      | £ 526.00   |
| 24/6/04 - | Interview with the Chief Minister                                                                                  |            |
| -         | Light Lunch at 'Café Solo'                                                                                         | £ 91.00    |
|           |                                                                                                                    | <hr/>      |
|           | Total:                                                                                                             | £ 5,459.00 |

### Full Itinerary

Financial press visit to Gibraltar, Tuesday 22 – Thursday 24 June 2004

#### **Tuesday 22 June**

**14.30** Please proceed directly to one of the BA check-in desks at North Terminal, Gatwick, show your passport and you will be issued with a boarding pass and return ticket. The group reference number for your e-ticket is **ZIOQAJ**. If arriving on Gatwick Express from Victoria, please take monorail from South Terminal to North Terminal and go up the escalator on the right.

**16.05 BA6906** Depart Gatwick **19.50** Arrive Gibraltar  
Transfer to Elliott Hotel by coach

**21.30** Welcome drinks and buffet dinner at Elliott Hotel  
Financial Services Commissioner and Supervisors, Finance Centre Council members, President of Chamber of Commerce, Chairman of Federation of Small Businesses and Government Media Director in attendance.

Welcome remarks by James Tipping, Finance Centre Director

Cont'd.....

## **Answer to Question 1925**

### **Wednesday 23 June**

Presentations at Finance Centre conference room, 761 Europort

**9.30** James Tipping, Finance Centre Director

**10.15** Marcus Killick, Financial Services Commissioner

**11.00** Coffee break

**11.15** Tony Provasoli, Finance Centre Council Chairman  
Each slot includes 15 minutes for questions and answers,

**12.00** Visit to major new derivatives trading floor in Europort

**13.00** Lunch at La Mamela, Catalan Bay

**15.30** Rock Tour

**20.00** Dinner at Claus on the Rock hosted by Finance Centre Director, Financial Services Commissioner, Finance Centre Council Chairman, Government Media Director, Joe Macano and Guy Canessa in attendance

### **Thursday 24 June**

**10.00** Chief Minister Peter Caruana's press conference at No. 6 Convent Place.  
James Tipping, Joe Macano and Guy Cancesa in attendance.

**12.00** Light lunch at Café Solo, Casemates Square, for those wishing to attend.

Rest of day for meetings, networking or discovering Gibraltar.

**19.15** Transfer to airport **20.45 BA6907** Depart Gibraltar **22.20** Arrive Gatwick.

ORAL

**NO. 1926 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can the Government confirm whether the companies which were 'Qualifying Companies' are to be treated for the purposes of taxation as 'Exempt Companies' or whether they are to be required to 'submit to the normal corporation tax regime'?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1927 of 2004.

**NO. 1927 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

How many qualifying companies were sent the memorandum from the Finance Centre Director asking whether they were prepared to 'submit to the normal corporation tax regime' and of these:

- (a) how many replied;
- (b) of those who replied (i) how many replied that they were prepared to pay the 20 per cent to 35 per cent tax; and (ii) how many replied that they were not; and
- (c) did the replies indicate that all companies in a particular industry had the same approach to the request to pay tax at the rate of 20 per cent to 35 per cent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are currently engaged in relation to this matter with holders of Qualifying Status Certificates. It would not be appropriate to comment further at this stage. No one has yet been required to 'submit to the normal corporate tax regime'.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1926 AND 1927 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister what has changed since he announced in this House that it was likely that the Exempt regime would be applied to all Qualifying Companies?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have no recollection of having ever announced that. I remember saying that the letter to which he refers and which was leaked by a now identified recipient, had not been sent to all the Qualifying Certificate holders but to those who by virtue of the low amount of

tax that they had been paying over the years might be content to go to a normal corporate status. The letter from which the hon Member quotes and which he cites, asked them the recipients, who were not all the Qualifying Certificates, this letter did not go to the ones who clearly would have difficulty by the size of the company, the size of the employment and the amount of their profits, the ones who did receive it who were the ones who from the amount of tax they have been paying over the years seemed to be insubstantial and therefore might not mind going to the normal tax regime, they were asked to reply stating whether or not that would cause them difficulty or not. That was the question that they were asked.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this the group that the Chief Minister is in discussion with, that he does not want to give information because he is talking to some group or companies?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, Qualifying Status Companies are being dealt with almost on an individual basis, because they all have different circumstances, different needs, different tax structures, different ownership structures subject to different international tax considerations, and therefore the Government are doing it almost, certainly in the case of the larger ones, certainly on a case by case basis. In respect of the ones that the Government had not intended to deal with in one to one meetings, this letter was sent. The letter invited two replies. One, yes I have no difficulty with going on a normal tax basis, here is my Qualifying Certificate; or yes, it does cause me problems and I would like to meet you – which is what the letter asked for. It said ‘please let us know if it causes you any difficulty so that we can discuss this with you’. That is the position. Now of the people that received the letter there have been some replies and the replies have been of all types. Now they are being worked through one at a time and dealt with accordingly.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What is the difficulty, for example, in answering the bit that says how many replied? How is that going to affect the negotiation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

How many replied, no, when I was last told five or six had replied. It was not all companies, he also asked how many people got that letter and he has not complained that he has not had that answer. I think from memory the letter went to about 30, but that is from memory. It is of that order but it may be slightly more or slightly less, but it did not go to any company with substantial economic activity or track record of employment, or high tax bill and therefore high profitability.



ORAL

**NO. 1928 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government now state how many qualifying companies were trading in the tax year 1998/1999, 1999/2000, 2000/2001, 2001/2002 and 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1929 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1929 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state whether there has been any reduction in the number of (a) trading; and (b) active qualifying companies since the answer to Question No. 1300 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested is in the attached schedule. I should say to him that for the purposes of the records of the Finance Centre Director, Qualifying Companies remain registered as active until such time as the company or its representative notifies him to the contrary. For the purposes of the Income Tax Office companies remain classified as trading until such time as the Commissioner is satisfied that the company no longer trades. The schedule that he has got is drawn up on the basis of the Commissioner of Income Tax definition of trading. In other words, until such time as the Commissioner is satisfied that the company no longer trades.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1929**

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1928**

| <u>TAX YEAR</u> | <u>No. of Qualifying Companies trading</u> |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1998/1999       | 65                                         |
| 1999/2000       | 74                                         |
| 2000/2001       | 79                                         |
| 2001/2002       | 74                                         |
| 2002/2003       | 67                                         |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1929**

|                                    | Active | Trading |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| April 2004 (Question 1300 of 2004) | 122    | 84      |
| October 2004                       | 102    | 65      |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1928 AND 1929 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably, since the consultation process is almost on a one to one, it ought to be able to establish who is active and who is trading on the basis of having to meet up with them.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, all that will come out in the wash of this process which is very time-consuming because there is not a one size fits all. Bear in mind that if the Government just give everybody tax exempt status there is a pretty substantial loss of revenue. On the other hand there are some companies who cannot live with exempt status and that is the need for a little bit of tailor making.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact, substantial revenue in the light of the answers we have been getting on the breakdowns, in fact the revenue does not seem to be more than a couple of million pounds. They are insubstantial in the context of £200 million, we are talking about one per cent of Government revenue, yes?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is not insubstantial. Next time they ask me how much the cocktail party for Mr Morris retiring costs at £900, I will remind him that if £2 million is not substantial then he should not be questioning me about things that only cost £900. I think £2 million is substantial and worth saving if we can. I am not saying that it would be fatal to Government finance if we lost them.

ORAL

**NO. 1930 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government now state what was the total number of persons employed by Exempt Companies in October 1998, 1999, 2000,2001, 2002 and 2003 giving a breakdown by industry and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information required by the hon Member is set out in the attached schedule. Sorry, it has not been provided to him, it has been provided to him only as at September 2004 and I have a note here to the effect that it has not been possible in the time available to provide the information requested as at October in each of the years that he has asked, by which I suppose they mean that they are working at it and will produce it in due course.

**Answer to Question 1930**

According to the Employment and Training Board the total of persons employed by Exempt Companies as at September 2004 was 680.

A breakdown by industry is as follows:

|                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| Financial Services | 293 |
| Gaming             | 376 |
| Bunkering          | 6   |
| Other              | 5   |
|                    | ——— |
| TOTAL:             | 680 |

A breakdown by nationality is as follows:

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| Gibraltarian  | 218 |
| Other British | 277 |
| Irish         | 15  |
| Spanish       | 42  |
| Swiss         | 11  |
| Portuguese    | 6   |
| Danish        | 2   |
| Australian    | 3   |
| German        | 13  |
| French        | 11  |

Cont'd.....

**Answer to Question 1930**

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| Italian       | 7   |
| Malaysian     | 2   |
| USA           | 5   |
| Norwegian     | 1   |
| Greek         | 1   |
| Belgian       | 2   |
| Moroccan      | 2   |
| Swedish       | 1   |
| South African | 1   |
| Israeli       | 17  |
| Dutch         | 7   |
| Antiguan      | 11  |
| Austrian      | 4   |
| Brazilian     | 2   |
| Chinese       | 1   |
| Finnish       | 1   |
| Indian        | 14  |
| Japanese      | 1   |
| Russian       | 1   |
| Czech         | 1   |
|               | —   |
| TOTAL:        | 680 |

It has not been possible within the allocated time frame to provide the above information as at October 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1930 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I hope that the Chief Minister's interpretation that that is what it means is what it means, because that is the answer that I got in March in answer to Question No. 1320 and then it was that they had obviously not had time in the five days' notice of the question to produce the answer. I interpret it to mean that they were working on it, as he is doing now, and therefore I have assumed that they have now been working on it for six months and five days.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Obviously not.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government confirm that when they said the last time 'it is not possible within the allocated time frame' and I took that to mean that it would eventually materialise and that has not happened, can I put a different interpretation to the same phrase this time or am I likely to see it happening this time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know. The Government's position is, as he well knows by the reams of information provided to him, that if it can reasonably be provided without a disproportionate administrative effort, which is what the conventions of this House provide, then it should and will be provided. I had interpreted the answer in the same way as him but I hesitate to give him a formal assurance that it will be provided until I can find out, which I will do, how much effort is required to actually put it together. I will have somebody communicate that to him. If it requires a huge, huge trawl through we may rely on the rule that then entitles us not to produce the information. If, on the other hand, it is just a question of a couple of hours work by somebody, then I see no reason why it should not be done and provided. So, although my interpretation is the same as his, since he is now asking me for a formal commitment in effect a formal commitment that it will be produced, I would rather hold that until somebody can tell me what actually is involved in putting this together. I do not know where these records are held.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would assume that this is the Employment and Training Board from the format in which it is, because in answer to Question No. 1320 in the last meeting of the House, the information was provided by the ETB and this says according to the Employment and Training Board, that is the answer that I have been given. So I have naturally assumed that these are the records in the computer of contracts of employment still live.



Therefore, presumably the computer is capable of dishing out, particularly the sophisticated computer which is Profile 2001.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Let me say, looking at I would expect the numbers to be showing in growth because as at September 2004, 376 of them were in the gaming industry. So I suspect that he will find if these numbers are provided to him, that there has been movement. It is not just a question of my saying to him 'well there has not been much change'. I think there will have been change but I will let him know in the next day or two whether he can expect to receive this information, and if so, how long we think it will take to give it to him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the context of the numbers that the Chief Minister has mentioned, I am assuming of course that since the question is about exempt companies for example in the gaming industry not everybody is an exempt company presumably. So in fact this figure is not the whole of the gaming industry.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Only the exempt gaming industry.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Only the exempt gaming industry that is why I have not been surprised by this figure.

ORAL

**NO. 1931 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION**

What are the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding entered into between the Financial Services Commission and the Malta Financial Services Authority announced by the FSC on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1932 to 1935 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1932 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION**

What are the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding entered into between the Financial Services Commission and the UK's Financial Services Authority announced by the FSC on 31<sup>st</sup> August 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1931 and 1933 to 1935 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1933 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION**

Are Government aware of any further Memoranda of Understanding to be entered into by the Financial Services Commission with the financial services regulatory authorities of any other states or territories?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1931, 1932, 1934 and 1935 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1934 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION**

How do Government believe that the Memorandum of Understanding entered into between the Financial Services Commission and the UK's Financial Services Authority will assist the investors in TEP plans given that many of those who have such plans and who have approached the FSA in relation to the UK parties involved in such plans have, to date, been told that the FSA cannot assist them in any way and have actually been referred to the Gibraltar Ombudsman?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1931to 1933 and 1935 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1935 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION**

Can Government say under the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the FSC in August, what additional information will have to be provided by the FSC to the UK Financial Services Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Financial Services Commission is wholly independent of the Government. The Government are not accountable for its actions or for it. However, I can tell the hon Member that the FSC does not seek Government's approval either as to the entering of MOUs with overseas regulators or their contents. The Government are considering whether this is an appropriate state of affairs.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1931 TO 1935 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are the Government telling the House that they are not aware of what the terms of the Memoranda of Understanding with Malta and the FSA are?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am telling the hon Member now that I am not aware of the contents, but that even if I were, I would not be willing to account to the hon Member in this House for it because it is not Government business. The hon Member would have to ask the Financial Services Commission directly. I am not willing to explain, justify, inform about or still less defend the actions of a body that is entirely outside of my control and influence.

The last part of my answer, because the Government accept that the Regulator is independent of the Government in regulation but when it comes to entering into agreement with authorities in a foreign country, we think that there are political aspects there about which I think the Government should be consulted regardless of the

independence of the authority. So that is why I say we are considering the appropriateness of this state of affairs.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I take it from that answer also that the Government are not aware of any other Memoranda of Understanding that may be pending signature on completion by the FSC, or whether any other Memoranda of Understanding which may not have been publicly announced actually exists and signed by the FSC?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct, and I say that both as Chief Minister and as Minister with responsibility for the Finance Centre.

ORAL

**NO. 1936 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the months of April to September 2004 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1937 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1937 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies are registered in Gibraltar in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are not aware of any applications to form a Protected Cell Company which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected between the months of April to September 2004.

In the months of April to September 2004, one Protected Cell Company appears as registered. No new Protected Cell Companies have been registered in this period.

ORAL

**NO. 1938 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1939 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1939 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates were issued in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached schedule.

### **Answer to Question 1939 of 2004**

#### **Answer to Question 1938**

In the months of April to September the following number of companies terminated their certificate.

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| April     | 135 |
| May       | 99  |
| June      | 33  |
| July      | 11  |
| August    | 33  |
| September | 36  |

“Terminated their tax exemption” is interpreted by the Finance Centre as companies which have returned their certificate and no longer require their tax exempt status.

The higher numbers in April and May reflect a seasonal trend following the end of the financial year.

#### **Answer to Question 1939**

During the months of April to September 2004 the following exempt company certificates were issued:-

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| April     | 60  |
| May       | 86  |
| June      | 123 |
| July      | 71  |
| August    | 137 |
| September | 143 |

ORAL

**NO. 1940 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the Companies register in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1941 to 1943 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1941 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1940, 1942 and 1943 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1942 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government state how many companies have been redomiciled out of Gibraltar in each month of each calendar year since 1996 to 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1940, 1941 and 1943 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1943 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government state how many companies have been redomiciled out of Gibraltar in each month from January 2004 to the end of September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

With the caveat that I made the last time he asked Question No. 1941, and although he accepted at the time, he has not corrected the terminology of the question. When he asks 'can the Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the months of April to September?', I presume that he is asking for the number of companies and not the list of companies by name. On that basis the information that he has requested is set out in the attached schedule.



## **ANSWER TO QUESTION 1943**

### **Answer to Question 1940**

The following Companies were removed from the Companies Register in the months of April to September 2004:

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| April     | 197 |
| May       | 186 |
| June      | 337 |
| July      | 310 |
| August    | 203 |
| September | 321 |

### **Answer to Question 1941**

The following Companies were formed in the months of April to September 2004:

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| April     | 241 |
| May       | 175 |
| June      | 686 |
| July      | 272 |
| August    | 314 |
| September | 221 |

**CONT. ANSWER TO QUESTION 1943**

**Answer to Question 1942**

The Registrar has issued notices in the Gazette that the following numbers of companies have applied to him for consent to redomicile to another State.  
The Registrar gives consent 30 days after the notice is issued, and consent is given almost without exception.

|              | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 |
|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| January      | 0    | 0    | 0    | 2    | 0    | 1    | 3    | 9    |
| February     | 0    | 0    | 0    | 11   | 2    | 2    | 1    | 6    |
| March        | 0    | 0    | 0    | 2    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 8    |
| April        | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 5    | 1    | 8    |
| May          | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 4    | 4    | 7    |
| June         | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 12   |
| July         | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 1    | 2    | 7    |
| August       | 0    | 1    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 11   |
| September    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 18   |
| October      | 0    | 0    | 3    | 1    | 0    | 1    | 7    | 48   |
| November     | 1    | 0    | 3    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 2    | 275  |
| December     | 5    | 0    | 5    | 29   | 5    | 2    | 4    | 202  |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | 7    | 1    | 13   | 45   | 11   | 18   | 27   | 611  |

Cont'd.....

## **CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1943**

### **Answer to Question 1943**

The following Companies have lodged applications for consent to re-domicile out of Gibraltar between the months of January 2004 and September 2004:

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| January   | 142 |
| February  | 102 |
| March     | 93  |
| April     | 38  |
| May       | 22  |
| June      | 33  |
| July      | 49  |
| August    | 21  |
| September | 56  |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1940 TO 1943 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

There seems to be, in relation to Question No. 1941, an inordinately high number of companies formed in June. Are the Government aware of any reason for this?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, yes, the Government are aware that in June an inordinately high number of companies were formed.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

My supplementary actually said are the Government aware of any reason for this? That is not the question that has been answered.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the Government are aware of why that figure is inordinately high and do not consider it appropriate to comment about it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Chief Minister inform the House of the reason why he does not consider it proper to comment further?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I could not do that without telling the reasons.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not that June is a high month for company registrations?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

ORAL

**NO. 1944 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1945 and 1946 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1945 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1944 and 1946 of 2004.

**NO. 1946 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new applications for banking licences have been received in the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Most of the information requested by the hon Member is given to him in the schedules printed. I see that the person who has put this material together has correctly thought that it is inappropriate to give the information broken down by name of company. So whereas the numbers and the nationality are given, the breakdown by company name is not. The answer to Question No. 1946 which is textual and not statistical, has been added to the schedule.

In answer to Question No. 1946, applications for banking licences are made to the Commissioner of Banking appointed under the Banking Ordinance 1992, the Commissioner is also the Commissioner appointed under the Financial Services Commission Ordinance 1989. The Commissioner does not, as a matter of policy, disclose the existence of applications currently under consideration, as to do so may make it possible for the applicants to be identified by some third parties. As such the Government have neither sought nor obtained from the Commissioner such information.

The Financial Services Commission, however, publishes both through its own website as well as through the Gazette all authorisations granted and revoked. From that information it is clear that no authorisation has been granted during the period in question.



**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1946**

**Answer to Question 1944**

**Banking**

| Months | No. of Employers | No. of Employees | NATIONALITIES |       |        |        |              |       |         |         |          |               |            |         |         |       |
|--------|------------------|------------------|---------------|-------|--------|--------|--------------|-------|---------|---------|----------|---------------|------------|---------|---------|-------|
|        |                  |                  | Danish        | Dutch | French | German | Gibraltarian | Irish | Italian | Maltese | Moroccan | Other British | Portuguese | Spanish | Swedish | Swiss |
| Apr-04 | 15               | 642              | 18            | 6     | 2      | 9      | 454          | 2     | 1       | 1       | 2        | 100           | 1          | 34      | 1       | 11    |
| May-04 | 15               | 640              | 17            | 6     | 2      | 9      | 451          | 2     | 1       | 1       | 2        | 101           | 1          | 35      | 1       | 11    |
| Jun-04 | 15               | 657              | 17            | 6     | 2      | 9      | 463          | 2     | 1       | 1       | 2        | 104           | 1          | 36      | 1       | 12    |
| Jul-04 | 15               | 679              | 18            | 5     | 2      | 9      | 488          | 2     | 0       | 1       | 2        | 102           | 1          | 36      | 1       | 12    |
| Aug-04 | 15               | 677              | 18            | 5     | 2      | 9      | 487          | 2     | 0       | 1       | 2        | 102           | 1          | 35      | 1       | 12    |
| Sep-04 | 15               | 674              | 17            | 5     | 2      | 8      | 484          | 2     | 0       | 1       | 2        | 104           | 1          | 34      | 2       | 12    |

These figures have been provided by the Employment and Training Board and might be slightly inflated as some employers do not always deregister employees once they leave the company. However, we have been informed by the ETB that the insurance industry and banking sector are generally compliant.





**CONT ANSWER TO QUESTION 1946**

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1945**

**Insurance**

| Months | No. of Employers | No. of Employees | NATIONALITIES |       |        |              |       |               |            |         |        |  |
|--------|------------------|------------------|---------------|-------|--------|--------------|-------|---------------|------------|---------|--------|--|
|        |                  |                  | Belgium       | Czech | French | Gibraltarian | Irish | Other British | Portuguese | Spanish | Indian |  |
| Apr-04 | 34               | 208              | 1             | 1     | 1      | 126          | 1     | 65            | 1          | 12      | 0      |  |
| May-04 | 34               | 210              | 1             | 1     | 1      | 131          | 1     | 62            | 1          | 12      | 0      |  |
| Jun-04 | 34               | 211              | 1             | 1     | 1      | 130          | 1     | 64            | 1          | 12      | 0      |  |
| Jul-04 | 34               | 220              | 1             | 1     | 1      | 130          | 1     | 73            | 1          | 12      | 0      |  |
| Aug-04 | 34               | 219              | 1             | 1     | 1      | 127          | 1     | 74            | 1          | 13      | 0      |  |
| Sep-04 | 33               | 221              | 0             | 1     | 1      | 126          | 1     | 76            | 1          | 14      | 1      |  |

These figures have been provided by the Employment and Training Board and might be slightly inflated as some employers do not always deregister employees once they leave the company. However, we have been informed by the ETB that the insurance industry and banking sector are generally compliant.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1944 TO 1946 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

This question has been asked in this House on a considerable number of occasions and the Chief Minister himself has answered me twice in my period in this House, this is now a new formulation of an answer. I would be grateful if the Chief Minister could indicate why there is now a change in policy in terms of answering this question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is no change of policy by us, although he is right in identifying that there has been a change in policy. There has been a change in policy by the Financial Services Commission. I have to say that I do not share the views of the Financial Services Commission on this matter and it is an issue which we are going to raise with him. I think that the Government of Gibraltar are entitled to know what licence applications there are, if only for economic management purposes. I will not make any partisan provocative statements but suffice it to say that I think it is time that we all aspired to regaining a greater measure of control over our financial services industry.

ORAL

**NO. 1947 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 2 INDIVIDUALS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of the months of April to July 2004 and how many have applied for that status since the coming into effect of the new Qualifying (Category 2) Individuals Rules 2004 made under the Income Tax Ordinance and published on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2004 and how many were registered?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1948 and 1949 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1948 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 INDIVIDUALS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 3 status in Gibraltar as at the end of each year from 1996 to 2003 and each of the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1947 and 1949 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1949 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 4 INDIVIDUALS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 4 status in Gibraltar as at the end of each year from 1996 to 2003 and in each of the months of April to September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information that the hon Member has requested is set out in the attached schedule.

## **ANSWER TO QUESTION 1949**

### **Answer to Question 1947**

During the months of April to July 2004 the following numbers were registered as Category 2 individuals.

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| April 2004 | 6 |
| May 2004   | 3 |
| June 2004  | 6 |
| July 2004  | 6 |

The new Qualifying (Category 2) Individuals Rules 2004 were published on the 29<sup>th</sup> July 2004 but take effect from the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2004.

As from the 1<sup>st</sup> July 2004 to date we have received 15 applications for Category 2 status, 12 of which have been registered.

### **Answer to Question 1948**

The Qualifying (Category 3) Individuals Rules were introduced in June 1998. They replaced the Relocated Executives Possessing Special Skills legislation.

During the years from 1998 to 2003, the following numbers of individuals were granted Category 3 status.

|      |    |
|------|----|
| 1998 | 5  |
| 1999 | 5  |
| 2000 | 14 |
| 2001 | 23 |
| 2002 | 26 |
| 2003 | 46 |

During the months of April to September 2004 the following numbers of individuals were registered.

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| April     | Nil |
| May       | 3   |
| June      | 6   |
| July      | 2   |
| August    | Nil |
| September | 8   |

Cont'd.....

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1949**

**Answer to Question 1949**

The Qualifying (Category 4) Individuals Rules were introduced in November 1999. During the years 1999 to 2003 the following numbers were registered as Category 4 Individuals.

|      |     |
|------|-----|
| 1999 | Nil |
| 2000 | 11  |
| 2001 | 9   |
| 2002 | 7   |
| 2003 | 7   |

During the months of April to September 2004, 8 individuals were registered – 5 in June 2004 and 3 in September 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1950 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the income from employment in the Income method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1951 to 1963 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1951 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the income from self-employment in the Income Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 and 1952 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1952 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the income from rent in the Income Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950, 1951 and 1953 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1953 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the income from company profits in the Income Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1952 and 1954 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1954 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the income from gross trading surplus of Government enterprises in the Income Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1953 and 1955 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1955 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the income from stock appreciation in the Income Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1954 and 1956 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1956 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the level of consumers' expenditure in the Expenditure Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1955 and 1957 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1957 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the level of expenditure on gross domestic fixed capital formation in the Expenditure Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1956 and 1958 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1958 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the level of expenditure on export of goods and services in the Expenditure Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1957 and 1959 to 1963 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1959 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the level of expenditure on import of goods and services in the Expenditure Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1958 and 1960 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1960 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the residual error between the Income and Expenditure Methods in the calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1959 and 1961 to 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1961 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the level of subsidies in the Expenditure Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1960, 1962 and 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

NO. 1962 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the level of taxes on expenditure in the Expenditure Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1950 to 1961 and 1963 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1963 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the level of expenditure of Government final consumption in the Expenditure Method of calculation of the 2001/2002 GDP?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information that the hon Member requests, which as he knows is traditionally given in tabular form, is contained in the attached schedule.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 1963**

£ million

| <b>INCOME METHOD</b>                            | * | 2001/02 |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|---------|
| INCOME FROM EMPLOYMENT                          | B | 272.17  |
| INCOME FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT                     | C | 48.25   |
| GROSS TRADING PROFITS OF COMPANIES              | C | 65.14   |
| GROSS TRADING SURPLUS OF GOVERNMENT ENTERPRISES | A | 4.36    |
| RENT                                            | C | 81.32   |
| TOTAL DOMESTIC INCOME                           | B | 471.24  |
| <u>LESS</u>                                     |   |         |
| STOCK APPRECIATION                              | C | -1.06   |
| GDP (FACTOR COST)                               | B | 470.18  |

£ million

| <b>EXPENDITURE METHOD</b>        | * | 2001/02 |
|----------------------------------|---|---------|
| CONSUMERS' EXPENDITURE           | B | 222.87  |
| GOVT. FINAL CONSUMPTION          | A | 152.27  |
| GROSS DOMESTIC FIXED CAP. F',MTN | C | 58.12   |
| TOTAL DOMESTIC EXPENDITURE       | C | 433.26  |
| EXPORTS OF GOODS AND SERVICES    | C | 656.52  |
| IMPORTS OF GOODS AND SERVICES    | B | -541.71 |
| RESIDUAL ERROR                   |   | -21.20  |
| GDP (MARKET PRICES)              | B | 526.87  |
| SUBSIDIES                        | C | 5.46    |
| TAXES ON EXPENDITURE             | A | -62.15  |
| GDP (FACTOR COST)                | B | 470.18  |

ORAL

NO. 1964 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state in respect of each year's GDP calculation 1995/1996 to 2001/2002, of the amount attributed to Gross Trading Profits how much was obtained by grossing up the corporation tax received in a given year and how much was in respect of the addition of an estimated amount in respect of profits not yet assessed to tax?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule attached.

**Answer to Question 1964 of 2004**

£ million

|         | <u>Gross Trading Profits</u> | <u>Estimate of Profits<br/>not yet Assessed</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|---------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1995/96 |                              |                                                 |              |
| 1996/97 | 39.64                        | 5.0                                             | 44.64        |
| 1997/98 | 40.00                        | 5.0                                             | 45.00        |
| 1998/99 | 48.57                        | 5.0                                             | 53.57        |
| 1999/00 | 50.36                        | 5.0                                             | 55.36        |
| 2000/01 | 55.91                        | 5.0                                             | 60.91        |
| 2001/02 | 63.64                        | 1.5                                             | 65.14        |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1964 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I notice that the 1995/1996 line is blank, is there a reason for that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not aware what the reason is but I can only speculate that that year was not covered by the exercise that we did which I think started in 1996/1997 if I recall. That is the only reason that I can speculate.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept that the exercise did not cover that year but in the explanation that I was given as to how it was calculated there was no indication that the method of calculating Gross Trading Profits had changed in 1996/1997. I would understand it if in fact the formula of grossing up plus estimating profit started in 1996/1997, if that is not the case then of course there is a logic to starting then, but if the same formula was being used in 1995/1996 then I cannot see why it is not there. Perhaps the Chief Minister can establish whether it is the case that the formula was different before.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will try and find that out.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I imagine the Chief Minister does not know but if I ask him the question then he can probably find out, or he may know. In grossing up the trading profits do I take it that this is based on the tax yields at 35 per cent and then this figure is the 100 per cent of that figure? This is following up the question that I asked how this was calculated at the last meeting of the House which is when I was told that it was a combination of these two things, grossing up the company profits shown that I have got from answers to other questions and therefore I am interpreting that to mean that if a figure is £35 million then the grossed up profit is £100 million, on the basis that the tax is 35 per cent. Can he confirm whether that is right?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think that is. The only distorting factor is capital allowances would interrupt the straight line extrapolation of, in other words, the tax yield is 35 per cent of a figure and it is that figure that the hon Member wants. So what figure is that amount of tax (35 per cent) would be the gross trading figure. What I do not know is how they accommodate capital allowances, which of course distort that mathematical calculation, because of course if

one has capital allowances one is paying less tax but still making the profit. So subject to that, I think the hon Member is right. That is what I do not know, whether they make an allowance for allowances. In other words, whether they write back into profits what is not paid in tax by virtue of the operation of capital allowances and things of that sort.

ORAL

NO. 1965 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the share of GDP taken up by public expenditure in 1999/2000 and in 2000/2001?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1966 to 1968 of 2004.

ORAL

NO. 1966 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state in respect of which year the share of GDP taken up by public expenditure in the UK was 42 per cent?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 1965, 1967 and 1968 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1967 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the source of the calculation of the GDP share taken up by public expenditure in UK quoted in this year's budget?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1965, 1966 and 1968 of 2004.

**NO. 1968 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government explain how the share of GDP taken up by public expenditure was calculated to arrive at the 29 per cent in 1997/1998, 30 per cent in 1998/1999 and 31 per cent in 2001/2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question Nos. 1966 and 1967**

The figure of 42 per cent in respect of public expenditure as a proportion of GDP for the UK is taken from an article written by the Guardian's political editor, Michael White, on May 27<sup>th</sup> 2004. This rate is quoted to be that as at that date. I am just looking through the article to see whether it cites his source, but it appears to be correct because it is the number that is bandied around in the House of Commons, in debates between the Shadow Chancellor and the Chancellor. So I suppose if it were not right the House of Commons equivalent of the Opposition Members would have spotted the error by now.

**Answer to Question Nos. 1965 and 1968**

The share of GDP taken up by public expenditure for the period 1997/1998 to 2001/2002 is shown in the table attached.

Answer to Question 1968 of 2004

|                                          | <u>1997/98</u> | <u>1998/99</u> | <u>1999/00</u> | <u>2000/01</u> | <u>2001/02</u> |
|------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <u>£ million</u>                         |                |                |                |                |                |
| (1) Government Final<br>Consumption (£m) | 100.41         | 109.54         | 119.56         | 134.86         | 152.27         |
| (2) GDP (£m)                             | 364.51         | 393.23         | 409.89         | 433.61         | 470.18         |
| (1) as % of GDP                          | 27.6           | 27.9           | 29.2           | 31.1           | 32.4           |

## SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1965 TO 1968 OF 2004

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it from this paper that what I am being told is that the figures that are being provided today have been calculated by using the figure of Government final consumption in the expenditure method calculation of the GDP, am I right?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes and of course Government final consumption as he probably knows is limited to the recurrent expenditure and not to the capital expenditure, in order to make it comparable to the 42 per cent figure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do know that, but in fact that was not how the figure was calculated in his statement in the budget because the figures here are not the same as the ones he gave in the budget. My question which says can Government explain how the share of the GDP was calculated to arrive at 29 per cent in 1997/1998 and here we have got that by using Government final consumption we get 27.6 per cent of a GDP of £364.51 million. In his budget statement which was prepared beforehand, so it was not something that he calculated on the spot, he quoted 29 per cent in 1997/1998. That is why I wondered if it was a different method of calculation. Obviously I would have been able to work this out from the figures that have been published.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not a different method of calculation, it is applying the same calculation to a slightly different based figures. The percentage figures calculated cited at budget time do differ slightly from the finalised National Income account figures because the percentages used at budget time were taken from the expenditure figures in the Estimates, whereas the percentages now shown use the National Accounts definition for Government expenditure. So for example, at budget I quoted 28.8 per cent for 1997/1998, in fact the figure quoted now is 27.6 per cent and so on and so forth. So the figures being quoted now are in every case, except 2001/2002, very slightly lower by usually 1 percentage point or less but in the case of 2001/2002 the figure being quoted now is one and a half per cent higher. The reason apparently is that the figures given to me for the budget are taken from the Estimates of Expenditure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The figure that is taken from the Estimates which was used in the budget is the annually recurrent expenditure out of the Consolidated Fund?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Chief Minister know whether that is comparable to what has been used in the United Kingdom to arrive at the 42 per cent?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Technically speaking the figure which is most purely comparable to our figure of 32.4 per cent for 2001/2002 would in the UK produce a comparable figure for 2003 of 38.2 per cent. The figure in the UK of 42 per cent is the figure as a percentage of public spending which includes net capital expenditure. In other words, net investment, net capital expenditure not gross capital expenditure. So it is somewhere in between my position and his but slightly nearer his in terms of the inclusion of an element of capital expenditure. In other words, the 42 per cent figure is recurrent plus net investment not gross investment.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Let me say I have not expressed any preference for any particular method so I am not sure, all I am trying to do is establish the comparability of the figures. I am not saying that 42 per cent is too low or too high or any other figure.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not mind giving the hon Member a copy of the page out of the UK blue book, which I have used to identify which is the most precise comparable figure so that he can do the exercise that I have just done on my feet.

ORAL

**NO. 1969 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government explain why in the October 2003 Employment Survey Report Summary in Point 2(A) the average annual earnings in respect of all employees is given as £16,766.49p as at October 2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1970 of 2004.

**NO. 1970 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state what was the distribution of average annual earnings in respect of all employee jobs as shown in Table 16 of the October 2003 Employment Survey Report showing separately the distribution in the case of:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government; and
- (c) Private Sector employers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1969**

Point 2(a) of the Survey Summary in respect of the October 2003 Employment Survey should read:

“Average annual earnings in respect of all employee jobs increased by +3.9 per cent, from £16,802.96p to £17,460.44p in October 2003.”

This average annual earnings figure for 2002 is consistent with the figure published in the October 2002 Employment Survey Report and with the figure shown in Table 17 of the October 2003 Employment Survey Report.

**Answer to Question No. 1970**

I pass on to the hon Member a schedule containing the information requested.

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Private Sector Employees Jobs, October, 2003.

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | ALL EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |        | ALL MALE JOBS |           |       | ALL FEMALE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|--------|---------------|-----------|-------|-----------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL  | FULL-TIME     | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME       | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 11     | 11            | 0         | 2     | 2               | 0         | 9     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 30        | 30     | 0             | 7         | 7     | 0               | 23        | 23    |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 34        | 34     | 0             | 11        | 11    | 0               | 23        | 23    |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 17                | 170       | 187    | 0             | 14        | 14    | 17              | 156       | 173   |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 40                | 182       | 222    | 31            | 49        | 80    | 9               | 133       | 142   |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 60                | 297       | 357    | 34            | 69        | 103   | 26              | 228       | 254   |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 120               | 450       | 570    | 68            | 302       | 370   | 52              | 148       | 200   |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 60                | 228       | 286    | 28            | 43        | 71    | 32              | 183       | 215   |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 137               | 171       | 308    | 39            | 37        | 76    | 98              | 134       | 232   |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 252               | 114       | 366    | 90            | 32        | 122   | 162             | 82        | 244   |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 746               | 94        | 840    | 327           | 20        | 347   | 419             | 74        | 493   |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 490               | 64        | 554    | 254           | 27        | 281   | 236             | 37        | 273   |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 690               | 61        | 751    | 454           | 12        | 466   | 236             | 49        | 285   |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 541               | 30        | 571    | 347           | 4         | 351   | 194             | 26        | 220   |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 787               | 38        | 825    | 508           | 8         | 516   | 279             | 30        | 309   |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 567               | 18        | 585    | 365           | 4         | 369   | 202             | 14        | 216   |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 513               | 23        | 536    | 347           | 5         | 352   | 166             | 18        | 184   |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 1,133             | 25        | 1,158  | 686           | 5         | 691   | 447             | 20        | 467   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 781               | 21        | 802    | 545           | 6         | 551   | 236             | 15        | 251   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 637               | 9         | 646    | 480           | 4         | 484   | 157             | 5         | 162   |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 445               | 4         | 449    | 324           | 1         | 325   | 121             | 3         | 124   |
| 25,000 and over | 1,320             | 3         | 1,323  | 1,106         | 2         | 1,108 | 214             | 1         | 215   |
| TOTAL           | 9,336             | 2,075     | 11,411 | 6,033         | 684       | 6,697 | 3,303           | 1,411     | 4,714 |

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of Gibraltar Government Employee Jobs, October 2003.

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | ALL EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | ALL MALE JOBS |           |       | ALL FEMALE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------|-------|-----------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME     | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME       | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 | 0 - 999           | 0         | 0     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 1         | 1     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 1     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 2         | 2     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 2     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 0     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 0     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 10                | 2         | 12    | 0             | 0         | 0     | 10              | 0         | 12    |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 2                 | 0         | 2     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 2               | 0         | 2     |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 1                 | 3         | 4     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 1               | 3         | 4     |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 9                 | 137       | 146   | 3             | 1         | 4     | 6               | 136       | 142   |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 4                 | 19        | 23    | 3             | 0         | 3     | 1               | 19        | 20    |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 1                 | 9         | 10    | 1             | 0         | 1     | 0               | 9         | 9     |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 8                 | 12        | 20    | 3             | 0         | 3     | 5               | 12        | 17    |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 15                | 26        | 41    | 2             | 1         | 3     | 13              | 25        | 38    |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 28                | 12        | 41    | 11            | 0         | 11    | 18              | 12        | 30    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 94                | 10        | 104   | 35            | 0         | 35    | 59              | 10        | 69    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 76                | 8         | 84    | 21            | 0         | 21    | 55              | 8         | 63    |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 87                | 9         | 96    | 62            | 1         | 63    | 25              | 8         | 33    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 181               | 8         | 189   | 58            | 0         | 58    | 123             | 8         | 131   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 226               | 6         | 232   | 101           | 0         | 101   | 125             | 6         | 131   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 209               | 6         | 215   | 104           | 0         | 104   | 105             | 6         | 111   |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 234               | 2         | 236   | 136           | 0         | 136   | 98              | 2         | 100   |
| 25,000 and over | 1,476             | 4         | 1,480 | 1,053         | 1         | 1,054 | 423             | 3         | 426   |
| TOTAL           | 2,662             | 276       | 2,938 | 1,593         | 4         | 1,597 | 1,069           | 272       | 1,341 |

Distribution of Average Annual Earnings of MoD Employee Jobs, October 2003.

| £<br>PER ANNUM  | ALL EMPLOYEE JOBS |           |       | ALL MALE JOBS |           |       | ALL FEMALE JOBS |           |       |
|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------|-------|-----------------|-----------|-------|
|                 | FULL-TIME         | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME     | PART-TIME | TOTAL | FULL-TIME       | PART-TIME | TOTAL |
|                 |                   |           |       |               |           |       |                 |           |       |
| 0 - 999         | 0                 | 3         | 3     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 0     |
| 1,000 - 1,499   | 0                 | 4         | 4     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 0     |
| 1,500 - 1,999   | 0                 | 0         | 0     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 0     |
| 2,000 - 2,499   | 0                 | 2         | 2     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 0     |
| 2,500 - 2,999   | 0                 | 5         | 5     | 0             | 1         | 1     | 1               | 0         | 1     |
| 3,000 - 3,999   | 0                 | 1         | 1     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 0         | 0     |
| 4,000 - 4,999   | 2                 | 9         | 11    | 2             | 3         | 5     | 5               | 0         | 5     |
| 5,000 - 5,999   | 4                 | 13        | 17    | 2             | 5         | 7     | 7               | 2         | 9     |
| 6,000 - 6,999   | 7                 | 16        | 23    | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 7         | 7     |
| 7,000 - 7,999   | 11                | 5         | 16    | 0             | 1         | 1     | 1               | 11        | 12    |
| 8,000 - 8,999   | 10                | 6         | 16    | 2             | 0         | 2     | 2               | 8         | 10    |
| 9,000 - 9,999   | 3                 | 1         | 4     | 0             | 0         | 0     | 0               | 3         | 3     |
| 10,000 - 10,999 | 14                | 1         | 15    | 6             | 0         | 6     | 6               | 8         | 14    |
| 11,000 - 11,999 | 80                | 5         | 85    | 32            | 0         | 32    | 32              | 48        | 80    |
| 12,000 - 12,999 | 65                | 1         | 66    | 30            | 1         | 31    | 31              | 35        | 66    |
| 13,000 - 13,999 | 56                | 0         | 56    | 30            | 0         | 30    | 30              | 26        | 56    |
| 14,000 - 14,999 | 70                | 0         | 70    | 42            | 0         | 42    | 42              | 28        | 70    |
| 15,000 - 17,499 | 171               | 0         | 171   | 113           | 0         | 113   | 113             | 58        | 171   |
| 17,500 - 19,999 | 116               | 0         | 116   | 90            | 0         | 90    | 90              | 26        | 116   |
| 20,000 - 22,499 | 80                | 0         | 80    | 64            | 0         | 64    | 64              | 16        | 80    |
| 22,500 - 24,999 | 47                | 0         | 47    | 38            | 0         | 38    | 38              | 9         | 47    |
| 25,000 and over | 262               | 0         | 262   | 246           | 0         | 246   | 245             | 17        | 262   |
| TOTAL           | 988               | 72        | 1,070 | 698           | 12        | 708   | 302             | 60        | 362   |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1969 AND 1970 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Then I take it that the answer to Question No. 1969, which is why it has that other figure, is because it was put in there by mistake.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO. 1971 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**RGP – VACANCIES**

How many applications were received in respect of the Official Notice advertising vacancies for the posts of Police Constable in the Royal Gibraltar Police Force which appeared on Friday 21<sup>st</sup> May 2004 and how many were employed in respect of the said posts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Forty-one applications were received and for some reason they do not want me to say how many were employed. I can say that three did not meet the requirements of the advert, 20 failed the entrance exam, one withdrew the application and 17 candidates were interviewed but it does not go on to tell me how many were actually employed. I will try and get that information for him and pass it on to him.



ORAL

**NO. 1972 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SALE OF S/Y PERKEO**

What have been the proceeds of the sale of the S/Y "Perkeo" sold by auction on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2004 and have any such proceeds been earmarked or ring fenced exclusively for investment in respect of law enforcement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The S/Y "Perkeo" was not sold by auction as the reserved price was not met. It was subsequently sold by private sale for £81,579, the full proceeds of which are expected to be received by the end of October 2004. Government have not made a decision as to the use of the funds. Other than Special Fund Rules, there is no provision for hypothecated Revenue in our system of public finances.

ORAL

**NO. 1973 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**RGP – REMUNERATION**

Are Government committed to parity in respect of the pay of serving and retired officers of the Royal Gibraltar Police?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1974 of 2004.

**NO. 1974 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**RGP – REMUNERATION**

Have Government taken a decision on whether to rely on the Limitation Ordinance in respect of the claims or potential claims of retired and serving officers of the Royal Gibraltar Police in relation to the incorrect application of parity arising more than six years ago?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are committed to the principle of parity, as applied to Gibraltar under the local parity agreement in respect of all pay reviews for serving officers for which they are responsible. In respect of claims of failure to honour parity by previous administrations, the Government consider each case on its merits and fairness to both sides. In the Government's view the current issues raised by retired officers do not raise issues of parity.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1973 AND 1974 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister whether he is going to answer specifically the issue of the Limitation Ordinance in Question No. 1974 or is that an issue that is also considered not wholesale but in relation to the merits of each of the claims made?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are certainly not going to commit themselves here in this House as to what legal defences they will keep open in the event that they are faced with a legal claim which they consider to be unmeritorious.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not asking for that, if my question suggested that I apologise. I am asking whether the Government have made a decision to say that any application to them for relief in terms, I am not talking by way of legal suit but in terms of representation, will simply be met by a statement that they will only make themselves responsible in respect of liabilities no more than six years old, or whether they will take a different attitude to claims, not in terms of legal suit.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If anybody other than a lawyer were asking me that question I could attribute it to ignorance, but since it is a lawyer asking me that question I cannot distinguish it from the answer that I have just given. The statute of limitation necessarily only applies by way of legal defence to a claim. For the hon Member to try and separate the question of the Limitations Ordinance from the question of legal claim is nonsensical.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What I am asking the Chief Minister, in fact as he is a Silk I think it is appropriate for me to call him the Honourable and Learned Gentleman when we are being noble to each other, but in this instance of course as a result of his answer I will limit myself to calling him the hon Gentleman, is whether he will deal with claims made to him by retired officers simply by turning them away if those claims relate to periods longer than six years ago. That is what I am asking him.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The temptation to say to the hon Member that I have already answered his questions is almost irresistible but I will go the extra mile in trying to resist it. It seems self-evident, even to those Government Members who are not lawyers, that if the Government choose to entertain a claim ignoring the question of the party's legal rights, then necessarily the question of the Limitation Ordinance does not arise given that the Limitation Ordinance is about legal defences to otherwise valid claims in law. I assume the hon Member knows what the Limitation Ordinance is. Therefore I cannot make sense of the distinction he is trying to draw and that is the last answer that I will give him on the matter. As to whether he should call me honourable and learned colleague or Member because I am a Silk, I think he will find that the epithet learned applies to all lawyers, one does not have to be a Silk, which means that even I have to call him learned.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Given that I am not going to be given any other answer in relation to the substantive issues, I will just get on my feet to say that the Parliamentary rules say that honourable and learned attaches in Parliament only to somebody who is Silk. So he does not yet have to afford me that distinction.

ORAL

**NO. 1975 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCIES**

Will the Government be publishing and circulating information on what procedures citizens should follow in the event of an environmental emergency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not clear what the hon Member means by an environmental emergency. Many civil contingencies have potential impact on the environment. As I have already said publicly the Government intend to publish a guidance leaflet to citizens relating to accidents and other emergencies. It is not focused on environmental issues.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1975 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Government give an indication of when they expect that publication to be made available to the public?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am not in a position to give a meaningful indication now. I think I am on record as saying that we hope to do it before the end of the year.

**NO. 1976 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPEAN BORDERS AGENCY**

Have the Government now taken legal advice on the feasibility of challenging the planned exclusion of Gibraltar from the workings of the European Borders Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Not yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1976 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does it follow from that answer that the Government will be taking legal advice on this question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In the statement that the Government issued, they referred to mounting a legal challenge in the UK courts, does that suggest they will take the action against the British Government and not against the European Commission or the Council or whoever it may be?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is what he should read from any decision to commence actions in the UK courts. We could only take action in the UK courts against the UK Government.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say when they intend to commission somebody to actually produce that legal advice and who they have in mind perhaps?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes well, the deed is done now. Course of action is already on the way so it is not urgent in that sense. It is important but not urgent. The Government's resources for the consideration, conception, management and mounting of legal actions are presently fully occupied with the tax reform case and the Regional Selectivity case, and as soon as that case has got over, the heavy pleading stage which is basically the filing of the application and the defence and the reply to the defence, then we can start devoting or rather Michael Llamas can start devoting his attention to this matter. It is not just a question of taking legal advice, one has got to put together a brief to counsel, which is necessarily a long and complex document given that if we do take action against the British Government it will be based on considerations of whether they are discharging their legal obligations under the Constitution to discharge our foreign affairs.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Government statement which was issued on 30<sup>th</sup> July also mentions the fact that the EU took the view that because the Agency was a Schengen external borders measure, and UK had opted out of Schengen, therefore the UK could not participate in it as of right. The Government statement said that the UK rejected that decision, both in respect of itself and of Gibraltar and that it would challenge that decision in the ECJ. Are the Government in a position to say whether the UK itself is now going ahead with that challenge?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well it has not challenged it yet and I think the hon Member, I do not know if I said it at the time, I think I did but I was sceptical about whether they would in the event do it or not. If I did not say it in the House I think I said it in an interview. That is what the UK Government's position is, I doubt or rather I have a doubt about whether they will in fact initiate that legal action as opposed to settling for their cooperating status from which of course we are excluded. It suits us that they should take action because if they take action it could result in our inclusion if they win.

**NO. 1977 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SINGLE EUROPEAN SKY**

Have Government now received legal advice on the feasibility of challenging the exclusion of Gibraltar airport from the Single European Sky?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The position remains as I think I have told him in the past, although I have not checked this out that the Government have received preliminary advice. I think I told him that last time. We have not yet firmed up that advice in terms of final advice.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1977 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Chief Minister in a position to say who the advice was received from and perhaps give the House an indication of whether it will allow the Government to proceed with the action that they politically intended to take?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is some time since I looked at this but I think that the advice was that the Government did have a course of action that they could pursue. I do not recall at what level it expressed the prospects of success and of course having a course of action open to one is very different to whether one will win it or not. In a sense one is procedural and the other is substantive. These are both areas where we are determined to embark on a course of litigation in the exclusion of Gibraltar from aviation measures, and the exclusion of Gibraltar if the Borders Agency Regulation is as a first precedent, are not areas that Gibraltar can afford to leave unchallenged if it possibly can mount a challenge.



**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the Single Sky, the action would presumably also be against the United Kingdom up against the Commission or the Council and will that be in UK courts or would it be in the European Court of Justice?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There we have the option to do both. The reason why we do not think we have an option to take action against the Council in the Borders Agency Regulation is that of course that is a measure that does not in European law extend to UK or Gibraltar because it is a Schengen measure. So there our complaint is that the UK has agreed to cooperate with it notwithstanding that we are excluded from it. That is a complaint that we can level at the UK. It may not be a complaint that we can level at the European Council who have in effect excluded us from a Regulation that they say does not apply to us any way. So in that sense the textual exclusion of Gibraltar is superfluous. Their position is that it does not apply to the UK or Gibraltar anyway because it is a Schengen measure and we are outside the Schengen Borders Chapters.

ORAL

**NO. 1978 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**GIBRALTAR GOLD COIN CO LTD**

What was the total cost to the Government of defending the case brought by The Gibraltar Gold Coin Co Ltd?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 1979 of 2004.

**NO. 1979 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**UNFAIR DISMISSAL**

What were the legal costs of defending the case of unfair dismissal brought by John Gomez?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1978**

The Government did not incur any costs in the defence of the Gold Coin case because the defence was conducted on the Government's behalf by the Attorney General who does not levy fees against the Government.

**Answer to Question No. 1979**

The information as to the cost of defending the unfair dismissal case brought by John Gomez against the company, I think it was called Gib Procurement Limited, is not yet known.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1978 AND 1979 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In light of that I will want to put the question again even within the next six months just to keep tab on that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I should add that the Government consider that the ruling in the John Gomez case is completely erroneous but given the size of the damages awarded, we have thought it inappropriate to invest further tax payers money in trying to seek a reversal of it, since we do not think that we would recover the full amount of the additional costs even if we

won an appeal. So the Government have decided to take it on the chin even though we think that the case and the decision is eminently appellable.

ORAL

**NO. 1980 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORMS**

With whom did the Chief Minister meet in respect of the EU Tax reform legal case on his trip to London of 26<sup>th</sup> May 2004, what was the outcome of the meeting, who attended with the Chief Minister and what was the cost of the trip?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1981 to 1983 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1981 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORMS**

With whom did the Chief Minister meet in respect of the EU Tax reform legal case in London on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> May 2004, what was the outcome of the meeting, who attended with the Chief Minister and what was the cost of the trip?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1980, 1982 and 1983 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1982 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORMS**

With whom did the Chief Minister meet in the EU Commission in respect of the EU Tax reform legal case in Brussels on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2004, what was the outcome of the meeting, who attended with the Chief Minister and what was the cost of the trip?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1980, 1981 and 1983 of 2004.

**NO. 1983 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORMS**

With whom did the Chief Minister meet in the EU Commission in respect of the EU Tax reform legal case in Brussels on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2004, what was the outcome of the meeting, who attended with the Chief Minister and what was the cost of the trip?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Chief Minister does not meet with EU officials in relation to the EU Tax Reform legal case. Meetings in relation to that case in Brussels would be with the Government's own legal team and in London would be with the Government's own legal team and UK Government officials and lawyers in relation to the coordination of each Government's separate cases in relation to the Tax Reform case.

Meetings with EU officials would relate to the Exempt Status dossier rather than the Tax Reform dossier. As to the costs I think they have all emerged in answer to previous questions. Have they not?

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 1980 TO 1983 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, in fact the meetings referred to in Question Nos. 1980 and 1981 which are obviously Financial Services related meetings, are not reflected in the answers to Question No. 1915 which was the question on the Chief Minister's travel in relation to financial services. I think that they are in the answer to Question No. 1860 but they are not in the answer to financial services. The question also asked what the outcome of the meetings was, I wonder whether the Chief Minister will deal with that issue.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, to tell him that it is not appropriate to give him a meeting by meeting, blow by blow account of what transpires in meetings in which I take part. It is just wholly



inappropriate. These are meetings in the context of to consider, plan and make decisions as to lines to take in the conduct of these two issues. It is wholly inappropriate for the hon Member to expect me to give him, if he wants to come to meetings with me he should ask, I did not agree of course but that would be the way to find out what transpired at the meetings.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Statements are made to the media that the Chief Minister is going to make these trips, the Chief Minister gives press interviews on his return from these trips saying a little but not much of what has transpired, it is for that reason that in this House I am asking him what was the outcome of those trips. I certainly do not think it is not appropriate. This is an issue that concerns the financial services industry in Gibraltar. The Chief Minister is spending a lot of time, as can be seen from the record of the trips he has done on these issues, and I would ask him to reconsider giving the House at least the flavour of what it is that the outcome of these meetings was. Was it positive, negative? I would ask him to consider that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister goes away on trips and when he comes back he says in public all that it is appropriate to say in public. It is not any more appropriate to say things in public in the media than it is to say them public here. Both are public and the Chief Minister does not withhold information because he does not want to say it. He withholds information from publication when he considers that it is not in the interests of Gibraltar to put it in the public domain. The judgement is the same whether it is published in the media or published in this House. So we shall have to agree to disagree about what is appropriate and what is not. We are the ones elected to make decisions about what is in the public interests of Gibraltar and he is just going to have to accept our judgements.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister whether following his latest excursion to Brussels is he still in a position to say we are going to continue issuing Tax Exempt Certificates for the time being. That has not changed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well Tax Exempt Certificates continue to be issued.

ORAL

**NO. 1984 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORMS**

What is the present state of the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission following the latter's rejection of the Government's tax reform proposals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government have filed their claim and the Commission has filed its defence. We now have I think until some date in November to reply to the defence.

**NO. 1985 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORMS**

When will the Government provide the Opposition with the details of their tax reform proposals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I have made a full statement in this House about the Government's proposed Tax Reform Proposals. Therefore I do not accept the implication of the hon Member's question which is to the effect that it has not yet been given. It may be that the hon Member meant to ask "When will the Government provide to the Opposition copies of the detailed legislation that would be required to implement the Tax Reform Proposals?". In that respect the position remains as previously explained in the House, namely, that the Government do not consider it appropriate to do so until and if the Government are free to implement that policy – which as the hon Member is aware is not presently the case. In other words, there is a statement in the House explaining the outline and the principles of the Government's tax reform proposals but not the full nitty gritty detail but the principal contents of the proposal. It is also true that the Government have had to draw up, prematurely really, very detailed legislation and therefore having to make very detailed decisions for the purposes of legislation that would be required to implement that policy proposal. We had to do that because it is a requirement of the notification procedure to the European Union. In other words, when one notifies a tax scheme one cannot just notify an outline, one has actually send them copies in draft of the legislation so that they can see every nook and cranny of it, so to speak. That is what the Government have done. The Government may not proceed with that legislation, may not be allowed to proceed with that legislation depending on the outcome, and in those circumstances we think it is premature and unnecessary to publish that legislation to unleash a debate about the detail of proposals and legislation which may be wholly academic. We will have plenty of opportunity to debate it if it is going to become legislation. In other words, it has to be published as legislation and it has to go through the legislative process, some of it is subsidiary legislation but most of it is not, and therefore it will go to the legislative process which will include giving copies to the Opposition and debate just like anything else. To publish it now is in the Government's view completely unproductive.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1985 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

We have already found ourselves in this House this year in a position where the Government have cleared with an external body the terms of the legislation they are going to bring to this House, and then when that legislation comes to this House, although it is published and the Opposition have an opportunity of scrutinising it in technically the normal way, we are not able to influence it in the normal way because the Government have already agreed the letter of it with somebody else. That happened in relation to the European Parliamentary Elections Ordinance which had been cleared with the UK. We are going to be in pretty much the same situation if the Government clear their primary legislation at least with an external body, in this case the European Commission, and when it comes to this House we are not able to influence in any way however positively the Government might receive any suggestions that we make. It is for that reason that I would ask whether the Government are in a position to reconsider their answer, given that that detailed proposal has already been published to the Commission, to the United Kingdom and to all the Member States of the European Union who have representation in the Commission and have a copy of that legislation, but the Opposition do not. Can the Chief Minister at least address that point?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes I will address it only to repeat the Government's position which I will just do by reference and not actually repeat it that that is not the position which the Opposition will find themselves. In other words, it is not the case that once the Commission approves, if it approves which of course it is refusing to do, but should it approve the legislation, so this is sort of hypothesis on hypothesis, should it approve the legislation it is not the case that the House is then just a rubber stamp and in effect the European Commission has become the legislature. The House of Assembly will be perfectly free to modify that legislation provided it does not modify it in a way which would infringe State Aid Regulations. The legislation is not sent for approval in the sense that once they have approved that we are not free to modify it. That is not the position. The position the hon Member has described is not the case. Therefore the legislature's legislative role remains in tact, including its ability to modify the draft legislation the Government publish in Bill form. Of course the Government are not going to agree to any amendment and would use our majority to prevent any amendment moved by the hon Members that would prejudice the Commission's approval by incurring in a breach of the State Aid Regulations. So the Government do not approve. Giving the legislation to the Opposition is not the same as giving the legislation to a multi-lateral national organisation, international organisation like the EU where we are obliged to give it as part of an established legal procedure. This is not publication, this is a Government going through an EU administrative process. It is not open for debate, nobody can publish it, nobody can adopt public statements based on the position that they have read and that would not be the case if we gave it to the Opposition. What I remember saying, I think it was in answer to the Hon Dr Garcia but I do not recall if it was him or somebody else, he may recall whether it was to him, was that when it was appropriate to publish the legislation, namely if the Government had been freed to proceed with that policy if they wanted to, and if they were allowed to, but the Government in recognition of the

complexity would not give five days or would not publish it the minimal seven days notice, but we would give as much notice as possible of publication. That commitment remains that we will as soon as it becomes the policy of the Government to proceed with that legislation, and as soon as the Government are legally free to implement that legislation if they choose to, the Government will then give the draft legislation because it will then not be a hypothetical exercise. It will then just be a question of time before this House has to consider it. At the moment this House may never have to consider that legislation and therefore in that context we think it would be premature and unnecessary to publish the legislation.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I then at least persuade the Chief Minister to commit himself to a date on which he will give the Opposition that which he has already committed himself to give the Opposition, namely, the submissions of his Government and of the UK Government in support of those proposals. He will recall that he has told us that he was going to give us that. He told us in fact that he was quite happy to give us the submissions of his Government. He then told us that he was seeking confirmation from the United Kingdom Government that he could let us have their submissions and that he would not let us have his submissions until the UK Government had agreed that we could have their because he thought that it was more reasonable and given that obviously that second filter is not proving as easily persuadable as he has so that we should see the submissions. Can I first of all ask him whether he is now in a position to tell us that those submissions of the UK are to be given to us? Second, if they are not, can we at least have his which he has agreed to give so that we have an element of greater understanding of what the issues are? Especially given that we are now at the stage where the proposals in respect of which those submissions were made have actually been rejected.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I do not know what I have lost sight of the position of the UK's attitude to the making available. I do not think that has come through. I am not sure it is being pursued with any great urgency but certainly I do not think it has come through. Whether the Government should then give the hon Members the Government's own submission, we will have to consider. I will reconsider the matter because there is a fair amount of cross reference to the submissions of each Government. We will consider that and we will consider whether subsequent events, in other words the fact that the Commission has made the decision and the fact that that decision is now the subject matter of a legal challenge, raises additional issues or not. If it does not then the Government remain free to give their submissions.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not asking the Chief Minister to publish it. What the agreement was, was that those submissions would be provided in confidence. Can I at least persuade him, if he has to, to black line those parts of his submission which make reference to the UK submissions. We are quite happy to accept it unless we are going to get whole pages of black, we are

quite happy to accept that so that we could at least try and find our feet in relation to those submissions. Can I persuade him of that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member has persuaded me to give it active consideration.

**NO. 1986 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORMS**

What are the “interim arrangements” which the Government have asked the EU Commission to agree (and announced to have been agreed between the Government and the EU Commission DG Competition in June 2004) pending the outcome of the legal proceedings commenced by the Government against the EU Commission in respect of the latter’s rejection of the Government’s tax reforms proposals, and will the said “interim arrangements” last until the outcome of the said legal proceedings or until 2010, whichever is the earlier?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This matter remains under negotiation with the EU Commission and until those negotiations conclude it is neither appropriate nor in Gibraltar’s interest to comment as requested by the hon Member, except to say that the objective is to ensure the continuation of Exempt Status on agreed terms until our legal right to replace it with something else is adjudicated upon by the European Courts.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1986 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I persuade the Chief Minister to give us the details or an indication of what those interim arrangements are, in confidence, given that that would not affect the interests of Gibraltar?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, he cannot persuade me.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

On what possible basis? Does he believe that sharing information of that sort confidentially with the Opposition would not be in the interests of Gibraltar?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have given him an answer. He has asked me whether I am willing to share with him information and the answer is that I am not.



ORAL

**NO. 1987 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAXATION OF SAVINGS ORDINANCE 2004**

Can Government state if they now expect the Taxation of Savings Ordinance 2004 to come into effect in January 2005, July 2005 or on another date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Government expect it to come into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 1988 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**POLICE AND CRIMINAL EVIDENCE ACT 1984**

Given the answer to Question Nos. 424 of 2004 and 1241 of 2004, have Government now received and considered any feedback from the group or Committee set up to consider the possibility of implementation of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I received a report on 5<sup>th</sup> October this year and I have not yet considered it.

**NO. 1989 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Given the Chief Minister's statements to the effect that electricity generation plants may be moved as part of the Eastside Project, will the Government:

- (a) make a statement clarifying which is the new possible site for the location of power stations;
- (b) state whether it will only be the publicly owned power station that will move or whether provision will also be made to move the OESCO power station; and
- (c) state the order of costs involved in such a move and whether the Government will be meeting the cost itself?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not appropriate to comment on on-going commercial negotiations. When they are concluded the Government will of course make a full appropriate statement. All these issues are at present hypothetical.

**ORAL**

**NO. 1990 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INCOME TAX – PETITIONS TO WIND-UP**

In respect of how many of the Companies in relation to which Petitions to Wind-Up by the Supreme Court were issued by the Commissioner of Income Tax and advertised on Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> July 2004 has a Winding-Up Order been made by the Supreme Court, stating the names of any companies which have been wound-up, and has a Provisional Liquidator been appointed over any and if so which?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested is on the attached schedule.

### **Answer to Question 1990 of 2004**

Following the advertisement placed by the Income Tax Office in the local press on the 6<sup>th</sup> July 2004 the Supreme Court ordered the winding-up of the following companies.

| <u>Name of company</u>          | <u>Date of Winding-up Order</u> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Best Bread Limited              | 15 July 2004                    |
| Central Cold Stores Limited     | 15 July 2004                    |
| Dataline (Gibraltar) Limited    | 15 July 2004                    |
| Japcol Imports Limited          | 15 July 2004                    |
| P & M Recording Studios Limited | 15 July 2004                    |
| Rentokil (Gibraltar) Limited    | 15 July 2004                    |
| Tetouan Limited                 | 15 July 2004                    |
| Jab Limited                     | 28 September 2004               |
| Manse Limited                   | 28 September 2004               |

Although the Official Receiver has as yet not appointed a Provisional Liquidator for any of the stated companies, it is expected that appointments will shortly be made in respect of all the companies.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1990 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The narrative at the base of that question says that although the Official Receiver has, as yet not appointed a Provisional Liquidator for any of the stated companies, it is expected that appointments will shortly be made in respect of all the companies. Should that not be a reference to Liquidator and not Provisional Liquidator?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO. 1991 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government state how much of the £19.5 million estimated receipts from company tax for the financial year 2003/2004 was attributable to exempt companies previously shown as other company tax?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1992 to 1994 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1992 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government state how much of the £19 million forecast outturn for receipts from company tax for the financial year 2003/2004 was attributable to exempt companies previously shown as other company tax?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1991, 1993 and 1994 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 1993 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government state how much of the £19 million estimated receipts from company tax for the financial year 2004/2005 is attributable to exempt companies previously shown as other company tax?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1991, 1992 and 1994 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1994 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government state how much of the £19,383,733 actual receipts from company tax for the financial year 2002/2003 was attributable to exempt companies previously shown as other company tax?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested is given on the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 1994.**

The analysis required by the hon Member regarding Company Taxes (Corporation Tax) and Other Company Tax (Exempt Company Tax) is as follows:

|                   | Estimate<br>2004/2005 | Forecast<br>Outturn<br>2003/2004 | Estimate<br>2003/2004 | Actual<br>2002/2003 |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
|                   | £m                    | £m                               | £m                    | £m                  |
| Company Taxes     | 17.0                  | 17.0                             | 17.0                  | 16.93               |
| Other Company Tax | 2.0                   | 2.0                              | 2.5                   | 2.45                |
|                   | 19.0                  | 19.0                             | 19.5                  | 19.38               |

**NO. 1995 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**LAND PROPERTY SERVICES**

Can Government state whether they have now concluded a new contract with Land Property Services, and if so, on what terms?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A new contract has not yet been concluded but one is now imminent and I should add that the terms are on a cost plus basis.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1995 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Are the terms more favourable than those? I believe that that was the aim of the negotiations, to arrive at a contract which was more favourable to Government.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Obviously we think it is more favourable to us, because what we have done is that we have not renewed the contract on the old basis, which was a sum of money in which they were getting additional revenue and therefore making additional profit, regardless of extra work on their part, regardless of performance targets met in a way in which there was therefore no link between value for money for the taxpayer on the one hand and their revenue on the other. That has been replaced with a system where the Government agree their cost base, allow them a margin over cost but with us controlling the level of costs, they then have a set of performance indicators that they have to meet, if they meet they get certain bonuses or certain additional remuneration. So now we have a situation whereby there is a direct linkage between their benefits under the contract on the one hand, and the benefits to the Government from their performance on the other. So we think it is a much better deal for the taxpayer because this contains verifiable value for money and verifiable risk benefit to both sides. We actually think it is

fairer to the Government and we think it is actually still fair to Land Property Services and its employees, shareholders and directors.

**NO. 1996 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BANK NOTES**

Can Government state whether the system for the sale of banknotes via the internet is now operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No. Gibraltar banknotes are not being sold via the internet, at least not by the Government.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 1996 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is it likely to be operational soon, or ever to become operational?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

A revised proposal for the sale of currency notes via the internet by the Gibraltar Philatelic Bureau Limited is expected to be submitted for consideration by the Government shortly.

ORAL

**NO. 1997 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR COINAGE**

Has Tower Mint begun the minting of Gibraltar coinage and when are the first coins expected into circulation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1998 and 1999 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 1998 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR COINAGE**

Has the formal contract with Tower Mint for the production of Gibraltar coinage now been signed and if so when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 1997 and 1999 of 2004.



**NO. 1999 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR COINAGE**

Are Government now in a position to explain the apparent increase in the cost of coins in 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 1997**

Tower Mint have indeed begun to mint Gibraltar coinage. The first consignment of circulating coins was received on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2004 and were put into circulation on the same day.

**Answer to Question No. 1998**

The formal contract between the Government of Gibraltar and Tower Mint for the production and distribution of Gibraltar coins has not yet been signed, but this is to be concluded very shortly.

**Answer to Question No. 1999**

It turns out that there was in fact no increase in the cost of coins in the year 2002/2003. The increased expenditure during the year reflects increased orders in the number of coins for circulation.

ORAL

**NO. 2000 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PUBLIC SERVICES OMBUDSMAN**

Can Government state whether the Employer's Contribution shown under Personal Emoluments in the Estimates of Expenditure 2004/2005 for the Public Services Ombudsman is all in respect of Social Insurance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2001 to 2003 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2001 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC – EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Can Government state whether the Employer's Contribution shown under Personal Emoluments in the Estimates of Expenditure 2004/2005 for the Gibraltar Development Corporation – Employment and Training – is all in respect of Social Insurance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2000, 2002 and 2003 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2002 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDC – OTHER DIVISIONS**

Can Government state whether the Employers Contribution shown under Personal Emoluments in the Estimates of Expenditure 2004/2005 for the Gibraltar Development Corporation – Other Divisions – is all in respect of Social Insurance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2000, 2001 and 2003 of 2004.

**NO. 2003 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****GIBRALTAR REGULATORY AUTHORITY**

Can Government state whether the Employers Contribution shown under Personal Emoluments in the Estimates of Expenditure 2004/2005 for the Gibraltar Regulatory Authority is all in respect of Social Insurance?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Employer's Contribution shown under Personal Emoluments of the Public Services Ombudsman, the Gibraltar Development Corporation – Employment and Training and Other Divisions and the Regulatory Authority in the Estimates of Expenditure for the year 2004/2005 includes both the Employer's share of Social Insurance Contributions and Pension Contributions.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2000 TO 2003 OF 2004****HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say what are the respective figures of that sub-division which are shown separately in the cases of other statutory bodies?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes as follows:

| <b>Name of Organisation</b>    | <b>Social Insurance Contribution</b> | <b>Pension Contribution</b> |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Public Services Ombudsman      | 6,200                                | 10,300                      |
| GDC Employment                 | 26,382                               | 33,618                      |
| GDC Training                   | 11,814                               | 18,186                      |
| GDC Other Divisions            | 179,104                              | 140,896                     |
| Gibraltar Regulatory Authority | 8,000                                | 15,000                      |

ORAL

**NO. 2004 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – SALE OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES**

Can Government state what was the total number and total value of residential property sold, in respect of which stamp duty was collected in the financial year 2002/2003 and what was the amount of stamp duty paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2005 of 2004.

**NO. 2005 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HOUSING – SALE OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES**

Can Government state what was the total number and total value of residential property sold, in respect of which stamp duty was collected in the financial year 2003/2004 and what was the amount of stamp duty paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I regret I cannot give the hon Member this information because it appears that Land Property Services Ltd, the Government's agents, do not maintain analysed records of transactions in respect of which stamp duty is paid.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2004 AND 2005 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well do the Government know how much stamp duty has been paid in each of those years which relate to the residential property sales, or they do not even know that? I mean they may not know the property and the numbers of properties but do they know how much money they have got?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well we both know because it is contained in the Estimates and the Accounts, how much was collected in stamp duty. What we do not know is how it is distributed between residential and non-residential property. Still less, what was the value of the underlying property transactions represented by those, one can take a rough calculation and assume on a straight line basis one knows what the rate of duty is, one knows the amount of duty, one could put a value on it, what one cannot do apparently is break it down into residential and non-residential.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Or shares, if the Chief Minister will give way, because stamp duty is also payable on transfer of shares and it is in the same pot.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It might be possible, they have not said whether that is possible or not. I do not have a note as to whether it is possible to distinguish between stamp duty on property transactions and stamp duty on other dutiable transactions. That I can ask.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably Land Property Services only deal with stamp duty on property transactions.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, they are Commissioners for Stamp Duty. They deal with stamp duties on everything. There are not that many other things actually.



**NO. 2006 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****HOUSING – SALE OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES**

Can Government state which Government owned companies received income from the sale of property in 2003/2004 financial year, listing the companies, the amount received, the number of properties and any amounts still due in respect of such sales?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government-owned companies that received income from the sale of property in the year 2003/2004 are as follows:

| <u>Company</u>                         | <u>Income Received<br/>from Sales</u><br>£ | <u>Number of<br/>Properties</u> |
|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Brympton Co-Ownership Company Limited  | 395,868                                    | 14                              |
| Gibraltar Co-Ownership Company Limited | 2,327,079                                  | 107                             |
| G R P Investment Company Limited       | 1,341,678                                  | 55                              |
| Westside Two Co-Ownership Company Ltd  | 1,112,706                                  | 74                              |
|                                        | <u>5,177,331</u>                           |                                 |

The total responses received from 119 prospective buyers including a desire to purchase their share of the property under the current offer for sale amount to £2.75 million. Of these, the total amount actually received is £1.35 million and the remainder, if indeed they proceed with the purchase, is made up as follows:

|                                        |                  |
|----------------------------------------|------------------|
| Brympton Co-Ownership Company Limited  | £ 28,800         |
| Gibraltar Co-Ownership Company Limited | 846,218          |
| G R P Investment Company Limited       | 173,877          |
| Westside Two Co-Ownership Company Ltd  | 344,915          |
|                                        | <u>1,393,810</u> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2006 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer that has been provided seems to suggest that the balance due may not become due if the persons that have indicated an interest in buying do not proceed. Is the correct interpretation then that the balance is not really the balance of people who have already said 'yes we are buying' and paid part of the price? The people who have said they are going to buy have already paid the full lot, is that the correct interpretation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes there is £2.75 million worth. The total responses received from 119 prospective purchases, including a desire to purchase that property or a share of the property under the current offer, in other words, not the historical this is the current information, under the current offer for sale amounted to £2.75 million. Of these the total amount actually received is £1.35 million and the remainder relates to people who have not paid anything. These things are not paid by instalments. If one buys, one buys and pays the lot so there is no possibility of balance to pay.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Let me say the way the answer is phrased does not make it very clear because it does not then tell me how many properties are involved in the £1.4 million that there is printed on the page. I assume the properties at the top have nothing to do with 119 prospective because there are more than 119 properties up there. So there is nothing to say how many of the 119 have paid the £1.39 million given that the Chief Minister has just said that they do not pay in instalments.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The amount actually received is £1.35 million.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether that information is contained in the schedule that I gave the Hon Mr Bruzon earlier. I would have to check that. Earlier I gave the Hon Mr Bruzon a schedule with the latest position on sales.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes but I think that particular schedule actually included the 119 prospective buyers and the value of the properties that those 119 prospective buyers would buy if they completed, but there was nothing there to say at what stage in the process they were. Given that the question is the amount of sales that have taken place in the financial year 2003/2004, the answer previously given gave the impression that they were subsequent.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

My interpretation of this is that really the bottom half is in a sense not information asked for, in that I think it relates to transactions which have closed since the end of the financial year. That was my reading of this and the hon Member may now be putting me in doubt. I think that the top half is the answer to Question No. 2006. That is what happened in the financial year 2003/2004. Then they have gone on to explain that there are still 119 prospective purchasers who were still left after March 2004, of which £1.35 million had since completed since 1<sup>st</sup> April. That is how I have understood this. If the hon Member thinks it is open to some other interpretation.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The only thing is that the Chief Minister must understand that since the 1<sup>st</sup> April does not appear anywhere.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well only by reference to his question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My question ends on 31<sup>st</sup> March. So the money that has been received, the total amount actually received, is that in the current financial year then? As opposed to the financial year 2003/2004.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

My interpretation of this answer, but of course I will have this clarified and I will confirm it to him by letter, is that the £5,177,331 was received in the financial year 2003/2004. The £1,393,810 was actually being received in the next financial year to which his question does not relate. That is my interpretation of the answer I have just given him, but since there is, I agree, some ambiguity I shall clear that up for him. I agree that the language of that second paragraph beginning "The total responses", is not at all clear.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the actual amount received is not the amount that was quoted of £1.393 million but £1.35 million. So perhaps he can also obtain the information as to how many of the 119, the £1.35 million accounts for.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the £1.35 million has been received; the £1,393,810 is the not yet completed. If one adds £1.35 million and £1,393,810 I suppose one gets to £2.75 million, I have not checked.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The only thing is, two seconds ago the Chief Minister was saying that the amount received in the current year is the £1.39 million figure and I am now asking him if when he gets confirmation that this is the amount received from some of the 119 persons, I would be grateful if he tells me what is the distribution in terms of the four companies, the same as was done for the financial year where the numbers are given in the first half of the answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will do that.

ORAL

**NO. 2007 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 7, SUBHEAD 6**

Can Government give the breakdown of the source of receipts under Revenue Head 7(6) – Other Reimbursements – of £667,370 in the financial year 2001/2002?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2008 to 2013 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2008 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5, SUBHEAD 6**

Can Government give the breakdown of the source of receipts of £600,000 estimated under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2007 and 2009 to 2013 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2009 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5, SUBHEAD 6**

Can Government give the breakdown of the source of receipts of £430,000 forecast under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2007, 2008 and 2010 to 2013 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2010 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5, SUBHEAD 6**

Can Government give the breakdown of the source of receipts of £487,517 under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2007 to 2009 and 2011 to 2013 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2011 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5 – SUBHEAD 6**

Can Government give the breakdown of the source of receipts of £500,000 estimated under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2007 to 2010, 2012 and 2013 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2012 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5, SUBHEAD 6**

Can Government give the breakdown of the source of receipts of £1,250,000 forecast under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2007 to 2011 and 2013 of 2004.

**NO. 2013 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5, SUBHEAD 6**

Can Government give the breakdown of the source of estimated receipts of £900,000 under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Revenue Head – Other Reimbursements – is used for receipts that do not fall under the revenue classifications provided for in the rest of the Revenue budget. The revenue is collected from numerous Government departments.

Annual estimates of receipts under this Revenue Subhead are calculated on the basis of actual overall collections.

I hand the hon Member a breakdown of receipts collected under the Revenue Subhead – Other Reimbursements – for the years 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004.

Let me say, to help him interpret the lists that he gets that the headings do not correspond, these are just generic classifications. There are hundreds and hundreds of different entries for small amounts of money and this is just packing them up into recognisable Heads of Revenue.

**Breakdown of receipts collected under Revenue Subhead – Other  
Reimbursements by Departments**

**Financial Year 2001/2002**

|                                |   |                   |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Civil Status                   | £ | 8,445.50          |
| Gibraltar Regulatory Authority | £ | 42,178.00         |
| Customs                        | £ | 116,198.25        |
| Education/GCFE                 | £ | 1,163.28          |
| Electricity                    | £ | 118,597.07        |
| Fire Service                   | £ | 2,631.00          |
| Gibraltar Health Authority     | £ | 5,205.38          |
| GSSL                           | £ | 844.46            |
| Income Tax                     | £ | 5.04              |
| Licensing/MVTC                 | £ | 545.00            |
| Judiciary                      | £ | 298.16            |
| Ombudsman Report               | £ | 53.00             |
| Other Treasury Receipts        | £ | 178,444.21        |
| Gibraltar Community Projects   | £ | 1,222.51          |
| Pension Contributions AQUAGIB  | £ | 86,633.05         |
| Police                         | £ | 8,718.93          |
| Post Office                    | £ | 1,119.89          |
| Secretariat/Publications       | £ | 32,657.34         |
| Social Affairs                 | £ | 113.00            |
| Tax Exempt                     | £ | 1,250.00          |
| Technical Services             | £ | 6,548.86          |
| Tourism + Transport            | £ | 8,890.25          |
| Treasury                       | £ | 45,617.34         |
|                                | £ | <u>667,379.52</u> |

Cont'd.....

Breakdown of receipts collected under Revenue Subhead – Other  
Reimbursements by Departments

Financial Year 2002/2003

|                                  |   |                   |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| Treasury                         | £ | 9,819.11          |
| Customs                          | £ | 5,279.35          |
| Police                           | £ | 8,982.51          |
| Licensing/MVTC                   | £ | 2,591.00          |
| Education/GCFE                   | £ | 20,773.11         |
| Civil Status                     | £ | 21,827.75         |
| Secretariat/Publications         | £ | 16,268.05         |
| Technical Services               | £ | 2,237.00          |
| Fire Service                     | £ | 2,665.80          |
| Electricity                      | £ | 41,523.08         |
| D.S.S.                           | £ | 249.48            |
| Judiciary                        | £ | 16.61             |
| Post Office                      | £ | 265.00            |
| Tourism                          | £ | 51.28             |
| Port                             | £ | 183.05            |
| Gibraltar Health Authority       | £ | 10,408.06         |
| Gibraltar Regulatory Authority   | £ | 50,616.00         |
| Environmental Agency             | £ | 399.00            |
| Gibraltar Community Projects Ltd | £ | 7,252.49          |
| GSSL                             | £ | 1,814.09          |
| Pension Contributions AquaGib    | £ | 82,764.92         |
| Other Treasury Receipts          | £ | 201,530.52        |
|                                  | £ | <u>487,517.26</u> |

Cont'd.....

**Breakdown of receipts collected under Revenue Subhead – Other**  
**Reimbursements by Departments**

**Financial Year 2003/2004**

|                               |   |                       |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Buildings & Works             | £ | 0.17                  |
| Civil Status                  | £ | 19,833.00             |
| Culture                       | £ | 28,000.00             |
| Customs                       | £ | 56,225.50             |
| DSS                           | £ | 456.15                |
| DTI                           | £ | 1,055.16              |
| Education/GCFE                | £ | 26,819.55             |
| Electricity                   | £ | 647.16                |
| Employment                    | £ | 175.00                |
| F&DS                          | £ | 2,600.00              |
| Fire Service                  | £ | 2,848.56              |
| GHA                           | £ | 9,470.56              |
| Gibraltar Community Projects  | £ | 275.36                |
| GRA                           | £ | 20.00                 |
| GSS                           | £ | 180.07                |
| Housing                       | £ | 132.20                |
| Income Tax                    | £ | 456.42                |
| Judiciary                     | £ | 53,508.25             |
| Licensing/MVTC                | £ | 2,895.00              |
| Other Treasury Receipts       | £ | 34,544.08             |
| Pension Contributions AQUAGIB | £ | 88,124.04             |
| Personnel                     | £ | 4,768.46              |
| Police                        | £ | 8,763.88              |
| Post Office                   | £ | 451.09                |
| Rent – Med Management         | £ | 3,216.49              |
| Secretariat/Publications      | £ | 31,342.44             |
| Technical Services            | £ | 8,334.94              |
| Tourism                       | £ | 9,542.50              |
| Tourism & Transport           | £ | 7,607.97              |
| Treasury                      | £ | 868,954.91            |
|                               |   | <u>£ 1,271,248.91</u> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2007 TO 2013 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it correct that this lists the recipient department?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, yes depends how he is using the word 'recipient'.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The receiver of the revenue.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it lists the department that is the source of the revenue.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The source of the revenue in my question was intended to establish who was making the reimbursement to the Government. Does this give me who was making the reimbursement to the Government, or which department received the reimbursement?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is which department received the reimbursement. The question as he was asking, if he means who is the payer in to the Government from the outside world, then he is asking for sheets of paper with hundreds and hundreds of entries, some for miniscule amounts of money.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well then perhaps if I can limit myself to the amounts that are not so miniscule, is there an explanation why the reimbursements was originally estimated at £500,000 and the forecast outturn is £1.25million which is £750,000 more than the estimate?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

For which year?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

For 2003/2004, the one that has just finished, in this year's Estimate Book, because if the £750,000 is made up of miniscule amounts then the whole of the 30,000 of us must be paying something to produce £750,000.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the explanation is likely to be the last item on his list, given the item is large enough to have an impact but I am just trying to find out if I can give him an explanation for that figure. There are a series of extraordinary items and any one of these could be the explanation. There are three items apparently that Treasury has charged a 5 per cent administration charge in respect of the sale of Government shares and co-owned properties, because they are administering the scheme for the companies, and they amounted to (this is in the year 2003/2004) £62,000 in February, £242,000 odd later on in February, another £127,000 in February, I am ignoring the smaller amounts, £330,000 also in February, that explains it. I think that is the extraordinary item that presumably had not been estimated at the beginning of the year and which I suspect accounts for the lion's share of that difference. I have not checked the additions, does it account for the lion's share or more?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, it almost comes to £750,000. Can I ask then, £750,000 that the Treasury charged in February, for the sale of shares owned by the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, this is something that I am discovering myself now, but it is the sale of, the Treasury administers the 50/50 scheme sale of Government share in 50/50 properties that we have been discussing earlier. They deal with the buyers, they deal with all, and I think the Government through the Treasury have basically charged the owner of the property, namely the Government company, a commission into the Consolidated Fund to reflect the fact that the Consolidated Fund is bearing the labour costs of administering the scheme. That is what appears. We are discovering it together.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well it is interesting of course because if we look at page 13 of the Estimates, had they not thought of that in February, in March the figure for the forecast deficit would have been £2 million instead of £1.3 million.



ORAL

**NO. 2014 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

As at the end of September 2004, what was the value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The value of the Monthly Income Debentures and the Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 is as follows:-

|                                      |             |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Monthly Income Debentures            | £28,919,000 |
| Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures | £64,128,600 |

ORAL

**NO. 2015 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMMUNITY CARE LTD**

Do Government propose to repay any of the Loan Stock held by Community Care in cash when it matures in May 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2016 to 2018 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2016 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMMUNITY CARE LTD**

Has an agreement been reached with Community Care Limited as to the replacement loan Government will be issuing in May next year, by way of repayment for the existing loan stock?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2015, 2017 and 2018 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2017 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT LOAN STOCK**

How much of the Government Loan Stock maturing in May is held in the market and has to be repaid in cash?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2015, 2016 and 2018 of 2004.

**NO. 2018 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT LOAN STOCK**

Do Government intend to issue a replacement loan stock to the Gibraltar Savings Bank in replacement of the existing loan stock they hold which matures in May 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of £3.562 million of loan stock, by nominal value, is held by investors other than Community Care Trust and the Gibraltar Savings Bank. No final decision has yet been taken as to the precise manner in which the loan stock will be repaid, although it will be by some method of refinancing. It is unlikely that there will be any net reduction in public debt at that time. In other words, that we are not expecting to pay anything down in cash.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2015 TO 2018 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably, the holders in the market.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh yes, they have to be paid in cash, but no net reduction in debt means that we hope to refinance that too. Not then, but we will borrow the money in order to pay them in cash.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When I was talking about repaying the existing holders in cash, whether it is the Savings Bank or Community Care or the market, obviously that did not necessarily mean that the cash could not be obtained by issuing loans to somebody else other than those three parties. So at the moment is the position then that the only party that will get the cash,

even if the cash happens to be the proceeds of another loan, is the market and that the other two are undecided, is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well it is undecided. The Government have been, in effect, moving cash to Community Care over the years through purchasing of loan stock of Community Care, as a means of reducing the capital erosion of the value of their stock which of course approximates to 100 the closer one gets to redemption, as a means of minimising that erosion we had over the years bought from them whilst the capital value was higher. Of course we now have to decide whether to place cash or a loan note with a rate of interest to be decided in Community Care, we have to see which suits them better because frankly it makes little difference to us whether the loan is from Community Care or whether the loan is from somebody else, it is going to make no difference to Government, it would be a way of massaging the interest coupon in favour of Community Care.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the case of the £10 million which is held by the Savings Bank, which in fact is what was bought from Community Care in I think it was in three stages, their costs is a decision for the Government, have the Government taken a decision on that, on whether they want to carry on holding £10 million of Government stock in the Savings Bank?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well we are hoping that effectively the decision will be ours in both cases, since we are hoping that the trustees of Community Care will be guided by Government's advice. We have not taken a decision in either case but these decisions will be made in the next month or two. So it may be that by the time we come to the next Question Time, which I suppose will be some time before Christmas, it may be that these decisions will have been made.

ORAL

**NO. 2019 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT OWNED COMPANIES**

Can Government give the breakdown by companies of the total cash holdings as at 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2003 held by Government-owned companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2020 and 2021 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2020 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT OWNED COMPANIES**

Can Government give the breakdown by companies of the forecast total of cash holdings on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 held by Government-owned companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2019 and 2021 of 2004.



**NO. 2021 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT OWNED COMPANIES**

Can Government give the breakdown by companies of the estimated total of cash holdings for the financial year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 held by Government-owned companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question Nos. 2019 and 202**

A statement showing a breakdown by Government-owned companies of the total cash holdings held as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 is attached.

**Answer to Question No. 2021**

The end-of-year (of this current year) estimated cash holdings of the Government-owned companies are not expected to be materially different from current balances, which is a statement that I would take with a pinch of salt because there may be, depends how far we get with the new housing projects maybe financed out of these balances, so there are projects in the air which may eat into some of these cash balances before the end of the financial year. So I would not put too much stock but that is the answer to Question No. 2021.

### Answer to Question 2021

A breakdown of the cash holdings held by Government-owned companies as at 31 March 2003 and 31 March 2004 is as follows:

| <u>Government-owned Company</u>           | <u>Year Ended</u><br><u>31/03/2003</u><br><u>£'M</u> | <u>Year Ended</u><br><u>31/03/2004</u><br><u>£'M</u> |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Gibraltar Land (Holdings) Ltd             | 0.4                                                  | 0.5                                                  |
| GRP Investment Company Ltd                | 1.2                                                  | 2.1                                                  |
| Gibraltar Commercial Property Company Ltd | 0.7                                                  | 1.2                                                  |
| Gibraltar Co-Ownership Company Ltd        | 5.1                                                  | 5.2                                                  |
| Westside Two Co-Ownership Company Ltd     | 7.5                                                  | 8.2                                                  |
| Brympton Co-Ownership Company Ltd         | 0.9                                                  | 1.2                                                  |
| Gibraltar Information Bureau Ltd          | 0.3                                                  | 0.3                                                  |
| Gibraltar Shiprepair Ltd                  | 0.9                                                  | 0.9                                                  |
| Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners             | -                                                    | -                                                    |
| Gibraltar Community Projects Ltd          | -                                                    | -                                                    |
| Gibraltar Investment (Holdings) Ltd       | -                                                    | -                                                    |
|                                           | <hr/> 17.0M                                          | <hr/> 19.6M                                          |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2019 TO 2021 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not sure about the comment that the Chief Minister has made about not being very different in 2005, is not on the bit of paper that I have got. It must be on his, but in fact on page 14 of the Approved Estimates of Expenditure the expected figure for 2005 is £3.7 million less.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I see what he means, he has not actually asked that question. Yes he has, Question No. 2021 asks for the estimated for 2005.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, and if the answer is it is not likely to be materially different from the £19.6 million that it is at the end of four, all I can say is that in the Estimates presented in the House at budget time it was supposed to be £3.7 million less. Given that before £2 million was thought not to merit the adjective 'substantial' I do not see how £3.7 million is materially not different.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, these are based on revenue and expenditure and this is not like the Estimates whether we can give an indication of what the position is. It depends on how many people take up sales, how many people choose to buy their 50/50 shares and then it depends on whether the Government use the money for projects and for financing, but I agree. What he is saying is that there has already been a material difference.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Of £3.7 million.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. Higher than what was estimated.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, the point that I am making is that in my question I asked for the breakdown by companies on the 31<sup>st</sup>, the figure projected for the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005. That is I was asking for a breakdown of how they arrived at the £16 million. If I am now told that the expectation at the end of this financial year is that it is not likely to be materially different

from the £19.7 million that there was on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004, then in fact that is materially different from what has been published because it is £3.7 million more than the figure that I have been working on, which is £16 million. If we have been told that they expect to have £16 million I would have thought that to get to the £16 million they would have had to make assumptions about the companies in the breakdown, and that is the breakdown I have asked for in that question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Financial Secretary tells me that the reason why it is higher than estimated is that they have made a provision for expenditure on the new housing scheme which has not yet taken place. In other words, that they are assuming about £3 million worth of expenditure from these funds on the new housing schemes, which I was not aware actually that they had made an allowance for in the Estimates.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the answer then is that the breakdown for 2004 is the one we should assume is the breakdown for 2005, is that the correct interpretation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The breakdown of 2004 is an actual situation, that was the cash balance actually in hand. Now the estimate for the year ending March 2005 is materially different from the current balances so why does the hon Member say he is working on £16 million?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well Question No. 2021 asked for.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I now follow what the hon Member is saying. The reason is, yes he is right, I see, the language is not entirely accurate. The current balance is £19.6 million yet in the accounts in the Estimates at the start of the year, we estimated that they would end at £16 million, which is indeed materially different from current balances contrary to what it says in the answer. I accept that that is so and the explanation, although it does not explain the error of language, the explanation why it is estimated to be £16 million at the end of March 2005 even though it is currently much higher at £19 million is because of this, it allowed for an expenditure of over £3 million on the new housing schemes which may or may not materialise frankly now before the end of March.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Since my original Question No. 2021 was to give a breakdown by companies of the estimated cash at the 31<sup>st</sup> March that is referring to the £16 million.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Do not do it like that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well presumably when they pencilled in that the bottom figure would go down by £3 million, they must also have had in their minds whether it was going to be from the Gibraltar Information Bureau or Gibraltar Land Holdings, or from Westside Two. One of these companies must have been debited the £3.7 million in the Estimate? Or do they not even know which company is going to finance this? Well, when the Estimates were presented to the House, if I may ask the Chief Minister a question, if the House is being given on page 14 information that the total cash holdings of the Government companies are anticipated to come down by £3.7 million in the current financial year and it is obviously because those companies are expected to invest in housing a sum of one order, they must know, I know that this has not happened because it has been delayed or whatever, but they must have known which company was going to be doing the investing when they put that figure there. I do not see how else they could have made the estimate in the Treasury without knowing, or is it that the Government have not yet even taken a decision as to whether the company that is going to finance the investment is going to be the one that has most money for example, which happens to be Westside Two Co-Ownership or some other company?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well that is the question that I thought he had asked. I do not accept the censure implicit in the remark 'or is it that the Government have not even', there is no reason why the Government should not make that decision yet. As far as Treasury cash flow reserve planning is concerned, and future funding resources availability is concerned, this is just one pot and it may be that all of these balances will be required, not by the end of the financial year but by the end of the scheme as the housing scheme progresses, depending on how we decide to fund it. It may be that we may well end up using all that money. Certainly the first money to be used of course will be in the housing related companies, logically speaking. Westside Two Co-Ownership, Gibraltar Co-Ownership Company Limited and GRP Investment Company Limited, those are the companies but this is really one pot of money. It is true that once it gets spent it has to be debited to one or other because it has to be properly accounted for within the accounts of the company from which the money is withdrawn. So it is very important to the book keepers and then to the auditors of the company in question, but at Government level this is just a pot of money which is demonstrated by the fact that we account for it as if it were public reserves in the Government's Estimates. We just put Government-owned companies without bothering to distinguish monies parked in 100 per cent Government owned companies and which are available to the Government. How it is channelled in

and out is a matter for book keepers and accountants, but it is to be drawn at will by the Government which is why, given that they are in effect reserves of the Government albeit put in the company, that is how we deal with them in the Estimates. There is no reason why strictly speaking in the estimates when we are talking about reserves and public debts that is Consolidated Fund Reserves. We could theoretically exclude the Government balances from that figure but consistently with how we regard it as public reserves, we then show it here as if they were public reserves even if though strictly speaking they are not.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am well aware of that because that was a policy that was introduced a few years ago when that extra page was added, which is strictly speaking an informative sheet which does not form part of the Approved Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure or of the Reserves of the Consolidated Fund. I am well aware of all that, but if the Chief Minister is surprised that I should ask how is it that at this stage they still do not know, well if we are now six months into the financial year in which the decision had already been taken to spend £3.7 million in the year, which means that halfway through the year they might have been already past spending £1 million, I would have thought that they would have already earmarked at the beginning of the year how this was going to happen. So is it in fact the case that from the last remarks that the Chief Minister has made, that it may well be that the vehicle that is used for the investment is not any one of these companies and that simply the money is passed from one of these companies to that vehicle?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Absolutely. That is exactly what I meant because I should also add for his information that we are looking to further rationalise these companies and we are seeking to reduce them to the fewest number of Government property owning companies, which means that we will merge them and things of that sort. We would have done it already if it were not because these three co-ownership companies each are parties to trust deeds and I think they are party to mortgages, and we were looking for a way of dealing with this without having to sign all those documents, or one supplemental deed. What we want to do in effect is to end up with one holding company, one residential property owning company and one commercial property owning company, and further simplify the structure beyond this which is already itself a simplification. That is all in the sense of the corporate structuring. In terms of the money in the corporate structure, the Government regard and account in this House as if they were all sitting as part of the public reserve and that is the treatment that we give. In other words, we do not take advantage of the fact that they are in companies and that we could sort of beaver away in secret and not account. Yes, if we were not disclosing these balances and we were taking the view that these were company balances, theoretically the hon Members would not know what the money was being spent on until the accounts of these companies were eventually Tabled in this House, but long after the event. So the Government are being entirely consistent in that the money is in a company structure but we treat the money as if it were all in the hands of the Government, accountable through the Consolidated Fund, which is why it appears here. So, yes, the hon Member was right. In the Government's mind this is one pot currently £19 million and it is not segregated into different company names, because it is all moveable about. That need to move it all

about between one company and another will be further reduced when we shrink the companies from five or six into two or three.

ORAL

**NO. 2022 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND**

Can Government state whether the forecast Consolidated Fund balance as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 is still £26.985 million or has this figure now been revised?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2023 of 2004.



**NO. 2023 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND**

Can Government state what were the receipts of revenue giving a breakdown by Head, of the Consolidated Fund to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The actual balance of the Consolidated Fund as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 was £26.875 million

The figures for revenue receipts to the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 have not yet been compiled by the Treasury. Tentative figures are in the order of £74 million.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2022 AND 2023 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say the difference of £200,000 between the forecast estimate and the new revised figure, how does that change the total for revenue and expenditure that were previously shown in the printed Approved Estimates? That is to say, the £163,000 and the £165,000 income and expenditure. Is it that the revenue is higher or that the expenditure is lower than the figure quoted there?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It could be almost as many permutations of factors as the hon Member could care to speculate about. It could be higher revenue and lower expenditure, it could be higher expenditure but higher revenue by an even greater amount, the net effect is just over £100,000 to the good.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My question is quite simple, is the revenue figure now still £163.867 million and the expenditure £165.201 million or are there two different figures there? If they have the figures they have them if they do not they do not. I am asking for a breakdown of the £165 million.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him whether both or which of those figures have changed to produce the extra £110,000. We can get it.

ORAL

**NO. 2024 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST PENSION SCHEME**

Can Government list the employers that contributed to the No. 2 Pension Fund in the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004, and further state for each employer the amount contributed and the number of employees covered by such contributions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule with the information requested.

### Answer to Question 2024

Breakdown of Employers that contributed to the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No 2) Pension Scheme in the year ended 31 March 2004.

| <u>Employer</u>                       | <u>Total<br/>Contributed</u> | <u>Total No<br/>of Employees<br/>as at 31/3/04</u> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| The Office of the Ombudsman           | £9,786.95                    | 4                                                  |
| Gibraltar Regulatory Authority        | £13,675.94                   | 5                                                  |
| Gibraltar Joinery & Building Services | £95,990.55                   | 75                                                 |
| Gibraltar Community Projects          | £178,107.09                  | 157                                                |
| Gibraltar Development Corporation     | £125,716.09                  | 80                                                 |
| Social Services Agency                | £49,137.25                   | 53                                                 |
| Elderly Care Agency                   | £89,761.61                   | 78                                                 |
| Citizen Advisory Bureau               | £4,955.10                    | 4                                                  |
| Gibraltar Electrical Authority        | £12,784.56                   | 21                                                 |
| Land Property Services Ltd            | £712.58                      | 4                                                  |
| Government Contracts                  | £775..30                     | 1                                                  |
| Gibraltar Broadcasting Corporation    | £3,731.76                    | 2                                                  |
|                                       | <u>£585,134.78</u>           | <u>484</u>                                         |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2024 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I believe I am right without having checked the previous answer for the preceding year, I think Government contracts seems to be a new addition. Who is the employer there?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think that it is an employee of the company that runs the Alameda Gardens, Wildlife Gibraltar. It might be because I remember them asking whether they could participate and I assume that this is them but it may not be.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think that the last time the information was provided which was for the previous year, every single one were sort of Government-owned companies. This one of course is not, it is a Government contractor but it is privately owned, so would this be the first or the only one that has actually joined?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, be careful, a lot of these things are public sector but not Government. GBC for example is there he will have noticed, Government contracts, Land Property Services is also a Government contractor.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not think that one was there either.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are there examples of moving into the next tier which is Government contractors. The scheme is open to private sector companies and indeed it is a bit disappointing that more have not taken it up because this is a very cheap and cost-effective way for private sector companies to provide pensions to mobile low-paid workers. By mobile I mean the sort of worker that suffers a high churn in terms of job employer mobility, but there has not been a huge take up.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of GBC, given that GBC has its own pensions system, are these because they are new entrants who do not go into the historical pension scheme, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct. The GBC Pension Scheme is substantially under-funded as most final salary schemes are under-funded in Plc's and in the BBC for reasons the hon Member knows from reading the press. I think the Board of GBC is sensibly taking the view that new staff members in GBC should go onto the Provident Scheme and not onto the existing scheme, and indeed that is something that the Government welcome particularly if they are going to look to the Government to shore up the under-funding.

**NO. 2025 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**I & D FUND**

Can Government state whether they have drawn any part of the £5 million loan facility so far in the current financial year, intended to finance expenditure by the I & D Fund?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, it has not been drawn upon so far.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2025 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that it is now halfway through the financial year, do the Government think they will need as much as £5 million in the second half?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, as things stand right now I think there is an intention to draw upon it quite soon. That might be avoided because of course proceeds of sale of Government properties may be higher, all these MOD properties coming up and all that thing so it is really a cash flow issue, whether the proceeds from the sale of the properties come in quickly enough to avoid having to draw down because this really is a balancing figure. There is a contribution from the Consolidated Fund which will be drawn on first, then there are sale of Government properties which is the other Head of Revenue and this really is the balancing figure that sort of mops up the residual situation. There are a lot of Government sales coming up in the next few months, I do not know how quickly they will be completed, whether they will be completed and the money will come in before the end in time for the Treasury cash management programme.

ORAL

**NO. 2026 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 102, SUBHEAD 1**

Can Government state how much revenue has been received to date under Head 102 – Land and Building Sales and Leases – and give a breakdown?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A total of £1.7 million has been received by Government under the Improvement and Development Fund, Head 102 Subhead 1 – Land and Building Sales and Leases as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004.

The sum of £187,302 relates to Commercial land sales and £1,543,129.77p relates to Residential land sales. In fact I can tell the hon Member that those figures are now higher. I am aware that there have been one or two substantial receipts under the first heading, Commercial Land Sales since that date.



ORAL

**NO. 2027 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 102, SUBHEAD 1**

Can Government state whether they still expect to receive £6,000,000 under Head 102 from sale of Government properties in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is still too early to predict the extent of proceeds from land sales planned by the Government, £6 million is still the latest amount estimated to be recovered in the current financial year and I regard that still as an eminently achievable target, given the amount of transactions in the pipeline

**NO. 2028 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GARRISON LIBRARY**

Have discussions for the transfer of the Garrison Library to the Government now commenced?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No, not yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2028 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What time frame do the Government envisage those discussions commencing?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is really so much going on at the moment that really in the context of the Lands deal that was really shunted to one side. This actually is an issue in which I dedicate a fair amount of blood pressure if not time. I feel very strongly about this issue, I am a passionate believer in the fact that the Garrison Library should be transferred to Government, so I really do look forward to getting stuck into that in due course. As I think we have discussed here tentatively before it is a potential alternative venue for this House with much more supporting offices available because there is the potential of Government allocating buildings in that area for support offices for the staff, for the House, for the Speaker, indeed for Members, which are not available here.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given what the Chief Minister has last said, will he pursue this energetically and vigorously.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will pursue it energetically from the moment that I get round to starting to pursue it. Yes I think it is one of the issues that perhaps the new Minister for Culture will take over just as soon as I can brief him, I will hand the file over to him.

ORAL

**NO. 2029 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Who are the beneficial owners of MCB (Gibraltar) Ltd the company with whom the Government have signed heads of agreement in respect of the Eastside project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As far as the Government are concerned and aware, the beneficial owners of MCB (Gibraltar) Ltd are Multiplex of Australia, and Chelsfield plc of the UK.

ORAL

**NO. 2030 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what is the area in square metres occupied by the commercial activities located next to the East Side Reclamation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2031 to 2034 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2031 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government confirm that the commercial activities adjacent to the East Side reclamation area may require relocation as part of the development of that site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2030 and 2032 to 2034 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2032 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Have Government identified possible sites for relocating, if required, the commercial activities currently located adjacent to the East Side Reclamation area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2030, 2031, 2033 and 2034 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2033 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Do Government have an order of cost for relocating the commercial activities currently located adjacent to the East Side Reclamation area, if required?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2030 to 2032 and 2034 of 2004.



**NO. 2034 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Would the cost of relocating the commercial activities currently located adjacent to the East Side Reclamation area be met by the developer of the area, the Government or a Government owned company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The area in square metres occupied by the existing commercial activities is 11,700 square metres. Under the development proposal currently under negotiation all these activities would have to be relocated. The Government have tentatively identified relocation sites for each of them. The order of costs is still unquantified with any meaningful degree of accuracy but Government have a ball park figure in mind. The issue of who bears the costs is an element of the commercial agreement under negotiation. It would therefore be inappropriate to comment at this stage.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2030 TO 2034 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Government think it inappropriate to reveal what the ball park figure is?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well yes, because we do not wish to put ideas in the minds of the people with whom we have to negotiate the relocation, and if they think that there is a pot they will all aim for a share of it and obviously the Government want it to cost as little as possible if it is going to affect the premium that we get for the rest of it.

ORAL

**NO. 2035 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government state what is the area of the east side reclamation that is being made available for redevelopment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2036 of 2004.

**NO. 2036 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Is the area that is being offered for redevelopment in the east side reclamation the whole of the area at present reclaimed or does it involve additional reclamation taking place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This is straying into sensitive commercial areas under negotiation, the issue is negotiable and under negotiation. In other words, the developer puts up proposals and we consider whether we are willing to allow them to extend the site as required. Of course we are clear that there must be no encroachment either into the public beach at Eastern Beach, to the north, or to the Catalan Bay site to the south, so the scope for growth so to speak is necessarily outwards. So it is really just a question of to what extent, to what distance we are willing to allow them to reclaim.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2035 AND 2036 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Chief Minister say what is the present area that is there now, which is Question No. 2035?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think whoever put this answer together has interpreted this as asking for a figure in square metres. I think it has been interpreted to mean what is the description of the area, how far does it extend, made available for redevelopment meaning what are the areas under negotiation. If the question is asking for what is the superficial area in square metres of the existing reclamation zone then that information is available. In fact it is in my file but I am afraid I have not got it here.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But there is no problem of that being sensitive?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, whatever is there. What is commercially sensitive is the extent to which we may be willing to allow them to enlarge to do more.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the answer then that subject to whether they will do more or not do more, the negotiating position is that all that there is there plus the 11,700 square metres would be the minimum as it were?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, subject to including therein, in a way which is under negotiation too, a free public car park to service Eastern Beach at one end and to service Catalan Bay at the other. In other words, the whole area is available but they have got to provide a minimum number of parking spaces for the beaches, separate access not in the development as such. Subject to that the whole area is available.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Chief Minister be able to provide me then with the measurement of the whole area?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO. 2037 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD**

Can Government say what was the amount that the MOD had to pay in cash on the book value of its property under UK accounting rules which resulted in a reduction in its spendable budget in Gibraltar in 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2038 of 2004.

**NO. 2038 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD**

Can Government say what was the MOD's spendable budget in 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Neither of these questions relate to matters for which the Government are responsible and the Government are not therefore accountable in this House, but I can tell the hon Member that the figure produced by the application of UK Treasury accounting rules to MOD Gibraltar's spendable budget is not known to the Government. I can try and explain to him what the Treasury rule is but I do not know how to apply this to the spendable budget. The hon Member should seek this information from the MOD directly. Last time I tried to find out on his behalf what the current side of the budget was, we had to write more than one letter.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2037 AND 2038 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, the reason why I am asking the Chief Minister is because in the statement that he provided in the House in answer to Question No. 1144 he mentioned this in his statement and therefore, I accept he is not responsible for the MOD but I think it has been the practice that when something is mentioned in the House then one can ask questions on the statement.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think I mentioned it in the context of giving it as one of the reasons why it suited the MOD to unload the properties from its books. In other words, I can explain to the hon Member in a nutshell what the system is. The Treasury makes the MOD account, this is not just the MOD by the way all Government Departments, as a means of preventing or discouraging departments from sitting on un-needed real estate which they then have to spend money maintaining, the Treasury attaches a value to real estate property and

makes them deduct a percentage of that value from their annual budget. So, for example, if the figure is 5 per cent per year and the Treasury has £5 million worth of real estate, then 5 per cent of £5 million is £250,000 would have to be deducted from their spendable budget and sent in cash to the Treasury. That is the system. Now what I cannot tell him is what the mathematical calculation is and what figure it produces because I do not know at what values the MOD's real estate in Gibraltar is valued by Treasury for those purposes. Nor actually do I know, though it was once mentioned to me in the heat of a negotiating meeting, but as it was not relevant I did not note it, what was the percentage that they have to rebate, but that is the system but I cannot tell him by how much. This is the reason why it suited the MOD to suddenly abandon this pay me for assets principle because it was actually costing them money now to sit on it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Apart from the fact that it has encouraged them to pass property over to the people of Gibraltar which is a good thing, presumably it will also mean that their spendable budget in Gibraltar will be higher than it would otherwise have been if they do not have to reduce it. Does that follow or not? My question is, would the Government not agree that in fact the implications of that presumably are that the MOD spendable budget will benefit in Gibraltar and that therefore it is good for the Gibraltar economy at the same time?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, correct. In other words, there is now a smaller sum of money that they have to pack off and not spend on things in Gibraltar. In other words, they have more money to spend in Gibraltar.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Government of Gibraltar have not been able to obtain from the MOD what that might amount to?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the truth is that we have not really asked. There are other benefits to the MOD budget from the lands deal. For example, there is I think it was £250,000 reduction in SILAU so there are other areas in which the lands deal delivers budgetary benefits on-going to the MOD.

**NO. 2039 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD**

Can Government state what is the relocation costs they expect to meet in the current financial year in respect of the MOD land release and whether this expenditure is already provided for in the approved expenditure of the I & D Fund?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The exact relocation costs, we have got to be careful with the use of the word 'relocation' in this context, for all envisaged relocations which might need to be undertaken as part of the recent lands deal is not yet known.

As the lands deal was signed after the start of this current financial year there is no specific I & D Fund provision for this. I suppose I could add that there is one element of the lands deal which is in the lands deal but had already been agreed and that was the relocation of Coaling Island, the boats and that is already under way and I think there is provision for that in the I & D Fund. The only other project which is in fact already under way, which involves expenditure by the Government as a result to unlock the MOD land deal benefit but is not really a relocation as such, is that in order to obtain the release of some of the valuable villas we are reconverting some of the blocks in Four Corners into higher grade accommodation. In other words, the blocks in Four Corners were of a certain grade, the villas were for tenants of a higher grade in MOD grading terms and therefore we have got to convert the blocks in Four Corners to those higher grades. There are several million pounds of expenditure in total in that, phased over a number of years and JBS who was doing this work started on the blocks, the hon Member will see the scaffolding up as he drives past the taxi stand there in Winston Churchill Avenue. That is not a relocation cost as such but it is a cost of release of land.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2039 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

This work which is being done by JBS, presumably JBS will not have to pay for it itself. Is that being charged to the I & D Fund?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the Government will pay but whether it will be the Government through the I & D Fund or whether it will be one of the companies, we will have to make that decision. Needless to say, the resale value of the properties that that expenditure releases is hugely greater than the cost of the works to secure their release.

ORAL

**NO. 2040 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD**

Can Government state how many commercial entities were renting premises from the MOD in 2003/2004 and whether these tenancies have now been registered with the Rent Assessor?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2041 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2041 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD**

Can Government state what is the estimated yield of the rates that become payable by commercial entities holding MOD tenancies, in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Nine commercial entities were renting premises from the MOD in 2003/2004 and they are all registered with the Rent Assessor.

The estimated yield assuming the benefit of the 20 per cent discount has been obtained through timely payments of the rates that become payable by such commercial entities in the current financial year amounts to £71,824. Let me say that although it is not a huge sum of money, the reason why we included this issue in the lands deal was not so much for the sum of money but rather that the companies who were competing with these companies in the private sector felt that they were on an unlevel playing field, that these people were saving rents, saving rates and therefore were able to compete in the market place. So the purpose of securing this was to eliminate that commercial disadvantage for their competitors.

**NO. 2042 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD**

Can Government state what was the amount payable by the MOD in lieu of rates in respect of the financial year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The amount payable by the MOD in lieu of rates in respect of the financial year 2003/2004 was £2,478,779.58p.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2042 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that the lands memorandum comes in at the end of the last financial year, I take it that this figure does not reflect any reduction as a result of any release of property. That will be seen in the current financial year, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it does not yet reflect any of those issues.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So any change would be reflected in the current financial year, that is the question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. I am told that it is about £1.99 million.

ORAL

**NO. 2043 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Based on the expenditure incurred up to September, do Government anticipate any changes to the estimated expenditure for the current financial year by the Gibraltar Electricity Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2044 and 2045 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2044 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Based on the expenditure incurred up to September do Government anticipate any changes to the estimated expenditure for the current financial year by the Elderly Care Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2043 and 2045 of 2004.

**NO. 2045 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA**

Based on the expenditure incurred up to September, do Government anticipate any changes to the estimated expenditure for the current financial year by the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is too early in the financial year to say whether or not there will be changes to the estimated expenditure by any of the entities mentioned by the hon Member. The Government expect spending departments, authorities and agencies to stick to approved levels of expenditure except where this is outside of their control. We are fast approaching the time in the financial year when we take a closer look at these things and either make new money available or start pressing the departments to find savings in their expenditure for the rest of the year, to make up for any over-expenditure in the previous year but that exercise has not yet taken place.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2043 TO 2045 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the implication now is that in all three areas the expenditure in the first six months is in line with the estimates.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not necessarily, we do not know. I have personally not yet looked at that although I will start looking at that now in the next month or so. If there is over-expenditure we will have to analyse what the cause of that over-expenditure is, whether it is caused by things that deserve to be funded by supplementary funding or whether it is over-expenditure of the sort for which they should be penalised in the sense of making them find savings in respect of the rest of the financial year in order to minimise the over-expenditure. Usually savings that we force on them towards the end of the financial year

do not normally cover the full amount of the over-expenditure, and the net residue usually emerge in the House as supplementary funding.



ORAL

**NO. 2046 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – GLACIS ESTATE**

Can Government state who is responsible for the cleaning and maintenance of Glacis Estate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2047 to 2052 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2047 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – GLACIS ESTATE**

Can Government state if the rubbish chutes at Referendum House and Constitution House, in Glacis Estate, are cleaned at regular intervals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2046 and 2048 to 2052 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2048 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – GLACIS ESTATE**

Are Government aware of the unhygienic state of the areas around the rubbish chutes at Referendum House and Constitution House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2046, 2047 and 2049 to 2052 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2049 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – GLACIS ESTATE**

Can Government state what arrangements are in place for the carrying out of repairs to the lift at Brother O'Brien House, Glacis Estate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2046 to 2048 and 2050 to 2052 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2050 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – GLACIS ESTATE**

Can Government state on how many occasions the lifts at Referendum House and Constitution House have broken down in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2046 to 2049, 2051 and 2052 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2051 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – GLACIS ESTATE**

Can Government state on how many occasions the recently installed lifts at the Glacis Estate have broken down in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2046 to 2050 and 2052 of 2004.

**NO. 2052 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – GLACIS ESTATE**

Can Government state which is the procedure the tenants have to follow to have defective lighting in the landing of Glacis Estate blocks attended to?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Master Service (Gibraltar) Ltd is responsible for the cleaning and maintenance of Glacis Estate.

The rubbish chutes at both Referendum House and Constitution House are cleaned on a regular basis.

Government are aware of their extensive and successful programme of cleanliness. However, there might be, from time to time, some occasions whereby limited areas are targeted by indiscriminate users.

There is a maintenance contract with 'OTIS' for the repair of all lifts at Glacis Estate, including of course, Brother O'Brien House.

There have been a total of 228 breakdowns in the current financial year, amongst the four lifts installed in Referendum House and Constitution House.

There have been a total of 16 breakdowns in the current financial year amongst the five lifts in Glacis Estate.

Tenants should report any defective 'landing' lighting directly to the Reporting Office at the City Hall.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2046 TO 2052 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Who oversees Master Service in connection with the work that is to be carried out in Glacis Estate?

**HON J J NETTO:**

The Ministry for Housing have a Senior Manager who is in charge in overseeing and monitoring the state of cleanliness of Master Service.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I have visited Glacis Estate regularly and I would like to ask the Minister for Housing maybe to visit the area himself. I am afraid that the state of Glacis Estate in terms of hygiene and cleanliness leaves much to be desired.

**HON J J NETTO:**

No, I do not agree at all. The fact of the matter is that we are continuously congratulated by the Tenants Association of the job well done by Master Service Ltd. They live there, they know what is going on there and they have a better inkling than the hon Member.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Do Government have any plans to tackle the problem, which I admit is difficult, in the area surrounding the lifts and the chutes in Glacis Estate, where there are pigeons and nests and droppings which cause problems vis a vis hygiene?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes, this is an area which we will look into as well.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Finally, could Government explain this OTIS firm that is responsible for repairing the lifts, is this company a Spanish company?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is the Minister aware that there are sometimes difficulties in getting this company to attend to a problem quickly?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No, I do not agree, I think the hon Member is trying to suggest that because we had a problem with Brother O'Brien House in relation to one of the lifts that was faulty there but that is not the case. OTIS does provide a good service and they do attend,



with the exception of one case which was in Brother O'Brien House, which they did attend to the wrong block and the wrong lift. Having said that, they went back on the following day and what happened there was that in attending the fault in Brother O'Brien House, they had realised that acts of vandalism had been committed to some of the sensory electrical equipment there because some people had put in superglue in the connectors and they had to go back and order specific equipment for that particular lift, which took an extra couple of days. But if one takes away that particular incident alone the service is quite good.

ORAL

**NO. 2053 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ALAMEDA ESTATE**

Can Government state who is responsible for overseeing that the public area outside Flat Nos. 1 and 2 of Victoria House, Alameda Estate, overlooking Rosia Road, is kept clean and in a proper hygienic condition?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The Ministry for Housing and its cleaning contractor, Master Service (Gibraltar) Ltd are responsible.

**NO. 2054 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – MINOR WORKS**

Can Government state how many Government tenants are currently listed as requiring work to be done in their homes by the Housing Department as landlords, and give a breakdown of the numbers in pre-war and post-war housing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Current tenants awaiting minor works (response maintenance) is 1,756 as a whole. With regard to this category of works, our system does not differentiate between pre-war and post-war housing.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2054 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

When the Minister refers to these as minor works I understand that there is a list that refers to urgent works to be done. Are these urgent jobs also included in the 1,756?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Correct, amongst other categories of work, not just urgent.

**NO. 2055 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ALLOCATION PROCEDURES**

Can Government state if they are now in a position to make an announcement of the major reforms concerning housing allocation procedures that they referred to in answer to Question No. 1457 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

No. Government will make their policy announcement when they are ready to do so. The target date is the first quarter of next year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2055 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The reason for asking the question is because we were told last time that they would be in a position to make an announcement before the end of this year, that is my understanding.

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes, that would have been our desire but things have slipped a bit and we are, as I said in my answer, hoping to do this in the first quarter of this coming year.

ORAL

**NO. 2056 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED.**

Can Government state how many persons are medically recommended (excluding those that are described as applicants on the Housing Waiting List) giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 2057 of 2004.

**NO. 2057 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants on the Housing Waiting List are medically recommended, giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The total number of persons medically recommended is 231, broken down as follows:

|           |   |    |
|-----------|---|----|
| Medical A | - | 86 |
| Medical B | - | 63 |
| Medical C | - | 82 |

The total number of applicants on the Housing Waiting List who are medically recommended is 24, broken down as follows:

|           |   |    |
|-----------|---|----|
| Medical A | - | 6  |
| Medical B | - | 6  |
| Medical C | - | 12 |

**NO. 2058 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war housing units have been allocated during the months of October and November of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The number of pre-war housing units allocated is as follows:

October – 2

November – 5

ORAL

**NO. 2059 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the pre-list for housing to date, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 2060 of 2004.



**NO. 2060 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the Housing Waiting List, to date, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The number of applicants on the pre-list to date is 553, broken down as follows:

|        |     |
|--------|-----|
| 1RKB - | 352 |
| 2RKB - | 41  |
| 3RKB - | 105 |
| 4RKB - | 49  |
| 5RKB - | 4   |
| 6RKB - | 2   |

The number of applicants on the Housing Waiting List to date is 539 broken down as follows:

|        |     |
|--------|-----|
| 1RKB - | 288 |
| 2RKB - | 46  |
| 3RKB - | 131 |
| 4RKB - | 63  |
| 5RKB - | 10  |
| 6RKB - | 1   |

ORAL

**NO. 2061 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – NUMBER OF REPOSSESSED FLATS**

Can Government say how many Government flats have been repossessed in the current financial year to date giving a breakdown of pre-war and post-war?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The number of Government flats repossessed in the current year to date is as follows:

Pre-war - 2

Post-war - 7

**NO. 2062 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households on full rent relief for the financial year 2003/2004 and how many households have been assessed as entitled to receive the full amount for the financial year 2004/2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2063 to 2066 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2063 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that had the level of rent relief reduced for the financial year 2003/2004 and how many households have had this benefit reduced in the current financial year 2004/2005 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2062 and 2064 to 2066 of 2004.

**NO. 2064 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households on rent relief that had this terminated during the financial year 2003/2004 and how many households have had this terminated in the current financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2062, 2063, 2065 and 2066 of 2004.

**NO. 2065 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that were receiving rent relief in the financial year 2003/2004 and the comparable figure for the current financial year to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2062 to 2064 and 2066 of 2004.

**NO. 2066 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households applying for rent relief in the financial year 2003/2004, the final number approved and the comparable figures for the current financial year to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

A total of 154 tenants were on full rent relief in 2003/2004, and to date, under this financial year 2004/2005, a total of 120 tenants are on full rent relief.

A total of 244 tenants had the level of rent relief reduced in 2003/2004 and to date, under this financial year 2004/2005, a total of 222 tenants have had their level of rent relief reduced.

A total of 214 households had their rent relief terminated in 2003/2004, and a total of 114 households have had their rent relief terminated to date, under this financial year 2004/2005.

A total of 792 households were receiving rent relief in 2003/2004, and to date, under this financial year 2004/2005, 737 households are receiving rent relief.

125 applications for rent relief were received in 2003/2004 out of which 98 were approved and 27 rejected. To date, under this financial year 2004/2005, 69 applications have been received out of which 60 have been approved and nine rejected.

ORAL

**NO. 2067 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ARREARS OF RENT**

Can Government say since the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004, how many tenants have entered into agreements to pay arrears of rent, what is the total amount of arrears covered by such agreements and do tenants entering into such agreements still have to pay the 8 per cent annual interest charge for the period that the arrears have been outstanding?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2068 and 2069 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2068 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ARREARS OF RENT**

Can Government say what is the total amount of rent arrears and the 8 per cent interest charge being demanded of tenants with rent arrears in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2067 and 2069 of 2004.

**NO. 2069 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ARREARS OF RENT**

Can Government say how many tenants have been sent summonses for the payment of arrears of rent plus an annual interest charge of 8 per cent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

A total of 125 agreements have been entered into with tenants for the recovery of rent arrears.

The total amount of rent covered by these agreements is £693,737.

Tenants entering into these agreements have not got to pay the 8 per cent interest charge.

The total cumulative amount of rent arrears as at 14<sup>th</sup> December 2004 was £2,886,198.

A total of 11 tenants have been sent legal claims in respect of the non-payment of rent. The 8 per cent interest charge is not included and does not form part of the above figure as this charge is only raised by the Treasury Department at the time that a legal claim for the recovery of rent is sent.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2067 TO 2069 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the event that they enter into an agreement, does the 8 per cent still apply?

**HON J J NETTO:**

No it does not apply.

**NO. 2070 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS & WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government provide an update on the on-going discussions with the Union regarding the move into a proposed Authority of the Buildings and Works Department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

As stated in answer to previous questions, negotiations are on-going.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2070 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Government provide the number of times that they have met with the Buildings & Works Department since the answer to Question No. 1467 of 2004 which the Minister has referred to?

**HON J J NETTO:**

The Government are not in a position to give details of the negotiating process with the Union.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Surely I have not asked for details. All I have asked is to be provided with the number of meetings that have been held to discuss this subject, not the subject matter.

**HON J J NETTO:**

We do not think that is a relevant question at all.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

With respect, the relevance of questions is determined by the Speaker not by the person purporting to answer the question.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I agree, the relevance is the Speaker's ruling. The Minister may answer any terms other than reference to relevance.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister has answered originally and that is that he does not think it appropriate. The hon Member interprets the word 'details' as meaning details of the subject matter and I do not think that is what the Minister meant by the word 'details'. I think by the word 'details' he meant details of the mechanical process of the negotiations as opposed to just the details of the substance of the negotiations he interpreted.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Minister not agree that if he describes the process as on-going, one would expect that that means between the last question and this answer there would have been a number of meetings. If nothing has happened then it is difficult to see what on-going means. Is something regularly taking place or have things sort of come to an impasse?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member's supplementary is predicated on a false premise. That is that negotiations only take place through meetings. Negotiations also take place through exchange of papers, through exchange of documents, through exchange of drafts which may not have been formed in a meeting but nevertheless is an on-going process of negotiation. Particularly when what one is doing is negotiating the terms and conditions of new terms of employment, where it is very much documented stuff.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer then is that it is going on all the time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

ORAL

**NO. 2071 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUILDINGS & WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government now state how many of the applicants for the vacancies of (a) carpenters and (b) masons in the Buildings & Works Department were successful and give the nationality of the successful applicants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

To date none.

**NO. 2072 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIETY FOR THE VISUALLY IMPAIRED**

Can Government state if they have taken a policy decision, having discussed the matter with the Society for the Prevention of Blindness, to provide:

- (a) A Centre for the Blind;
- (b) A Mobility Officer?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

In a meeting between the Society for the Visually Impaired and myself, a request was made for the provision of bigger and more suitable premises for the Society. In principle, I agreed to assist them in identifying and acquiring such premises, and asked the Society to also look around for themselves and come back to me. Unfortunately, no suitable premises have been found to date which will cater for their needs.

Government have never committed themselves to providing a Mobility Officer for the Society. During the said meeting, the society mooted the possibility of bringing over from the UK a Mobility Officer, as and when required, to instruct their members in the use of mobility aids. However, this would only be possible once the premises had been acquired, and it was implicitly agreed that the Society, whose funds are thankfully healthy, would meet this cost.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2072 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could I ask the Minister if Government consider that there is a need for a Mobility Officer for the blind? I think the Minister has said that when premises are found, the two ideas have been connected, the actual premises with the Mobility Officer. Is there a need for a Mobility Officer? I think there is.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I do not think it is up to the Government to decide what the needs of charitable organisations are. As I said, if the Society feels there is a need, we did discuss the

matter and they themselves did not even feel the need arose to ask Government for a Mobility Officer. They feel one is required and they have the funds to pay for one.

**NO. 2073 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state how many of the persons receiving social assistance in respect of each month of the third quarter of 2004, have been employed since and how many are still receiving social assistance, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2074 and 2075 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2074 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving social assistance for each month of the third quarter of 2004, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2073 and 2075 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2075 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a disability allowance under the social assistance arrangements for each month of the third quarter of 2004, giving a breakdown of their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 2075 OF 2004**

Answer to Question No.2073of 2004

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE THIRD QUARTER 2004**

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 3<br>2004 | Jul-04 | 177   | 271     | 448   | 70    | 145   | 107   | 126   |
|               | Aug-04 | 187   | 271     | 458   | 70    | 152   | 104   | 132   |
|               | Sep-04 | 185   | 290     | 475   | 75    | 153   | 112   | 135   |

**PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING THE THIRD QUARTER 2004**

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 3<br>2004 | Jul-04 | 8     | 3       | 11    | 4     | 2     | 4     | 1     |
|               | Aug-04 | 2     | 2       | 4     | 1     | 1     | 1     | 1     |
|               | Sep-04 | 10    | 1       | 11    | 4     | 5     | 1     | 1     |

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 14TH DECEMBER 2004**

| AS AT     | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|-----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 14-Dec-04 | 198   | 292     | 490   | 83    | 151   | 116   | 140   |

cont....

**Cont. ANSWER TO QUESTION 2075**

Answer to Question No.2074 of 2004

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE THIRD QUARTER 2004**

| QTR           | MONTH  | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 26/35 | 36/45 | 46/60 |
|---------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| QTR 3<br>2004 | JUL-04 | 177   | 271     | 448   | 70    | 145   | 107   | 126   |
|               | AUG-04 | 187   | 271     | 458   | 70    | 152   | 104   | 132   |
|               | SEP-04 | 185   | 290     | 475   | 75    | 153   | 112   | 135   |

cont..

**cont. ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 2075**

Answer to Question No.2075

**PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE 3RD QUARTER OF 2004.**

| Months | 0-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 41-50 | 51-60 | 61-70 | Total | Male | Female |
|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------|
| Jul-04 | 30   | 23    | 19    | 11    | 21    | 9     | 0     | 113   | 80   | 33     |
| Aug-04 | 30   | 23    | 19    | 11    | 21    | 9     | 0     | 113   | 80   | 33     |
| Sep-04 | 29   | 25    | 19    | 11    | 21    | 7     | 0     | 112   | 81   | 31     |

**NO. 2076 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of the third quarter of 2004 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund, giving a breakdown of the pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners showing the number of Gibraltar/UK nationals, Moroccans and other nationals for each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2077 to 2080 of 2004.

**NO. 2077 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state how many persons with incomplete records they consider to be eligible to pay arrears of contributions since the Social Security (Closed Long-Term Benefits and Scheme) Ordinance 1996 was amended by this House on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2004? And how many persons, to date, have taken advantage of this further opportunity to pay arrears?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2076 and 2078 to 2080 of 2004.

**NO. 2078 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the third quarter of 2004, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2076, 2077, 2079 and 2080 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2079 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the third quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2076 to 2078 and 2080 of 2004.

**NO. 2080 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month of the third quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Twenty persons have already taken advantage of this further opportunity to pay arrears of social insurance contributions. However, it is not possible to determine if there are others who are eligible unless they enquire or apply. The department could still receive such enquiries until the closing date which is 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2005, but we do not envisage that there will be many more.

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 2080**

**Answer to Question No. 2076/2004**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from Jul 2004 – Sep 2004.

|                                                | <b>JUL-04</b> | <b>AUG- 04</b> | <b>SEP- 04</b> |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b><i>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</i></b>      | 6489          | 6469           | 6458           |
| <b><i>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</i></b> | 4906          | 4923           | 4918           |
| <b><i>Moroccan Pensioners</i></b>              | 1517          | 1518           | 1514           |
| <b><i>Other Nationalities</i></b>              | 420           | 423            | 427            |
| <b>Total</b>                                   | <b>13332</b>  | <b>13333</b>   | <b>13317</b>   |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 2080**

Answer to Question No.2078 of 2004

The income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the third quarter of 2004, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds is as follows:

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

|                                                       | <u>31-Jul-04</u>  | <u>31-Aug-04</u>  | <u>30-Sep-04</u>  |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>                          |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>                         | <u>£668,486</u>   | <u>£545,969</u>   | <u>£479,175</u>   |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>"Local Account"</u></b>                         |                   |                   |                   |
| Opening Balance                                       | £51,595           | £16,290           | £73,610           |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| <u>Add</u>                                            |                   |                   |                   |
| Transfers from the<br>Open Long-Term<br>Benefits Fund | £900,000          | £950,000          | £950,000          |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| Other Receipts                                        | <u>£3,617</u>     | <u>£1,550</u>     | <u>£2,349</u>     |
|                                                       | <u>£955,212</u>   | <u>£967,840</u>   | <u>£1,025,959</u> |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| <u>Less</u>                                           |                   |                   |                   |
| Pension Payments                                      | <u>(£938,922)</u> | <u>(£894,230)</u> | <u>(£954,538)</u> |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| Closing Balance                                       | <u>£16,290</u>    | <u>£73,610</u>    | <u>£71,421</u>    |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>"Spanish Account"</u></b>                       |                   |                   |                   |
| Opening Balance                                       | £616,891          | £529,679          | £405,565          |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| <u>Add</u>                                            |                   |                   |                   |
| Receipts from DFID                                    | <u>£230,000</u>   | <u>£230,000</u>   | <u>£1,260,000</u> |
|                                                       | <u>£846,891</u>   | <u>£759,679</u>   | <u>£1,665,565</u> |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| <u>Less</u>                                           |                   |                   |                   |
| Pension Payments                                      | <u>(£317,212)</u> | <u>(£354,114)</u> | <u>(£872,542)</u> |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| Closing Balance                                       | <u>£529,679</u>   | <u>£405,565</u>   | <u>£793,023</u>   |
| <br>                                                  |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Fund Account</u></b>                            |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>                         | <u>£545,969</u>   | <u>£479,175</u>   | <u>£864,444</u>   |

cont....

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 2080**

Answer to Question No. 2079

The income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the third quarter of 2004, is as follows:

**OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

|                               | <u>31-Jul-04</u>   | <u>31-Aug-04</u>    | <u>30-Sep-04</u>    |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>  |                    |                     |                     |
| <b><u>Opening Balance</u></b> | £10,790,270        | £10,746,508         | £10,345,189         |
| <b><u>Add</u></b>             |                    |                     |                     |
| Receipts                      | £946,376           | £659,011            | £747,452            |
|                               | <u>£11,736,646</u> | <u>£11,405,519</u>  | <u>£11,092,641</u>  |
| Payments                      | <u>(£990,138)</u>  | <u>(£1,060,330)</u> | <u>(£1,032,050)</u> |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b> | <u>£10,746,508</u> | <u>£10,345,189</u>  | <u>£10,060,591</u>  |

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 2080**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month in the third quarter of 2004, are as follows:

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| July 2004      | £900,000          |
| August 2004    | £950,000          |
| September 2004 | <u>£950,000</u>   |
|                | <u>£2,800,000</u> |

ORAL

**NO. 2081 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the third quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information requested.

**Answer to Question No.2081 of 2004**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Social Insurance (Short-Term Benefits) Fund in respect of each month of the third quarter of 2004, is as follows:

**SOCIAL INSURANCE (SHORT-TERM BENEFITS) FUND**

|                               | <u>31-Jul-04</u>  | <u>31-Aug-04</u>  | <u>30-Sep-04</u>  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>  |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Opening Balance</u></b> | £6,058,016        | £6,030,362        | £6,024,894        |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |                   |
| <u>Add</u>                    |                   |                   |                   |
| Receipts                      | £48,635           | £41,959           | £43,656           |
|                               | <u>£6,106,651</u> | <u>£6,072,321</u> | <u>£6,068,550</u> |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |                   |
| <u>Less</u>                   |                   |                   |                   |
| Payments                      | <u>(£76,289)</u>  | <u>(£47,427)</u>  | <u>(£64,018)</u>  |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b> | <u>£6,030,362</u> | <u>£6,024,894</u> | <u>£6,004,532</u> |

ORAL

**NO. 2082 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can Government give a breakdown for the number of pensioners in receipt of the Minimum Income Guarantee showing the number receiving the single and married rates in bands of £5 up to the full amount as at November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested.



ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 2082/2004

PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE AS AT NOVEMBER 2004.

|      |         |    |         | TOTAL |  | COUPLE |  | SINGLES |
|------|---------|----|---------|-------|--|--------|--|---------|
|      |         |    |         | No    |  | No     |  | No      |
| FROM | £115.00 | TO | £120.00 | 1     |  | 1      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £110.00 | TO | £115.00 | 1     |  | 1      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £105.00 | TO | £110.00 | 0     |  | 0      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £100.00 | TO | £105.00 | 0     |  | 0      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £95.00  | TO | £100.00 | 0     |  | 0      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £90.00  | TO | £95.00  | 0     |  | 0      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £85.00  | TO | £90.00  | 13    |  | 0      |  | 13      |
| FROM | £80.00  | TO | £85.00  | 1     |  | 0      |  | 1       |
| FROM | £75.00  | TO | £80.00  | 0     |  | 0      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £70.00  | TO | £75.00  | 2     |  | 0      |  | 2       |
| FROM | £65.00  | TO | £70.00  | 2     |  | 1      |  | 1       |
| FROM | £60.00  | TO | £65.00  | 0     |  | 0      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £55.00  | TO | £60.00  | 26    |  | 0      |  | 26      |
| FROM | £50.00  | TO | £55.00  | 0     |  | 0      |  | 0       |
| FROM | £45.00  | TO | £50.00  | 4     |  | 0      |  | 4       |
| FROM | £40.00  | TO | £45.00  | 6     |  | 0      |  | 6       |
| FROM | £35.00  | TO | £40.00  | 21    |  | 2      |  | 19      |
| FROM | £30.00  | TO | £35.00  | 14    |  | 0      |  | 14      |
| FROM | £25.00  | TO | £30.00  | 16    |  | 0      |  | 16      |
| FROM | £20.00  | TO | £25.00  | 28    |  | 1      |  | 27      |
| FROM | £15.00  | TO | £20.00  | 32    |  | 2      |  | 30      |
| FROM | £10.00  | TO | £15.00  | 228   |  | 0      |  | 228     |
| FROM | £5.00   | TO | £10.00  | 19    |  | 2      |  | 17      |
| FROM | £0.00   | TO | £5.00   | 11    |  | 4      |  | 7       |
|      |         |    |         | 425   |  | 14     |  | 411     |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2082 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

At one stage the original rules were that it was for the single pensioner households or pensioner households for a married couple, and I think at a later stage the Government said they were going to reconsider that criteria to allow for people who were not necessarily a married couple but who were both on social assistance. Has that actually happened, is this reflected in the figures?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

What I can recall saying and which has been implemented is adding other categories to that list, another category that we included was for example if a married couple, or a single person for that matter, lived with somebody else who was either a pensioner or somebody on social assistance or long term unemployed, they would not be taken into account as living with the person and they would still be entitled.

ORAL

**NO. 2083 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government confirm that a new lift is being fitted in Mount Alvernia and if so when will it be ready for use?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2084 and 2085 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2084 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state if they are satisfied with the present system of emergency exits at Mount Alvernia?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2083 and 2085 of 2004.

**NO. 2085 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state if there has been any increase in the number of emergency exits at Mount Alvernia or has there been any improvement in connection with the emergency exits as part of the major refurbishment works that are being carried out there?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

A new lift is being installed. The lift will be fitted and commissioned by January 2005.

Government are satisfied that the ECA have put in place a system of emergency exits that has been recommended by the Supervising/Health & Safety Officer in conjunction with the Emergency Services.

There has been no increase in the number of emergency exits. However, following refurbishment, improvements have been made by compartmentalising different areas of the building with fire doors, which will avoid having to effect a mass evacuation in the case of a fire.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2083 TO 2085 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can the Minister tell this House how many emergency exits there are in Mount Alvernia?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

There are currently four.

**NO. 2086 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Given the answers to Question Nos. 1514 and 1515 of 2004 and supplementaries thereto are Government now in a position to state what UK or Gibraltar qualifications they will require of employees of ADA Limited providing services under the contract between that company and the Elderly Care Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

In answers to Question Nos. 1514 and 1515 of 2004 and supplementaries thereto, the issue of whether the ECA stipulated what standard it required of ADA employees was not fully determined and was left very much in the air.

Having sought further information, I can confirm that the ECA does in effect do this. The requirements are that any employee of ADA Ltd who provides care for an ECA recipient, must have a minimum of 180 hours of certificated training for care assistants and must have worked in a recognised hospital or care home for a minimum of three months. Alternatively, a care worker must have had a minimum of nine months experience working in a registered hospital or care home where the person in post will have been overseen by a qualified Sister or Staff Nurse. In the UK, these requirements currently translate, qualification-wise, into an NVQ level 2 in care, although the UK is now looking to achieve NVQ level 3 for all care workers by 2006. These are the standards used in the UK as set out by the Joint Advisory Group of Domiciliary Care Association in Surrey, of which the ECA is a member.

The Spanish equivalent of this qualification, which meets the requirements set out by the ECA, is the one which was loosely translated into English at the last House.

The ECA has been liaising with the School of Health Studies to look at the possibility of introducing NVQ certificated training in care in Gibraltar. If this comes to fruition, anyone who successfully completes the course will be able to compete for any domiciliary care worker posts that arise in the future.

**NO. 2087 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SOCIAL SERVICES – UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the months of October and November 2004 receiving:-

- (a) Unemployment Benefit;
- (b) Social Assistance;
- (c) No payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member the information in Schedule form.

**Answer to Question 2087 of 2004**

The following is a breakdown of unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over for the month of October and November 2004.

**A. UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT**

| 2004     | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 25+ |
|----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-----|
| OCTOBER  | 29    | 36      | 65    | 25    | 40  |
| NOVEMBER | 34    | 40      | 74    | 24    | 50  |

**B. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

| 2004     | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 25+ |
|----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-----|
| OCTOBER  | 89    | 58      | 147   | 30    | 117 |
| NOVEMBER | 90    | 57      | 147   | 30    | 117 |

**C. NO PAYMENTS**

| 2004     | MALES | FEMALES | TOTAL | 18/25 | 25+ |
|----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-----|
| OCTOBER  | 69    | 35      | 104   | 45    | 59  |
| NOVEMBER | 47    | 19      | 66    | 29    | 37  |



ORAL

**NO. 2088 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS**

I hand the hon Member the information in Schedule form.

**Answer to Question No.2088 of 2004**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the months of October and November 2004 is as follows:

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

|                               | <u>31-Oct-04</u>  | <u>30-Nov-04</u>  |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>  |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Opening Balance</u></b> | £5,077,198        | £5,081,733        |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Add</u></b>             |                   |                   |
| Receipts                      | £56,086           | £41,220           |
|                               | <u>£5,133,284</u> | <u>£5,122,953</u> |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Less</u></b>            |                   |                   |
| Payments                      | <u>(£51,551)</u>  | <u>(£38,135)</u>  |
| <br>                          |                   |                   |
| <b><u>Closing Balance</u></b> | <u>£5,081,733</u> | <u>£5,060,818</u> |

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2088 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In Question No. 2088 where the information was passed across, the column does not seem to add up to the figures there. Could the Minister look at that and see if there is an inaccuracy in the answer provided in writing? In the November figure for the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund, that shows that the receipts are £41,000 and the payments £38,000 for that month, but in fact if £38,000 is subtracted from £51,220 the answer cannot be £5,060,818. There seems to be an arithmetical error there. I wonder if that could be looked into and corrected if it is wrong.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I will certainly ask Treasury who prepares these answers to look into it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The receipts are in excess of the expenditure and the balance goes down, which is not the usual result.

**NO. 2089 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**TRAFFIC FLOW**

Can Government state whether there has been an improvement in the traffic flow generally after the change of school hours and how this is monitored?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The change in school hours has resulted in a marked improvement in the traffic flow at midday due to the reduced numbers of school children that are now going home for lunch. There has not, however, been any appreciable increase in volumes at 3.30 pm resulting from the earlier closing times of schools and neither has there been any significant difference in traffic volumes during the period between 4.00 pm and 6.00 pm. In the mornings the situation remains as normal as far as the effects of the school hours is concerned, although the introduction of the free travel for school children offered by the Gibraltar Bus Company has also had a very noticeable and positive impact on overall traffic flow at school opening and closing times.

The Royal Gibraltar Police handle day to day traffic issues and they are aware of any changes in traffic circulation patterns that may result, be they as consequence of any changes that may be introduced or otherwise.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2089 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister explain what scientific way this is monitored by the Police Force?

**HON F VINET:**

No, I cannot explain what scientific way, if any, is utilised by the RGP. What I can tell the hon Member is that the RGP does conduct surveys, tests, I am not aware whether these are scientific or otherwise, and they in turn provide the information to the Department of Transport.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I would like to ask the Minister that apart from the RGP what other systems are in place by the Ministry of Transport to monitor the traffic flow after the change of school hours?

**HON F VINET:**

There is no separate system. We are given the information by the RGP.

**NO. 2090 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SMITH DORRIEN BRIDGE**

Can Government state whether the report has now been concluded regarding recommendations on the maintenance work that needs to be undertaken on Smith Dorrien Bridge, and if so, provide the Opposition with a copy of the report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The report does not relate only to Smith Dorrien Bridge. It relates also to Orange Bastion Bridge and is part of the Government's on-going routine and periodic inspection of load bearing structures. This includes bridges with a view to their monitoring and the identification of required maintenance works. The report is now complete and the Technical Services Department is currently considering it. Government do not ordinarily make such reports available outside the Government.

**NO. 2091 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DUDLEY WARD TUNNEL**

Can Government state whether they have now obtained all the data that they require to confirm the full viability of a proposal for the remedial works that will enable the re-opening of Dudley Ward Tunnel for vehicular traffic?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2091 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Have the Government got at least a target date by which this data and the report will be ready?

**HON F VINET:**

The process is on-going.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Perhaps I should add for the sake of the completeness of the hon Member's understanding of this, the technical process of designing a scheme is on-going. The decision whether or not to invest the necessary amount of capital to implement it is a matter that will be taken in accordance with the Government's prioritisation of projects in due course. So I would not want him to get the wrong impression. In other words, it is not that the project will go ahead necessarily as soon as the technical works are finished. It is true that it cannot go ahead because the technical works have not finished, but the reverse is not necessarily the case either.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

That was my understanding and is my understanding, I just wanted to know when the report would be ready.

ORAL

**NO. 2092 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**CEMETERY**

Can Government state whether they are now in possession of outline proposals for Ministerial consideration to enhance the state of the cemetery?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The outline proposals are not yet available. These will be submitted shortly for Ministerial consideration and for possible inclusion in next year's budget.



**NO. 2093 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**

Can Government provide an update of the status for the tender of the Sewage Treatment Plant?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The various studies that were undertaken to generate the necessary data for inclusion in the tender documents have now been completed and we are presently at the stage of appointing a Technical Advisor for the project who will be assisting Government in the preparation of the tender documentation and subsequent negotiations that are to ensue.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2093 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state at what site the Sewage Treatment Plant will be located?

**HON F VINET:**

As I seem to recall I revealed in a previous answer to a question, on the site of the Brewery Crusher.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I can see, the hon Members are having difficulty locating the site of the Brewery Crusher, it is below the parapet wall along the road as one approaches the lighthouse. Opposite the Mosque, the other side of that road.

**NO. 2094 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MOT TESTS**

Can Government state how many days they estimate elapse at this point in time between the day one applies for an MOT test and the day the test is carried out?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

At present there is no delay. Tests can be carried out on the day following the application for an appointment.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2094 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is that the case as well for those tests that the Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department are not carrying out at the moment?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes, those are being carried out by the Supervising Examiner.

ORAL

**NO. 2095 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSING DEPARTMENT**

Can Government provide an update of the dispute involving Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 2096 of 2004.

**NO. 2096 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSING DEPARTMENT**

Can Government provide an update of the dispute involving Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Driving and Vehicle Examiners have submitted a claim which Government continue to consider not to be reasonable or justified and it has therefore not been met.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2095 AND 2096 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Has there not been any movement or progress since the answer to Question No. 1838 of 2004, in which I was told that the Government would shortly be deciding on what action to take?

**HON F VINET:**

The situation remains the same. We are hopeful that progress will be made but the situation at the moment is as has been explained.

ORAL

**NO. 2097 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**OESCO**

Can Government state how many units of electricity they project to purchase from OESCO in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2098 and 2099 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2098 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**OESCO**

Can Government state the commencement and termination date of the contract it recently renewed with OESCO?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2097 and 2099 of 2004.

**NO. 2099 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**OESCO**

Can Government state the number of new engines that OESCO is obliged to install and operate by the termination date of the recently renewed contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Subject to availability of generating plant at Waterport Power Station it is estimated that approximately 61,200,000 units of electricity will be purchased from OESCO in the current financial year.

The extension to the contract with OESCO was renewed on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2003 and has a duration of 8 years and 4 months from 9<sup>th</sup> June 2004, therefore the termination date would be 9<sup>th</sup> October 2012.

The new engine that is currently in the process of installation will represent the last one required from OESCO under the renewed contract.

ORAL

**NO. 2100 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the number of units of electricity that may be purchased from the MoD for the £300,000 that they have provided for in the Budget for this financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The number of units that could be purchased for £300,000 would be approximately 3,307,000.



**NO. 2101 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SALE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the amount of revenue collected from the sale of electricity in the current financial year to the end of November and the amount billed in the same period?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The amount of revenue collected during the current financial year up to the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004 was £7,416, 673.49p.

The amount billed during the same period was £10,194,181.00.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2101 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister confirm that the consumption rate between the months of September and November has increased substantially? I say this because when I asked Question No. 1834 of 2004, I was given a figure of £4.9 million for the period ending in August. So for the additional three months the increase seems to be in the region of £5.3 million, more than for the first five months. Will the Minister just check the number and let me know. I suspect that it may not be correct.

**NO. 2102 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WATERPORT POWER STATION**

Can Government state whether they propose to replace any of the three engines at the Waterport Power Station, and if so, by when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

There are currently no plans to install replacement engines at Waterport Power Station.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2102 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I am just somewhat concerned, with all these new developments there will be I assume an increase in consumption, so where is the present consumption going to be met by? Is it by one engine that is going to come on line at OESCO?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, obviously the hon Member has asked a different question to the one he may have intended to ask. The hon Member asked whether it was intended to replace any engines, by which we understood him to mean have any of the existing engines exhausted their shelf life and are they in need of replacing. The hon Member's supplementary, in contrast, relates to additional generating capacity to meet additional demand. The answer that he has had relates to the question as asked, namely the replacement of existing machines. The answer to the latter to his supplementary is that it is expected that additional demand, which is materialising even from the existing consumers let alone from the very substantial developments that are in the pipeline, will be met either from additional generating capacity at Waterport, as opposed to replacement, additional generating capacity at Waterport or, depending on how the negotiations for the East Side development goes, new generating capacity at a brand new power station. So the hon Member is right in supposing that there is a need for more generating capacity than exists at the moment.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just press the Chief Minister and ask him to clarify whether that potential new generating plant would be to cater only for the East Side of Gibraltar, as expanded or extended, or to cater for the whole of the town and replace Waterport.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, subject to a successful conclusion of negotiations, we envisage being able to close down the Waterport Power Station altogether and having a single power station with greater generating capacity than we have at the moment, all located in a new power station at a new site. Obviously to service the whole of Gibraltar, it goes without saying.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Has that site already been identified or is it one of the things still subject to negotiation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the location of the site is not for negotiating with the developer, it is a matter for the Government to designate.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Have the Government designated the site?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government have a shortlist of two, which is rapidly becoming a shortlist of one in terms of preference but I would rather not be pressed right now on that location because the negotiations are at a critical level.

ORAL

**NO. 2103 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBTELECOM**

Can Government state whether any entity is currently or was recently engaged in carrying out a due diligence exercise on Gibtelecom, and if so, for what purpose?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2104 and 2105 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2104 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBTELECOM**

Can Government state whether it is still the intention of Verizon, its equity partners in Gibtelecom, to dispose of its equity holding, and if so, which are the entities that have shown an interest in acquiring its shares?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2103 and 2105 of 2004.

**NO. 2105 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBTELECOM**

Can Government state whether they have any intention of disposing of their equity stake in Gibtelecom by the end of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

As is well know, Verizon wishes to sell its shareholding in Gibtelecom. Various potential purchasers have shown an interest. It would not be appropriate for the Government to identify these parties publicly at this stage. The Government are not seeking to dispose of their shareholding in Gibtelecom.

ORAL

**NO. 2106 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBTELECOM**

Can Government confirm that none of the Directors of Gibtelecom received a fee and/or allowance for the services they rendered to the company for the financial year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 2107 of 2004.

**NO. 2107 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**AQUAGIB**

Can Government confirm that none of the Directors of AquaGib received a fee and/or allowance for the services that they rendered to the company for the last financial year for which accounts have been audited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

I am advised that the Board of Directors of AquaGib, Gibtelecom and its subsidiaries do not receive any emoluments from the respective companies for their services as Directors. This information is set out in the notes to the latest audited accounts of the companies, which are filed at Companies House.



**NO. 2108 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state whether, in the interest of competition on the basis of a level playing field, they propose to offer to the competitors of the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited (GBCL) a site similar to the one that GBCL now occupies and on terms and conditions not dissimilar to those that GBCL enjoys?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Government have no such intention. Nor is there any issue of level playing field or competition since the two companies do not compete on any route.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2108 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will the Minister confirm that a commitment was made to the company to provide them with such premises way back in 1997?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, no such commitment was made to Calypso. Calypso was however told, as far as I am aware, that like any other commercial entity in Gibraltar in need of premises, if they identified Government premises they wished, they should put in a bid and Government would consider it. However, Government do not have a responsibility to provide them with premises just as we do not have such a responsibility to provide those that we do give premises to with premises. Regardless of whether the Government have a responsibility or not, the Government try to accommodate the needs of business in Gibraltar but it is up to business to identify particular sites and then ask the Government rather than expect the Government to find a site and offer it.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

With regard to competition, am I not correct in saying that both companies terminate a route at the frontier?

**HON F VINET:**

The fact that routes might terminate at a same location does not mean that they are the same routes.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Actually, Gibraltar only has one route across the runway to the frontier, so if both are covering the same route there must be some form of competition for the passengers.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It depends what view one takes of competition. In this industry competition means competing for the same passenger. One cannot compete for the same passenger unless one is seeking to persuade them to board one's bus at or at substantially along the same route. The passengers that board a bus with destination the frontier at the English Steps are not the same passengers who board a bus with the destination for the frontier at Market Place. Therefore the two routes are not in competition, but I should say in case the hon Member thinks that the answer requires or is based exclusively on the point of competition, the Government would not feel the compulsion that the question suggests that it should feel even if they were in competition. One is a Government-owned company which is receiving publicly owned garage space and the other is not. No one has suggested that there would be some requirement on the Government to treat all its competitors in the same way, but if another bus company wants the Government's assistance in having a bus depot, the Government want to support the other bus company as well, which provides a service to the public as well. It is not that the Government refuse to provide it with premises it is just that it is up to the bus company to identify, perhaps to bid for Government property on rent or purchase and then the Government will consider it.

ORAL

**NO. 2109 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government provide details of the fare structure that was operated by the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited as at close of business on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2110 to 2115 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2110 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state the number of employees presently working for the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited, their grades and provide a breakdown of the annual salaries paid to these grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2109 and 2111 to 2115 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2111 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state whether any of the Directors of the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited receive a fee and/or allowance for the services they render to the company, and if so, what is the annual level of the fee and/or allowance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2109, 2110 and 2112 to 2115 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2112 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state whether the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited contributes to a Defined Contribution or Benefit Pension Fund or Scheme for the employees of the Company, and if so, what is the level of the contribution as a percentage of basic salary?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2109 to 2111 and 2113 to 2115 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2113 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state whether the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited contributes to a Defined Contribution or Benefit Pension Fund or Scheme for any of the Directors of the Company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2109 to 2112 and 2114 and 2115 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2114 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state the level of the insurance premium that the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited expects to pay in its first 12 months of operation and how much of this premium is in respect of its fleet of buses?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2109 to 2113 and 2115 of 2004.



**NO. 2115 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state what was the monthly level of consumption and cost of the fuel used by the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited in the months of April to December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The information requested by the hon Member in Question Nos. 2109 and 2110 is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

The Gibraltar Bus Company presently has 42 employees.

Other than for the two Directors, there are presently nine different grades within the Company. Neither of the two directors of the Gibraltar Bus Company receive any remuneration over and above their basic salary, details of which have been provided in reply to Question No. 2110.

The Gibraltar Bus Company contributes 10 per cent of an employee's salary towards the Gibraltar Provident Fund in respect of those employees that have chosen to participate in the scheme. For their part, the employee contributes an additional 5 per cent or 10 per cent of their basic salary.

The Gibraltar Bus Company does not make any such contributions in respect of either of the two Directors of the Company. It is not in the commercial interest of the company to disclose the level of its insurance premiums since this will prejudice its ability to obtain the best rates available in the market. I am advised by the Directors of the Gibraltar Bus Company that up to the end of November 2004 the cost of fuel is £56,115.88p.

## ANSWER TO QUESTION 2115

### Answer to Question 2109 of 2004

#### FARES

Exchange rate Euro 1.6 = £1, exchange rate rounded upwards to the nearest 50c or 1 Euro.

|                | <u>Sterling</u> | <u>Euros</u> |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Adult Single   | 60p             | 1.00         |
| Adult Return   | 90p             | 1.50         |
| Adult Day Pass | £1.50           | 2.50         |

|                   | <u>Sterling</u> | <u>Euros</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Children Single   | 40p             | 0.70         |
| Children Return   | 60p             | 1.00         |
| Children Day Pass | £1.00           | 1.60         |

|                         | <u>Sterling</u> | <u>Euros</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Senior Citizen Single   | 30p             | 0.50         |
| Senior Citizen Return   | 50p             | 0.80         |
| Senior Citizen Day Pass | 80p             | 1.30         |

## ANSWER TO QUESTION 2115

### Answer to Question 2110 of 2004

|                         |         |
|-------------------------|---------|
| 2 Directors             | £35,000 |
| 1 Garage Superintendent | £20,000 |
| 1 Marketing Manager     | £20,000 |
| 3 Inspectors            | £15,000 |
| 2 Office Administrators | £12,272 |
| 1 General Operative     | £12,324 |
| 3 Chargehand/Drivers    | £14,350 |
| 27 Drivers              | £13,050 |
| 1 Panel Beater          | £13,050 |
| 1 Labourer              | £ 8,352 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2109 TO 2115 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

That was the cost of the fuel, what was the level of consumption? The number of litres.

**HON F VINET:**

I regret I have not been provided with that information but I will certainly make it available to the hon Member later on today.

ORAL

**NO. 2116 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**AQUAGIB**

Can Government state the name of the undertaking that is responsible for the supply of fresh water to ex MoD Estates in the area of Europa Point?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2117 and 2118 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2117 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**AQUAGIB**

Can Government state the name of the entity that presently carries out the tests to determine that the quality of the water supplied by AquaGib is fit for human consumption and the name of the undertaking that previously carried out these tests?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2116 and 2118 of 2004.

**NO. 2118 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**AQUAGIB**

Can Government state whether fresh water supplied by AquaGib from its desalination plants will be extended to ex MoD properties in the area of Europa Point, and if so, by when?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The Ministry of Defence is responsible for the supply of potable water to ex MoD Estates in the area of Europa Point.

Historically this part of Gibraltar was an area used for military and ancillary purposes and premises located therein have always been supplied by the MoD. When these areas were handed over for civilian use the MoD continued to supply these areas as agreed with the Government.

I am advised that the civilian water infrastructure is distant from the area, with the nearest suitable point currently being by the Casino at Europa Road.

Tests on the quality of water supplied by AquaGib Ltd are undertaken by AquaGib in compliance with EU Council Directive 98/83/EC concerning the quality of water intended for human consumption, as contained in the Public Health Ordinance.

Analysis under Schedule 2 – Check Monitoring, of the directive is undertaken at the AquaGib laboratory located at the Waterworks.

Analysis under Schedule 2 – Audit Monitoring, of the directive is undertaken at laboratories in the United Kingdom at Analytical and Environmental Services Ltd in Essex (previously known as Essex and Suffolk Water Central Laboratory). This company is part of the group of companies owned by Northumbrian Water Limited.

The Waterworks Laboratory and the Analytical and Environmental Services Ltd Laboratory (previously named Essex and Suffolk Water Central Laboratory) have carried out tests in respect of chemical parameters since the licence agreement with Lyonnaise Des Eaux Gibraltar Ltd came into effect.

Tests in respect to bacteriological parameters were undertaken up to 2002 in the St Bernard's Hospital Pathology Department, following which they have been undertaken at a new specially built Bacteriological laboratory at the Waterworks Analytical laboratory.

The Environmental Agency undertakes independent tests to those undertaken by AquaGib to ensure compliance with the Directive. The Chief Environmental Health Officer, as the competent national authority for the purposes of part III of the Public Health Ordinance (Water Supply) and the Public Health (Potable Water) Rules 1994, carries out a sampling programme. This programme is carried out to ensure the water meets the fitness and quality standards set out in the above mentioned EU Directive. During 2003, 86 samples were taken in compliance of these requirements. The Chief Environmental Health Officer also issues instructions to AquaGib to take such samples and analyses as he considers necessary and in accordance with the requirements of the above mentioned Rules and Directive. There have been no recent changes to these arrangements. Such tests are undertaken at the Gibraltar Health Authority's laboratories of Clinical Pathology and Public Health.

Recent developments, by AquaGib, of the civilian potable and seawater infrastructure has placed it in a position where it is now reasonably feasible for properties currently supplied by the MoD in the Naval Hospital area at Europa Road to be supplied by AquaGib.

Extensive works are required to supply these areas. These include the installation of new potable water pumping and potable and sea water distribution mains and the construction of a new potable water service reservoir within the ex Lathbury Barracks area. These works are currently on-going, funded by the Company and by appropriate contributions from the developers of the Cliftons development.

It is AquaGib's objective to continue to extend these potable and sea water mains to Europa Point to provide supply to ex MoD properties in the area. AquaGib do not at present have a projected completion date for this section of the work.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2116 TO 2118 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister satisfied that the quality of the water that is provided by the MoD is the same as the one provided by AquaGib?

**HON F VINET:**

The fact is that water supplied by the MoD has to meet the same standards as that provided by AquaGib, so the answer would be yes.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No, the answer is not whether they have to satisfy a requirement. What I am saying is the Minister satisfied that the quality is the same as the one provided by AquaGib currently?



**HON F VINET:**

It follows logically that if the water supplied by the MoD has to meet the same standards as that supplied by AquaGib, then we are confident that they both conform to the same standard.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Well what I am trying to ascertain is that AquaGib boasts that they have a better quality than the standards that are required. Therefore if AquaGib is saying that the water is better than the standard required, I am asking whether the standard that AquaGib is actually supplying now the rest of Gibraltar is the same, not that the requirement is the same as the one that they provide for the rest of their customers.

**HON F VINET:**

AquaGib is certainly confident that the water supplied by the MoD meets the requisite standards. I think there is always room for improvement and that is why AquaGib is keen to take over the supply of water from the MoD in order to improve the quality of that water even further.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Minister aware that there was an occasion two or three weeks ago in which the water supply was all cut at Europa Point due to the fact that an excess of E-Coli was found in the water supply and therefore people are worried now whether the standard quality water that is supplied to them is not exactly the same?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes I am aware of the situation and the fact that one of the MoD tanks contained water that was not of the quality that it should be. Steps were taken to remedy the situation immediately. This was done successfully and with no, at least with only minor inconvenience to the customers affected.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I wish to thank the Minister for his detailed reply to the three questions. However, it is not very easy to follow so perhaps he could confirm for me that the MoD is responsible for the supply of fresh water to ex MoD Estates in the area of Europa Point, and seeing that the bill for the consumption is received from AquaGib, is there some form of arrangement between the MoD and AquaGib whereby AquaGib bills for and then gives the collections back to the MoD for the consumption?

**HON F VINET:**

There are no actual monetary payments, it is done by exchange of water between AquaGib and then the MoD.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is paid for in water, in other words, as opposed to money.

**NO. 2119 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WASTE DISPOSAL**

Have Government made any decisions on how to deal with the problem of rubbish being littered onto streets as a result of animals, including apes, cats and rodents, being able to access bins?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The position remains as stated in answer to Question No. 1849 of 2004 of the previous House, namely that there are no immediate plans to change the system designed and introduced by the GSLP when it was in Government. Nevertheless, the matter remains under constant review and should it be considered necessary to undertake any works, the relevant department will be submitting proposals for Government's consideration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2119 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It is that final limb of the answer that I come to, as I did last time. I was told that the matter remained as it was but that it was under constant review. I think that there was agreement across the floor of the House that the situation was getting out of hand. What is that review producing in terms of action in order to try and rein in the problem?

**HON F VINET:**

Nothing as at present.

ORAL

**NO. 2120 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**AIR QUALITY MONITORING STATIONS**

Have Government now made a final decision on where they will locate the air quality monitoring stations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

Answered together with Question No. 2121 of 2004.

**NO. 2121 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**AIR QUALITY MONITORING STATIONS**

When do the Government expect that their air quality monitoring stations will commence operations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

**Answer to Question No. 2120**

The information requested has already been provided and so for the questioner to ask whether Government have “now made a final decision” is misleading to say the least. The hon Member already knows the air quality monitoring stations will be located as follows:-

One will be installed at the north end of Rosia Road within the perimeter wall of the Electricity Authority Consumer Division compound. This station will monitor oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide, particulates (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>25</sub>), lead, carbon monoxide and benzene and fulfils the criteria recommended by consultants that it should be sited at a “roadside location on a major road and close to key generation point sources”.

The second will be located at the northern end of the Bleak House car park and will monitor ozone and oxides for nitrogen. Again, the siting of this station will comply with the consultants recommendations for it to be sited at a “suburban/rural background location”.

Work in preparation of these sites has already started with the laying of the concrete foundations and provision of electrical and telephone services.

**Answer to Question No. 2121**

It is expected that the air quality monitoring stations will arrive in Gibraltar in mid January 2005 and that the first readings will become available a week later. The equipment is presently being commissioned and tested in the UK.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2120 AND 2121 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful. I would not have asked that question again unless I had been left with the impression last time that it was expected that those would be the sites but that no final decision had been made. I am very pleased to see that a final decision has now been made. The hon Gentleman knows my views about those sites. I do not think there is anything further to ask.

**HON F VINET:**

Perhaps I can clarify that at the last Session of the House what I said was that the air quality monitoring station would be expected to start operation in January but the sites had already been identified.

**NO. 2122 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EU EMISSIONS TRADING DIRECTIVE**

Why have the Government only allowed seven days (between 6<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> December 2004) for the public to comment in relation to their Consultation document on the EU Emissions Trading Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

The EU Emissions Trading Directive (2003/78/EC) requires National Allocation Plans to be made available to the public for comments. The directive is silent on how long this consultation process should be, even though Commission guidance describes this as "a reasonable time frame".

There are commitments for our Plan to be submitted to the Commission before the end of the year. However, it has not been possible to finalise the Plan until early December 2004. It could therefore not be put out for public consultation until this date. It follows that neither has it been possible to provide for a longer consultation period if comments are to be considered and the final Plan forwarded to the Commission by the agreed date. In any case, Government are of the opinion that the seven day consultation period is adequate, reasonable and fully compliant with the terms of the directive.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2122 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister give an indication of how many parties have been able to respond in that period?

**HON F VINET:**

There has just been one response, namely from the Environmental Safety Group.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Minister why it has not been possible to finalise the scheme until the beginning of December?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will try to give the answer to the hon Member in cryptic language because it is not something that I would wish to put in the public domain more clearly. It relates to the basis upon which the UK thought that Gibraltar's quota needed to be calculated in relation to the UK's, and the damaging effect that we thought that that would have on the regional selectivity arguments in the tax case.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will not press any further.

**HON F VINET:**

For the sake of completeness can I just add first of all that, for example, the seven days consultation period equals the same period utilised by Malta for example. Also the fact that we consulted DEFRA in the UK and DEFRA were of the opinion that seven days was perfectly reasonable and would meet the requirements of the directive.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is also worth the hon Members bearing in mind that this is not a consultation process on the legislation. This is a consultation process on the National Allocation Plan for emissions and there is not a huge amount. Basically it is the totality of the current emissions, it is not a huge issue upon which there is scope for a massive debate. It would have been different if we would have been talking about consultation on a whole piece of legislation.



**NO. 2123 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**AQUAGIB**

Can Government explain the nature of the pension contribution by AquaGib for the financial years 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 in the sums of £86,633, £82,765 and £88,124 respectively, shown under Revenue Subhead – Other Reimbursements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES**

At the time of the privatisation of the Water Supply Services employees had the choice to retain their status as Government employees and be seconded to the Company or to resign from Government Service and be employed directly by the Company on its terms and conditions of employment.

Clearly the Company pays the salaries of seconded personnel as well as Social Insurance contributions. They also pay the Government a percentage of basic salary in respect of each seconded employee to cover the pensionable entitlement accrued by seconded personnel in respect of the time they are seconded to the Company.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2123 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say what is the percentage of the salary that has to be paid in respect of pension?

**HON F VINET:**

Twenty-five per cent.

ORAL

**NO. 2124 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MOORISH CASTLE**

Is it still the policy of the Government to expand the Moorish Castle as a heritage and tourism site by moving the prison elsewhere?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question No. 2125 of 2004.

**NO. 2125 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MOORISH CASTLE**

Further to the answer to Question No. 1885 of 2004 can Government say which company was paid £3,750.00 in respect of 'Moorish Castle – Consultancy', what did the consultancy entail and what were its conclusions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The answer to Question No. 2124 is Yes.

In answer to Question No. 2125, the amount in question was paid to Prince Research Consultants Ltd.

The consultancy consisted of proposals in respect of a conservation policy plan and future development of the Moorish Castle site. The proposals are being considered.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2124 AND 2125 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister then in what time frame they envisage this taking place?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

It is difficult to put a time frame to it. The Moorish Castle question is connected to the move of the Prison, it is the whole of the area so it is not just a time frame that is exclusive of the development of the Moorish Castle site itself.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 2125, can the Minister state if the actual report entailed or was to do with the moving of the Prison out of the Moorish Castle, or only with the heritage aspects of what to do with the Prison after the Prison had been moved out, is that the case?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is correct.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister in a position to tell the House what it is that would happen in the Castle once the Prison had been moved out?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The consultancy was about a possible conservation policy plan. Ideas in relation to this. It is a purely conservational plan. How to develop that area from a conservation point of view, albeit taking into account obviously the fact that it is a living site. It is a historic site but there is also an estate next to it within the walls and so on.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The Minister will be aware, no doubt, that apart from the heritage problem there is also the social aspects to the question of the Prison as it is today. I would suggest, if I may, that something be done to put right some of the social aspects vis a vis the Prison in its present situation. I remember that the Minister for Social Affairs in a Budget speech a couple of years ago explained to the House that plans were very advanced and that I believe even funds were being put aside. Money was being put aside vis a vis the move of the Prison.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

With the greatest of respect to the hon Member, much as I take at face value his expression of concerns, based as I am sure they are in his case on sincere concern, the Prison has been in its present dismal state, if that is what he thinks it is, for many, many decades. At last Gibraltar has a Government willing to invest substantial sums of money which other Governments before it have not been willing to do, on the relocation of a facility in which there are not too many votes at stake and now we are being pressed whether we are taking three weeks or three months longer or shorter than we had indicated. It is not really, in our view, criticism that lies comfortably on the lips of a political party that obviously did not think there was very much wrong with the Prison, because if they had they would have themselves built a new Prison when they were in office. We believe, as they believe I am sure they believed at the time, that the Prison needed replacement. All these things are a matter of prioritisation of cash resources and the fact that they did not do it, I am sure does not mean that they did not think that Gibraltar needed a new Prison but there were other things that they wanted to do with the capital in priority to that in the eight years that they were in office. This is exactly our position except that we found a slot for it. Now it has taken longer to design, it has taken longer to conceive, it has taken longer to find a site, to approve the site, all these things take time. Now the project is nearly ready it is a question of when the Government decide to actually make the money available and get on with it in terms of the various projects that we have in the pipeline. We hope to be able to start as the answer has said but if we took longer than this, I do not think the hon Member's plea for speed is any stronger now than it

would have been had I made it ten years ago when I was sitting across the floor of this House and some of the hon Members were sitting over here.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The point of my comment is based on the fact that Government have made certain pronouncements on the matter. Whatever happened ten, fifteen, twenty or a hundred years ago is another business. It is just that if Government have made certain pronouncements in their term of office, I am just asking them whether or not the things are going to be put into practice.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is yes.

**NO. 2126 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRAFALGAR BICENTENARY COMMEMORATION**

What events are planned for the celebration in Gibraltar of the 200<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Battle of Trafalgar next year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Events being organised by the Gibraltar Government are of a sporting, heritage and cultural nature. These will form the bulk of the celebrations of the Trafalgar Bicentenary Commemoration. Details have not yet been finalised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2126 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are Government aware of any events of a military nature which might also take place as part of the Commemoration?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Government are aware that the MoD have a number of events themselves.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Which Government Department is responsible for organising or coordinating these events?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

My department.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is that through a special committee set up for this purpose or simply the officials or the Civil Servants who are there?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No committees are necessary on this occasion. The Department engaged will do it themselves.

**NO. 2127 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**GIBRALTAR MUSIC CENTRE**

Can Government confirm whether the lady who was managing the Music Centre at BFBS House is still doing so?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

As I informed the House in answer to Question Nos. 1495 and 1496 of 2004, the Gibraltar Music Centre is a charitable trust (not one appointed by Government). The Music Centre is run by its trustees and it is entirely up to them to decide how to, and who will, manage its business.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2127 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Since the Government actually give money to this entity, I think it is just normal that we can ask questions on what is happening with the money that the trustees and, therefore, the person if they are employed or if they do it voluntarily, or whether the lady is actually doing it or not. It is a perfectly normal question.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The hon Member is correct in saying the Government supports financially the Music Centre and all the arts generally in Gibraltar. It is very happy to do so but that is a different question totally as to who does the running or managing of a trust which is not a Government department. I think I am perfectly correct in saying that really it is not for me to say whether a particular person is in charge in the trust or not at this moment in time.



ORAL

NO. 2128 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**HERITAGE ACTION COMMITTEE**

How often and on what dates has the Heritage Action Committee met in 2003 and 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT

I hand the hon Member a schedule with the information he requests.

**Answer to Question 2128/2004**

The Heritage Action Committee has met on six occasions in 2003 and five in 2004 as follows:

| 2003                      | 2004                      |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 20 <sup>th</sup> January  | 22 <sup>nd</sup> January  |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> March     | 4 <sup>th</sup> March     |
| 23 <sup>rd</sup> April    | 6 <sup>th</sup> May       |
| 14 <sup>th</sup> July     | 20 <sup>th</sup> October  |
| 7 <sup>th</sup> October   | 30 <sup>th</sup> November |
| 17 <sup>th</sup> November |                           |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2128 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Minister was quoted as saying in the Annual General Meeting of the Heritage Trust a few weeks ago that the Heritage Action Committee had not met in the last few months, what committee was he speaking of?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

There is only one Heritage Action Committee which is the one that is contained in the information handed over. They have been meeting except that over the summer recess usually it does not meet that often and on this occasion because of the Tercentenary events, a plethora of events that were taking place actually involved a number of members of this Committee so they were really getting on with the action that the Heritage Action Committee advocates.

**NO. 2129 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HERITAGE ORDINANCE**

At what stage is the revision of the Heritage Ordinance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

This matter remains under Government consideration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2129 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

This matter has been under Government consideration for a considerable period of time if I remember correctly. Is the Minister in a position to say whether it is actually at the drafting stage, whether there is draft legislation before Ministers or it has not even got to that stage yet?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

There is draft legislation.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible for the Minister to say how long it will take for that draft legislation to come before this House?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No it is not possible for me to say, nor can I say whether it will indeed come before the House.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I assume the Minister is considering amending the Ordinance by regulation then, is that the case?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Not necessarily.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Or is it the case then that the draft legislation may not see the light of day because Ministers do not agree with it?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The legislation has wide implications for the community. The draft legislation actually precedes me, there are a wide number of stakeholders and I am assessing the whole new piece of legislation, new for me.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Has the Heritage Trust been consulted and involved in the production of this document?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I will rise to answer this supplementary because the events that are the answer to that question precedes my hon Colleague's responsibility for this matter. Yes, in the previous administration and with the previous Minister for Heritage, discussions took place which resulted in draft legislation but which had not been considered by other Ministers at the time of the Election. So the answer is yes there is draft legislation, yes there has been discussion between the Government before the last Election and the Heritage Trust but it never got to either me or indeed other Ministers before the Election was called and therefore that is where the matter now lies.

ORAL

**NO. 2130 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**VISIT BY THE CATALAN IPECC GROUP**

Can Government say why the media were refused access to the reception hosted by the Mayor and Minister for Culture and heritage on Saturday 30<sup>th</sup> October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2131 to 2133 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2131 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**VISIT BY THE CATALAN IPECC GROUP**

What was the cost of the reception hosted by the Mayor and Minister for Culture and Heritage for the Catalan IPECC Group on Saturday 30<sup>th</sup> October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2130, 2132 and 2133 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2132 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**VISIT BY THE CATALAN IPECC GROUP**

Can Government list the persons from Gibraltar who were invited to the reception hosted by the Mayor and Minister for Culture and Heritage for the Catalan IPECC Group on Saturday 30<sup>th</sup> October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2130, 2131 and 2133 of 2004.



**NO. 2133 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**VISIT BY THE CATALAN IPECC GROUP**

Can Government say where they plan to locate the plaque presented to the people of Gibraltar by the Catalan IPECC Group which was handed to the Mayor and Minister for Culture and Heritage on Saturday 30<sup>th</sup> October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The reception in question was hosted by the Mayor not the Minister. The Mayor is not answerable to this House and I am reluctant to set that precedent.

The position of Government with regard to the visit by the Catalan Institute, which I respected as Mayor, was to keep it low key.

As far as the plaque is concerned, this was presented to the Chairman of The Gibraltar Heritage Trust at the reception and, as far as I am aware, they have not yet decided where it will be located.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2130 TO 2133 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister in his capacity as the Minister for Heritage and not as Mayor whether there are any plans or whether it is considered placing this plaque at the statue of Rooke in the area of Watergardens?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I rise because in fact the Chairman has recently written to me on this subject. That proposal has been made and has been discussed and has been put to the Government, we are not in favour of it because it may lead, given the wording of the plaque, it may lead passers-by to believe that it was that Catalan organisation that erected the statue. We are not in favour of placing it there and therefore the matter will remain under review. But yes, the hon Member is right, that is one of the proposals that have been made.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister in his original answer explained that a decision had been taken to keep the visit low key. Can the Minister expand on that point as to why that was the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member knows, because I have said it many times myself, that whilst we regard normal exchanges with cultural organisations from other countries as being good, we do not believe in exaggerating their importance. Particularly not when it is the Government's view that it is not in Gibraltar's long-term political interests for Gibraltar and the aspirations of its people and our rights under international law to self-determination to be mixed up with, parcelled up with and associated with the rights of a region of a country whose people do not enjoy the same rights in international law. If the hon Member wants an example of the wisdom of the Government's policy on this matter and on how it does not serve Gibraltar's interests to have ourselves categorised with the Catalans, he need only refer to the unsuccessful application by the Skating Association to federate itself with the International Federation which in my view came a cropper only because it came before the Committee together with the Catalan application which was extremely controversial. Now, I realise that the hon Members have a different view of this issue and it is a different view, I can understand that there is room for more than one view on this issue, but that is the Government's view so the hon Member should not be surprised if we act in a way compatible with our view. He would presumably be surprised if we did not.

ORAL

**NO. 2134 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government say what is the area of the Theatre Royal site in square metres in respect of which rent of £60,000 per annum is being paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2135 and 2136 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2135 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government give a breakdown of the expenditure for the year 2004 on the Theatre Royal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2134 and 2136 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2136 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government confirm that the annual rent payable in respect of The Theatre Royal site forms part of the assessable income of the recipient for tax purposes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The area is 1,440 square metres. The rent income is subject to the provisions of the Income Tax Ordinance. I hand to the hon Member a schedule showing the breakdown he seeks.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 2136**

**Answer to Question 2135**

£ 21,000  
£69,118  
£47,217

-----  
£137,335

Paid to Haymills. Final account payments; purchase of scaffolding; piling and reinforcing of existing structure and adjacent properties affected.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2134 TO 2136 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

In the breakdown there seems to be the amount of £137,000 does not include the rent, does it because it is not there? Also the supplementary question to this will be, will the scaffolding and what is holding up the Theatre Royal at present, is it an on-going expenditure where the Government are actually paying the company to keep the scaffolding and the place safe until the project gets off the ground?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That part of the question, yes. The project continues in that sense. The expenditure to make safe and so on continues obviously. The rent is not included in those figures because it is not rent on the Theatre Royal as it were. The question asked on the Theatre Royal.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Basically it was because I looked at the Estimates of Expenditure in the Draft Estimates and I asked the question in this House last time, and the Minister actually answered £98,000. Therefore I was assuming that £60,000 was going to the rent and the other £38,000 was to sort of contractors in order to keep the place safe, but I appreciate that I have been given this now as a breakdown.

ORAL

**NO. 2137 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES**

Can Government state whether the police have concluded their investigation in relation to the stolen money from the youth services? Has there been any arrests or prosecutions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The matter was reported to the Royal Gibraltar Police and is still in their hands. No arrests or prosecutions have to date been reported.



ORAL

**NO. 2138 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state how many out of those who completed the youth leaders course are currently involved in a voluntary and/or professional capacity respectively?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The information requested by the hon Member is detailed in the schedule attached.

## **Answer to Question 2138/ 2004**

### **DETAILS OF TRAINEES FOR THE PERIOD 2001 / 2005**

|                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| In the year 2001 to 2002 | 14 people completed the training successfully<br>3 help as voluntary leaders with the Youth Service and other groups<br>3 are currently working as part time Youth Workers<br>2 have been employed as trainees and start as full time youth workers this coming summer |
| In the year 2002 to 2003 | 13 people completed the training successfully<br>3 help as voluntary leaders with the Youth Service and other groups<br>2 are currently working as part time paid Youth workers                                                                                        |
| In the year 2003 to 2004 | 15 people completed the training successfully<br>2 help as voluntary leaders with the Youth Service and other groups<br>3 are currently working as part time paid Youth workers                                                                                        |

Currently there are four voluntary leaders who are already involved in induction training programme for the same course this year ending in 2005.

The full training programme starts in February 2005 and will end towards the end of the year.

**NO. 2139 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES – EXCHANGES**

Can Government state how many youth exchanges have been organised in the financial years of 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 by the youth services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

In the period in question, one youth exchange with South American countries was organised for 2002/2003 but they subsequently, by they I mean the South American countries involved, cancelled it at the eleventh hour.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2139 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Therefore I assume that there has not been any other youth exchange since, because this was 2002/2003 they were organising one youth exchange, there has not been any in 2003/2004 (I am assuming) and 2004/2005? Correct?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The hon Member assumes correctly.

**NO. 2140 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICES – EU FUNDING**

Can Government state how much money has been obtained by the youth service from the EU for youth programmes generally in the financial years of 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 giving a breakdown by programme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

No funds have been sought from the EU in the period in question since the programmes undertaken, and there have been a number of them, did not fall within the criteria for EU funding.

**NO. 2141 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can the Minister for Sport state when he expects all the works to the facilities regarding the water-based pitch to be completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Works to the changing and spectator facilities for the water-based hockey pitch are expected to reach practical completion some time between late February and March 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2141 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister for Sport give an explanation why the works to these facilities have taken something like about three to four years to be completed? What has been the reason for the delays?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I have only been in this House for one year so I am not really privy, I have information but I do not see problems arising two years before then. There have been works there and this is what happens when one has construction. Sometimes there are delays in some of the materials, the materials may arrive and they are not exactly what they are expected to be or not up to the standard we insist on and they are returned. The only type of problem that I have been privy to or seen.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

For the sake of clarity if I could add to what my hon Colleague has said, that to avoid any doubt from anybody listening in, the water-based hockey pitch has been completed for quite some time, and has been in use for quite some time. The hon Member is asking purely about the changing and spectator facilities. Now the changing and spectator facilities are part of the overall project of what is happening at the Stadium and it is wrong for the hon Member to question us about specific delays on that particular aspect of the project. It is an on-going project and there

have been a number of issues including infrastructure issues which date back some time, but the project as a whole is not behind schedule, it is progressing as and how it has been scheduled by the Government and adjusted due to other priorities and other requirements.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Precisely that is why I have worded the question as I have. I am asking when the Minister for Sport expects the works to be completed to the facilities regarding the water-based pitch, not anything to do with the water-based pitch. Therefore, I would ask the Minister for example, if the facilities have not been completed to the water-based pitch as far as the changing rooms are concerned, what have the sportsmen and sportswomen been doing as far as changing rooms and showering facilities are concerned?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

A combination I suppose of different things. Some come with track suits and then go home and change at home, some change next to the stands, but I think the important point is that they have been enjoying first class, world level hockey pitch facilities. I mean, the changing facilities we wish to, as I say, have ready by hopefully February or March but I do not think that there have been huge delays with that in any way to make hockey difficult to participate in.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, I only mentioned the fact that there had been delays because the water-based pitch was completed nearly four years ago and that is why I am asking the Government why has it taken them so long after three years that the water-based pitch was completed, there have not been any facilities there for changing room facilities and showering facilities. Therefore that is why I was putting the question. Now can the Government confirm whether they are still using AMCO for the maintenance of that pitch?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Yes, AMCO is still maintaining the pitch.

ORAL

**NO. 2142 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether the new sports hall will be fully operational by this autumn, something he has said on two occasions in the last two meetings of this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2143 and 2144 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2143 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport confirm whether they have now met with the union in order to arrive at an agreement with regard to the transfer of staff to the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2142 and 2144 of 2004.



**NO. 2144 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport confirm when the Government intend to advertise vacancies for personnel to be employed by the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

Works at the Tercentenary Sports Hall have now reached the stage of “practical completion” which, in the construction industry jargon means that the hall is ready for handover for operational purposes.

However, it is not possible to advertise vacancies for personnel to be employed by the Gibraltar Sports Authority until the negotiations with the unions regarding the conditions of employment for transferring and new employees, which have already started are concluded.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2142 TO 2144 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So therefore the prediction that the Minister made during Budget time and during the last meeting of the House of Assembly that the hall would be fully operational by this autumn has not been complied with.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, the answer to previous questions referred to by the hon Lady, my answers have referred to completion of works and not dates for operational arrangements. My answer referred to completion of works, and they have been completed within the autumn deadline that we set ourselves.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, I think the Minister is mistaken. When I have put questions in the House previously I have asked precisely the same question. All that I have done on this occasion is say now, and my previous question was ‘can the Minister for Sport now confirm’ because he had confirmed it previously, ‘whether the new sports hall will be

fully operational by this autumn', and I remember specifically, because we have not got Hansard yet but I have got the information here that I have taken in shorthand, that he said that autumn did not necessarily mean it was October, that it could be middle or towards the end of December but I was not specifically referring to the works, I was referring to when the sports hall would be fully operational.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The hon Lady is absolutely correct. Autumn does not mean October but I did not decide that. I said the works could continue until the end of autumn. She is also correct in saying that her question referred to operational, my answers on both occasions referred to completion of works if one checks once Hansard comes out, and I have been true to my word. The works have been completed within the autumn, even though she may have asked something differently.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have asked something different and therefore, I am smiling because it is incredible the Minister now tries to change the tone or the words of my questions. Therefore I will prove it to him. I was never, ever referring to the works being completed, I was referring to the sports hall being fully operational. If the Minister cares to look back at his Budget speech he also said that the hall would be fully operational and that is all that I am saying. I am actually quoting his words.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think I have made my point very clearly. I referred on both occasions to completion of works even though the hon Lady's question may have referred to something else.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, they did not refer to something else, they referred to what I have just said. Therefore I think that the present Minister for Sport should have learned from the previous Minister for Sport who, about three or four years ago as well said that the Europa Sports ground was being handed to the Government and the Government were going to hand it over to the Cricket Association. Now, these are the answers that we get from the Government, and it is in Hansard. I am not inventing the questions that are asked here before, I have got proof here and therefore will the Minister say that yes, he did say so and yes, that he has not met the deadline, that is all.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Minister cannot say that because it is not the case. The hon Lady is getting herself into something of a tizzy over this. Look, the hon Lady must not confuse her question with the answer that she got to them. It is true that when she has asked this question in the past she has referred to whether the sports hall would be ready for use or words to that effect, operation, but the Minister, prudent chap that he is, I am not wishing to catch his fingers in any slamming door, was careful to answer what he chose to answer, regardless of what he was asked. So notwithstanding that the hon

Lady may have asked whether it would be ready operationally, the Minister answered that the works would be completed by the autumn. Now that being the case, it is not a question of the Minister now trying to change the hon Lady's question, rather it is a question of the hon Lady not having listened carefully enough to the answer. The relevance of all of this is that she has said, with her very attractive smile all across her face, I have my wife's permission to be charming to her of course, and the reason why all this is relevant now is because she gleefully said to the Minister 'contrary to what you said to me in answer to previous questions you have not complied with your undertaking to have it operational by the autumn'. To which the Minister said 'I did not promise to have it operational by the autumn, I said that the works would be ready by the autumn', and he has complied with his word. So it is at cross purposes, the hon Lady is assuming that my Colleague's answer suggests that she did not ask the questions that she did. She did ask the questions that she did but the hon Lady is in turn also mistaken by assuming that the Minister answered the precise question that the hon Lady asked, which he did not. He answered a slightly different question which makes his answer today entirely correct.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, let me first thank the Chief Minister for saying that I have a beautiful smile. Secondly, I must congratulate him because he uses words that he tries to actually get everybody else listening here in the House, and outside of the House, trying to make out that the questions that I have asked have not been exactly the same as the Minister for Sport has been asked by me. Now, I remember distinctly and if I have put a question in this House that says 'can the Minister for Sport now confirm, now confirm', which means that the previous question was 'can the Minister for Sport confirm whether the new sports hall will be fully operational by this autumn?'. Now, I know what he said in his Budget speech and all I need to do now, is to go back and get the information and prove that what I have said is right, and if I am wrong I will apologise. But if he is wrong I hope he apologises.

I still have Question No. 2143 and 2144 which I have not asked supplementaries on. That is regarding the Government, whether they have met with the union in order to arrive at an agreement. I am not too sure because I got really not agitated and not confused but I was concerned by the fact that the Chief Minister said I had a nice smile and therefore he put me off the supplementaries that I had for the two other questions. Now that I have forgotten about the smile I am going to get down to the business of the House. Can the Minister say whether they have met with the union or whether they have submitted proposals with the Union and can he also say as regards the vacancies for personnel to be employed by the Gibraltar Sports Authority, when this will occur?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Negotiations with the union have started of course and they are on-going, yes.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see, but as far as the Minister is concerned when he says 'on-going' does he mean that he has met with the union or that he has submitted proposals and they have not met?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Actually I have done both.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As far as Question No. 2144 is concerned, can the Minister for Sport confirm when the adverts will be coming out as far as the personnel that have to be employed to be members of the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I actually gave that answer in my reply but I shall repeat it for the benefit of the hon Member. It is not possible to advertise really vacancies for personnel to be employed by the GSA until obviously the negotiations with the union come to some conclusion, a happy one I hope, and it is looking like that.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That seems to be conflicting with what the Chief Minister said in the last meeting of the House, he is nodding, when he said that employing people for the Sports Authority had nothing to do with the negotiations with the union as regards the present members of the people who are employed with the Government. Am I not correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is correct in what she has said except that it is not correct to say that it is inconsistent. What I said to the hon Lady was that they were different things and that if we could not reach agreement with the union then we would certainly press ahead but that if there was a prospect of doing it on a consensual basis, including the existing staff, then that was the Government's preference and we would hold out for as long as possible in giving as much time as possible to that negotiation so that when there was recruitment it was on an agreed basis. I think she will remember I made that distinction.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So then the Government are not able to give a sort of date or an estimate as to when the Sports Hall will be functioning with new members of the Gibraltar Sports Authority if that is the case.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, yes. We cannot give a date but I can tell the hon Member that we are not going to accept the new facility being ready with nets up and the ball bouncing around on the court, unused, for this reason. So we will certainly press the button before we allow the thing just to gather moss there by itself. That date has not quite arrived but we are now getting very close to the wire. That is certainly true and I think in the next

few weeks the Government would have to make the decision either to press ahead or to bring the negotiations to a head.

**NO. 2145 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GIBRALTAR SKATING FEDERATION**

Can the Minister for Sport give details of the support the Government have given to the Gibraltar Skating Federation's application to the F.I.R.S.?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HERITAGE, CULTURE, YOUTH AND SPORT**

The Gibraltar Skating Association met with the Sports Development Officer prior to their application and were offered the same support as has always been given to other Associations applying for membership of their respective International Federation, as well as written confirmation that they are recognised by the Gibraltar Government as the governing body of skating in Gibraltar. In other words, it went through the usual procedure of other Associations in the past who signified their intention of applying for membership of the International Federation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2145 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister say what sum of money they provide to local Associations, is there a fixed sum of money that they provide to local Associations when they wish to go abroad to fight for Gibraltar's case to be accepted by an International Federation?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, there is no fixed sum of money. Some Associations want to be present at the International meeting where these decisions are taken, others are not necessarily so. Sometimes the venues for these International meetings of the Federations are prohibitive because they are so far away and expensive to get to and so on. So I think each case really has to be taken individually, because the circumstances change. There is no fixed sum.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So will the Minister for Sport then agree, or disagree, with the public statement that has been made by the local Skating Association, that have said that the Government only offered them £500?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That may have been the case but different Associations take decisions, they are independent bodies and they take decisions as to whether they want to be present at meetings or not.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Minister not agree that in such an important subject as whether Gibraltar is being accepted internationally, which is really important as regards not only sport but our identity as a people, that £500 will get them to wherever they want to go to. Will the Minister not agree that that is not enough money?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not think the hon Lady can deduce any of that. Certainly the Government do not mind admitting that there is no policy to automatically finance each and every Association that wants to go and federate itself to the International Federation. The Government make absolutely no apology for that and the Government deliver the advice based on the merits of each individual case, and based on the requests of each case, and then depending on how many such cases there are. Look if the hon Lady wants to know how much money the Government spends in what she calls the defence of the identity of the people of Gibraltar, she should be aware of the litigation that the Government are funding for two sports associations, in which tens of thousands not to say hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent by the Government in conducting litigation on behalf of associations. So that is the measure and of course the hon Lady, if she is a roller skater, may wish to focus the whole Government's commitment with the eyes of what it does in the roller skating case, but the hon Lady knows enough to know that it would be entirely wrong and misleading for her to focus the Government's commitment to this political point by reference to whatever sum of money may have been given by the Government to the Skating Association.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have not done that, I have not compared what sums of money other associations get. The Chief Minister has and he has said that they spend hundreds of thousands of pounds. Well surely this is a case which is similar and it stands out, because they have not spent the money. The Government have not actually provided any money to this Association and therefore if the Chief Minister says that there are cases of other associations where the Government have spent loads and loads of money, then why is it that to this particular Association the Government have not provided the same hundreds of thousands of pounds that the Chief Minister has said that they have provided to other Sporting Associations. When we are talking about the same point, the same principle, whether it is three or four people we are talking about a principle that the Spanish Government, whether they are saying that they are so friendly and they want to cooperate, they are still blocking Gibraltar Associations to be able to join international federations. Therefore, I think that the Government should forget about the actual numbers of people concerned, whether it is roller skating or whether people do not roller skate any more, whether they do or they do not, I think it is the principle behind it and the importance it is to the identity of the people of Gibraltar.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the hon Lady is entirely wrong and her question, if that is what it was, is full of political prejudice which she is not in a position to sustain. First of all, she is assuming that this is a case in which the refusal to grant permission or to admit the Skating Association is as a result of pressure from the Spanish Government. We have no information to that effect. Well the Spanish Government certainly objected to the Catalan application, I do not know why the hon Member thinks that she has the evidence for the fact, she may be right but certainly we have not been informed, certainly it is true to say that the Spanish Government objected to the Catalan application. Certainly it is true to say that both applications were refused. The hon Lady is assuming that there is, therefore that means that the Spanish Government objected to the Gibraltar application, as opposed to the International Federation saying 'if I cannot give both I will not give either'. That is the first thing that the hon Lady needs to take care of. The second thing that the hon Lady should take care of is to know that the Government do not immediately finance every case immediately. It depends on the state of the case, it depends if the matter has been challenged by Spain or not because the Government do not finance these things in order to facilitate the Association at a sporting level. The Government finance these things because of the political dimension of the matter. In other words, that sporting associations should not be kept out of their international sporting rights as a result of political activity and lobbying on the part of Spain, and only on cases where the Government receive evidence that that is the case, do the Government substantially finance the resistance at whatever level, whether it is judicial or extra-judicial. That is the Government's policy, it is not the policy of the Government automatically to finance the overseas trips of any Gibraltar sporting association or leisure association that simply wants to sign up to some international federation. Therefore the hon Lady has got to at least appreciate if not agree with that distinction. Therefore the Government do not agree with her implied criticism of this case and certainly, it is not unusual even without political interference for applications not to prosper the first time round. Therefore the hon Lady should also take into account that the Government choose their moment for the provision of financial assistance because it may often require more than one application.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So therefore can the Government give a commitment that they have evidence that the Spanish Government, that if they have evidence that the Spanish Government are trying to block Gibraltar's application, they will give reasonable funding and financial assistance and whatever support is needed to this Association?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Chief Minister has said what the Chief Minister has just said. The hon Lady does not have to paraphrase it into different words for me. What I have said is perfectly clear and it stands.



ORAL

**NO. 2146 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GENERAL PRACTITIONERS AND CONSULTANTS**

Can Government confirm whether it is their intention to renew those contracts which have expired or will expire in January 2005, for General Practitioners and Consultants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2147 to 2160 of 2004.

**NO. 2147 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can the Government state the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority, together with the addresses, and the type of public sector accommodation, which it is renting in connection with the medical profession who are on contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 and 2148 to 2160 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2148 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can Government state the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority, together with the addresses and the type of public sector dwellings which it is renting to accommodate nurses who are on contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2147 and 2149 to 2160 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2149 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can the Government give the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority of the private sector dwellings which they are renting in connection with the medical profession who are on contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2148 and 2150 to 2160 of 2004.

**NO. 2150 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can Government state the addresses, and the type of accommodation of the private sector dwellings the Gibraltar Health Authority is renting to accommodate nurses who are on contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2149 and 2151 to 2160 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2151 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can Government state the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority of the private sector dwellings which they are renting to accommodate nurses who are on contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2150 and 2152 to 2160 of 2004.

**NO. 2152 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can the Government give the addresses, and the type of accommodation of private sector dwellings the Gibraltar Health Authority is renting for members of the medical profession who are on contract?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2151 and 2153 to 2160 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2153 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE TEAM**

Can the Government provide the addresses and the type of accommodation the Gibraltar Health Authority has provided and continues to provide to members of the Clinical Governance team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2152 and 2154 to 2160 of 2004.



**NO. 2154 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT TEAM**

Can the Government give a breakdown of the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority of the accommodation it has and continues to provide to members of the Clinical Governance Audit team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2153 and 2155 to 2160 of 2004.

**NO. 2155 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Can Government state the address, the type of accommodation and the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority, of the permanent accommodation it is providing to the Government's newly appointed Chief Executive whom they have engaged from outside Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2154 and 2156 to 2160 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2156 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIRECTOR OF NURSING SERVICES**

Can Government confirm the address, the type of accommodation and the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority, of the permanent accommodation they are providing to the incumbent of the new post of Director of Nursing Services and Patient Management, recently recruited from abroad?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 and 2155 and 2157 to 2160 of 2004.

**NO. 2157 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER**

Can Government provide the address, what type of permanent accommodation and its cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority, which is being provided to the incumbent of the new post of Human Resources Manager?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2156 and 2158 to 2160 of 2004.

**NO. 2158 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – JOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Can the Government confirm the address, the type of accommodation and the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority, which has been or is being provided to Mr John Langan, who was seconded as Joint Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2157 and 2159 and 2160 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2159 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can the Government confirm the address, the type of accommodation and the cost to the Gibraltar Health Authority, which is being provided to Mr Frank McGurrin?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2146 to 2158 and 2160 of 2004.

**NO. 2160 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COST OF ACCOMMODATION**

Can Government confirm what is the final figure for accommodation, under sub-head 22 in the Financial Year 2003/2004 and the forecast outturn for the financial year 2004/2005 of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 2146**

The performance of contract GP's will be reviewed by an external assessor and where satisfactory contract terms will be extended. Where unsatisfactory, contracts will not be renewed and posts will be advertised in the normal way.

No consultant contracts expire in January 2005. As and when consultant contracts expire in future the consultants performance will be reviewed and where satisfactory the contract renewed.

**Answer to Question Nos. 2147 to 2160**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question 2160 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2147 to 2152**

**NURSING STAFF**

| No of Flats | Type of Accommodation                                              | Location     | Total cost per month |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 4           | 2 x 2 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom<br>2 x 4 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom | Merlot House | £1,909:00            |

**MEDICAL STAFF**

| No of Flats | Type of Accommodation                                              | Location                     | Total cost per month |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 4           | 3 x 4 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom<br>1 x 4 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom | Merlot House, Portland House | £2,339:40            |

**PRIVATE SECTOR ACCOMMODATION**

**NURSING STAFF**

| No of Flats | Type of Accommodation                                               | Location                                                                                    | Total cost per month |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 15          | 11 x 2 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom<br>4 x 3 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom | Eurotowers, Watergardens<br>Rosbay Court, Portland House<br>West View Park, Sunnyside House | £4,642:50            |

**MEDICAL STAFF**

| No of Flats | Type of Accommodation                                              | Location                                                                                             | Total cost per month                        |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 14          | 5 x 2 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom<br>3 x 3 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom | Eurotowers, Watergardens<br>Peninsular Heights, Montagu Gardens<br>6 x 4 Rooms, Kitchen and Bathroom | £11,385:00<br>Harbour Views, West View Park |



**Contd Answer to Question 2160 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2153, 2154, 2158 & 2159**

**CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AND F MCGURRIN ACCOMMODATION**

| No of Flats | Type of Accommodation                                                                                 | Location                      | Total cost per month |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| 4           | 1 X 2 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom<br>2 x 3 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom<br>1 x 4 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom | Eurotowers<br>Sunnyside House | £2420.00             |

**NOTE:**

- a) three of these flats were occupied by Clinical Governance team members and Mr McGurrian who have now left Gibraltar.
- b) One flat remains occupied at Peninsular Heights by a Clinical Governance team member at a cost of £1000 pm.

**Answer to Question 2155, 2156 & 2157**

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE & HR DIRECTOR & DNS ACCOMMODATION**

| No of Flats | Type of Accommodation           | Location       | Total cost per month                                             |
|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2           | 2 x 4 Rooms, Kitchen & Bathroom | Portland House | Rent levels not yet established for these Government owned flats |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2146 TO 2160 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Did I hear the Minister say that General Practitioners contracts do not expire on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, the Minister did not say that or was he referring to consultants?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No I did not say that, but if the hon Member would like me to say it again. There are some GP contracts that expire at the end of January 2005 and those GP's have been assessed, and depending on that assessment the contract will or will not be renewed. There are no consultants which expire in January but when their contracts expire, they will also be assessed. In other words, putting it in a completely different way, there is now a new policy and there is no automatic renewal of contract as there has been up to now, and people will have to perform if they want their contracts renewed.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister say who are the external assessors?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I do not know. When we say who are they, they are not internal to the GHA, we are bringing people in to do it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Minister is referring to the contracts being assessed by people who are external, what does he mean by people who are external assessors?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would have thought the answer is pretty obvious. In the English language 'external' means not internal. It means people who are not inside and part of the GHA. Independent assessors.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see. So this is a new policy from the Government because it never was like that before.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is what I said two minutes ago, that it is a new policy.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have the Government engaged these independent assessors already?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

This is not the Government, this is GHA doing its own thing at management level, this is not a Ministerial thing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Presumably the policy decision then has been a recommendation from somebody that has been accepted at a political level. Is this not the case?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

This is not a recommendation that has been given to the Government. This is management doing its job and accepted by me as Chairman of GHA. This is not a political decision, this is what corporations do everywhere else and instead of just renewing contracts automatically, we are now putting into place, if the hon Members look back at the review that the Opposition Spokesman for Health is so fond of deriding, they will remember that we are putting in appraisals, we are putting in a review of performances and that is exactly what I am saying. In future people, and doctors are no exception, contract officers will be required to meet to the levels, the standards expected of them. We are starting with those contracts that are due to expire now, and this will carry on in the future. There have been too many cases of standards not being met and we are trying to put this right.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Minister then confirm, after what he has just said, why the consultant Director of Public Health was given 13 years in his contract?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I fail to see the relevance to any of the questions that have been asked. In any case, the Director of Public Health had his contract granted many years ago, well before my time and I am not even sure it is 13 years I thought it was 10. But maybe if the hon Member has more information than I have maybe it was 13. No, I do not see

what she is expecting me to say, it was done years ago. There is now a policy of assessing people. That assessment does not mean that the contract will not be renewed for 13 years. What we are talking about is how contract officers will have their contracts renewed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

This policy will not apply to permanent and pensionable employees of the Health Authority, is that the case?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Obviously not.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it is not the case then, as I think we were led to believe in a previous House, that contract officers are entitled to equal treatment with permanent and pensionable officers?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not quite sure of the context in which that was said, but as far as possible I think it may have been said in relation to income and salaries, I am not sure, but as far as possible we try to deal within all other conditions the same with contract officers and with P&P officers. De facto, by definition, if a person is on contract he cannot be the same as someone who is permanent and pensionable. So they have to be treated differently. That does not mean, however, that the people who are on permanent and pensionable terms will not have to meet appraisals and assessments the same as the contract officers. If they were to be a consistent failure, then that would have repercussions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But presumably any employee of the Health Authority or any employee of any Authority or Government Department is subject to disciplinary procedures for failure to deliver his side of the contract in the terms of his employment contract. That presumably has nothing to do with this?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Absolutely not. To be clear, we are not talking about disciplinary procedures or actions taken for breaches of the disciplinary code. That is a separate issue altogether. Here we are talking about standards and faults and what we are saying is that we will be expecting doctors to do a number of things, like keeping up their professional education and development and performing to certain standards. That will be done in a number of ways, which is part of the review that is taking place and part of the recommendations of the review.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but that can only be applied, from the answer that we have been given, to persons who are on specifically defined contracts with a termination date and not people with open contracts of employment, because then there is not an automatic renewal date if they have got an open contract of employment.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

There is no one, to my knowledge, with an open contract of employment. Everybody who has a contract has a termination date.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, the Minister obviously has not focussed on the fact that everybody that is employed in the Health Authority has got an indefinite contract of employment.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Now the hon Member is talking about permanent and pensionable.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

People who are permanent and pensionable have got indefinite contracts of employment. What I am saying is, given his previous answer, it means that the contract of employment that is indefinite and therefore subject to permanent and pensionable employment, has not got a renewal date, therefore there is no question of an automatic assessment of his performance or skills.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member is mixing termination of employment with assessment. What I have said is, that all consultants who are on contracts and all GP's who are on contracts, will be required to go through an appraisal process and will be required to go through an assessment of their performance. That will be conditional for the renewal of the contract. How that is applied to people who are on P&P is a different issue, and one for which I do not have full details in front of me because it is not the subject of the question. But talking in terms of contract officers and not in the hon Member's definition 'people on open contracts' which I take to mean permanent and pensionable, I am not talking about them I am talking about people on contracts. What we are saying is that they are contracted for a period of time and part of that contract will be that they need to fulfil a number of things and that will include measuring up to an acceptable standard which will be assessed. As it is, we are not inventing the wheel here, as it is everywhere else.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I do not know whether we are inventing the wheel or not. The only thing is that the wheel does not seem to be the same wheel that we have had described to us before

in terms of the rights of people who are on contract, to promotion, to permanent and pensionable status, to being sent to the UK for training, irrespective of their performance or an assessment or the fact that when their contracts terminate they have no right to renewal, which is not what the law on employment says.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

We are widening the question. The question is 'will the contracts of GP's and consultants that expire in January, will they be renewed?' We are not talking about going to the UK for this, that or the other. Those are red herrings. That is the question and the answer is that they will be renewed if they meet the assessment criteria.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So is the Minister then saying that the recommendation that he has received and accepted as Chairman, only applies to GP's and consultants and that for example, none of the 49 contract Staff Nurses have to meet any performance targets to have their contracts renewed?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The question is on contract consultants and contract GP's and I have given the answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes I know that he has given the answer and I am asking a supplementary whether in fact there is one set of rules in terms of contract officers who are GP's and consultants, and a different set of rules for contract officers in other spheres of employment in the Health Authority. Either the answer is that there is or there is not or that he does not know or knows and does not want to tell me. I know the answer he has given me, I am asking a supplementary to that answer. Does it apply only to those two grades?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The answer is that I would need notice of that question because that is a much widening of the question which has been asked. I am answering the question that has been asked and I would need notice of the widening of the question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

In the list that I have been given by the Minister, he mentions Harbour Views. Now, Harbour Views as far as I am concerned because I live there, one is not allowed to rent. Can the Minister explain why Harbour Views is mentioned in the list that he has just given me?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, this is the list that has been provided to me by officials and I assume that it is correct. I am not familiar with the terms of Harbour Views and I assume that this is a private letting that has been rented.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Minister undertake to look into it, because I live there and I am 100 per cent sure that one cannot rent, one is not allowed under the terms of the under-lease. Therefore, will the Minister look into it and provide me with the information, because he mentions here Harbour Views as regards the medical staff, number of flats 14 and I am convinced, because I have the under-lease and I have read it myself, that no one is allowed to rent in Harbour Views. Secondly, when he has given me the list in answer to Question No. 2160, I do not seem to have the answer. When I am talking about what is the final figure for accommodation under sub-head 22 in the financial year 2003/2004 and the forecast outturn for the financial year 2004/2005 of the Gibraltar Health Authority. I do not seem to have the answer to Question No. 2160.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member will appear to be correct. It seems the answer may have fallen off the back of the computer somewhere. I will supply her with the answer in writing. It is not an intentional omission on my part.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I understand that, but it just so happens that in the previous House of Assembly the answer was not given to me either.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That may be the reason why it is not given now.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister has not given it to me in the previous meeting of the House and he has not given it to me now, but I would be grateful if he could provide it to me in writing.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, I will provide the answer to Question No. 2160 in writing, whatever that answer will be. In terms of the Harbour Views issue, no I will not undertake to do what she has asked me to do. I will certainly investigate whether the GHA is in breach by renting property in Harbour Views, and if it is in breach I will arrange for it to be put right, but if there is a breach it is a breach of the owner of the flat who is renting in breach of his under-lease but I will certainly not allow GHA to be a party knowingly to the breach, having been brought to my notice I will certainly look into it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It would not be the case that the Government owns these flats and provides them?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It is possible. As I said the hon Members will hopefully realise that I do not sit down and work out all these addresses, I have better things to do than compile the statistics. Statistics are compiled for me. I take note of what is being said and I will check whether the GHA is in breach of any law, or any regulation, by hiring this flat. If it is we will obviously put it right.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just bring to the Minister's attention in that respect that the schedule also refers to Montagu Gardens. I think it is only Montagu Gardens and Harbour Views that are covered but I think he should direct his enquiries in relation to both of those Estates, for the reasons he himself has referred to.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I will indeed. As I say, and I stress for the avoidance of doubt to the hon Lady opposite so that she listens to what I am saying, I will investigate whether GHA is in breach. If GHA is not in breach then it is up to one of my colleagues, I will pass on the information to them or to the owner of the flat if they are in breach of the under-lease, to do whatever is right. I will make sure that GHA is not a party to any breach.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Clearly GHA is not going to be in breach because it is not their lease but the issue we are asking to look at is whether GHA is a party to a breach by inadvertently renting.



ORAL

**NO. 2161 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – LABORATORY**

Can Government state whether a report was written by an agency from the United Kingdom, in respect of Quality Assurance of the laboratory of the Gibraltar Health Authority, and if so, what was the name of the agency that wrote the report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2162 and 2163 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2162 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GHA – LABORATORY**

Can Government state who is clinically in charge of the laboratory standards in the GHA?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2161 and 2163 of 2004.

**NO. 2163 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – LABORATORY**

Can Government state whether they are concerned at the remarks made public recently by GBC, that laboratory services provided by the Gibraltar Health Authority, could well break down, in connection with a letter written by the Consultant Pathologist which was leaked to the media?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 2161**

No report in respect of Quality Assurance of the Laboratory of the GHA has been commissioned or received by the Government or by the GHA.

**Answer to Question No. 2162**

Dr T Biedrzycki has overall responsibility for the clinical areas and care of the patient.

**Answer to Question No. 2163**

As Government have already made aware in a Press Release issued on 19<sup>th</sup> November, and as the hon Member therefore already knows, the Government are aware that in September 2004, senior GHA Management had to intervene to clarify the long established respective roles and responsibilities of the Laboratory Manager and the Consultant Pathologist. Also in September, the Laboratory staff was depleted unexpectedly and unplanned, by three members due to absences on annual leave, interdiction and sick leave. This shortage was adequately addressed in the short term by locum staff and contract extension. Staff levels returned to normal by the end of September.

Furthermore, as with all other areas of GHA, the Pathology Department and the Laboratory are the subject of detailed outside scrutiny and review under the current healthcare review process. The report will deal with all aspects of the department.

Additionally, the work of the Laboratory is subject to both internal and to external quality controls. These quality controls show that biochemistry results of the GHA Laboratory are ranked above average when compared with over 300 other European Laboratories that also participate in this quality control assessment scheme.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2161 TO 2163 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Minister not accept that the Healthcare Development Team Report identified that the Government needed to be aware that demand for most laboratory services had increased, in June 2003? Will the Minister not accept that when I asked a question the Government said that indeed laboratory services had increased in almost every area?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The trouble with the hon Member, as the Chief Minister said earlier on, is that she asks the question, does not listen to the answer or if she listens to the answer she either does not understand it or forgets it or ignores it, and then in the next House she asks exactly the same question. It has been explained to the hon Member countless times, that the report that she refers to from the Healthcare Development Team is a diagnostic report. It is not a report for action and therefore, it is not something that the Government or GHA, or anybody else, has acted on. It is a report of the diagnosis carried out by the Healthcare Development Team. Based on that diagnostic report, there have been 20 different work streams initiated. Most are in the process of being carried out, most are in the process of being finished, some have been finished, most are about to be finished, they are all going to be finished within three months and that is the process of recommendations the hon Member should be focussing on, and not the diagnostic report which are not recommendations for actions. I have explained this, the Hon Dr B Linares has explained this in the past, I seem to remember, and certainly both of us have explained it.

In terms of the staffing levels of the Laboratory, it has been said in answer to previous questions, if the hon Member will look at Hansard as she is so used to looking at she will see that the Government will look at the staffing levels as and when the Report of the Healthcare Review Team, the clinical reviews, are presented to the Government. Now if she persists in asking questions about the clinical review, and in my time in this House in the three Question Times that I have had, I have three times already said the same thing. The Clinical Reviews have not yet been presented to the Government, and that is true as I speak today. Therefore, until those Clinical Reviews and the work stream report and the recommendations of those clinical reviews come to the Government, that till those recommendations are accepted and then put to the GHA for action, it is pointless pointing to them and asking me what we are doing about them because we are not doing anything about them because there are no recommendations yet to do anything about. I am trying to explain myself as clearly and in as much detail as possible. The Chief Minister said some time ago that we knew that work had increased in the Laboratory. That does not necessarily mean that it needs more staff because by the nature of the reason and the nature of things, new equipment can do more tests and provide more results not necessarily needing more staff, but that we are committed to look at the reports of the Clinical Review Team, those clinical reviews, and to assess those recommendations as we are with all of the clinical areas, not just with the Laboratory. We will put those improvements as and when they come before us in recommendations. Those recommendations are the recommendations of the work streams. They are not of the diagnostic report which are not recommendations but purely an analysis.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, having mentioned the report of the Healthcare Development Team, now I move to the Pathologist himself. Therefore I would like to ask the Minister whether he agrees or he does not agree with the letter that he wrote in September, wherein he said that the Department could collapse, wherein he said it is ill-equipped, wherein he said the situation is chaotic, wherein he said the situation is dangerous, wherein he said that the staff morale is at rock bottom level. Now, will the Minister say whether he agrees with the Pathologist or not, or is he saying that the Pathologist is inventing everything he said in that letter?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

What I will say is that the Pathologist when he wrote that letter, was expressing concerns that he had at that moment in time, back in August. I have in my hand a further letter that he has written, addressed to the Medical Director, in which he makes that absolutely clear and in which he says '*I have to inform you that the on-call service,*' which was the staffing problem that he had highlighted, '*which was my major concern, has returned to normality and that there are currently five people providing this service.*' The hon Member also asked about resources, which as I said was raised in that first letter, and the Pathologist says in the second letter '*obviously the move to the new hospital in the new year will improve the situation regarding laboratory equipment. In my original letter I was referring to the situation at St Bernard's Hospital.*' [Interruption] Hon Members may laugh when they are told things they do not like but the reality is that that letter that was leaked to the press, for whatever reasons it was written, that letter covered three issues. It covered management issues, it covered staffing issues and it covered resources issues. In the management issues there was some confusion, and as I said in my original answer it was addressed by management with immediate effect, both the Pathologist and the Laboratory Manager were called in by Senior Management and their respective positions clarified and that situation was solved on the spot within days. The staffing issues I have already said in my reply were solved by immediate action being taken on extending contracts and providing local cover and within three weeks the Laboratory was back to normal staffing levels. So the problem was solved back in September. Finally, on the resources, the lack of resources or outdated resources which the Pathologist said, I have yet to receive an adequate explanation on this because there is £400,000 worth of new equipment for the laboratory being installed in the new hospital, of which £400,000 those items which the Laboratory Manager and the Pathologist with responsibility for the clinical areas, have required or have asked to be put in the present laboratory in St Bernard's, those bits of kit are there in the laboratory now. So if the rest was allowed to go into the new hospital, presumably it was not that urgent when both these gentlemen were involved in the analysis. Be that as it may and without wishing to criticise them, the position today is that within weeks over £400,000 of new equipment will be available and in use in the new laboratory. That addresses the three issues in that area, rectified by a subsequent letter.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Minister says it will be available in the new laboratory is he saying it will be available in Europort? Therefore if we are talking about the Pathologist saying in September that the department was ill-equipped, is the Minister saying that the

equipment will be available when the Europort hospital is fully operational? What happens in the meantime?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If the Government did not think that the present equipment needed to be changed they would not be spending £400,000. They would be spending the £400,000 on something else. Obviously the Government, with the advice of the Pathologist himself and others in the laboratory, agree that the equipment needs to be updated and needs to be changed, and that is what is being done. This is expensive equipment and it is not the sort of thing that can be put into a relatively small laboratory in the existing St Bernard's, some of it that was urgently needed was put in there, all of it does not fit and it is being installed in the new hospital. If the hon Member is saying to me why have we not moved into the new laboratory yet, that is a different issue, but what I cannot do is put all the new equipment into the old laboratory.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So why did the Minister say when he was interviewed in the local media that he thought that the Pathologist had vested interests in the remarks that he had made in the letter that he had written.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

These are the hon Member's words not mine. I do not have any recollection of having used the words 'vested interests' and I challenge her to tell me where I said that. I am trying to think on my feet, the only way that I could have meant was that he was trying to protect the vested interests in protecting his position. What I am saying is that I hope there is not the suggestion of vested interests in a financial term because I would never have said that, but it seems to me that there might have been a vested interest in protecting his position and therefore that is why he wrote the letter in the first place. That is a question to be asked to somebody else and not to me.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But the Minister did say that he thought that the Consultant Pathologist's remarks that he had made, he had made them because he had vested interests, and I have here the copy of his interview. What does he say that the vested interests were due to what?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Again, the hon Member asks the question, listen to the answer then either ignores it, does not understand it or does not want to hear it. I have just explained, I obviously cannot remember what I said or what I meant exactly at the time, but it does not matter whether she has the text. What I am saying is, I cannot remember the context and I do not think that I am here to answer for interviews in the press, but the only context that I can think of that I may have said that, and I quite honestly think it is

totally irrelevant to the subject of the question, is that I may have said when asked why it had been written, that the gentleman may have felt it necessary, he had a vested interest in protecting his personal position. That is the only context that I can think of but I am not going to defend what I said in an interview in this House unless directed to do so by the Speaker.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The point that I wanted to make is that the hon Gentleman actually started his answer to the hon Lady by saying that he had not said that, he had said that he had not said that there was a vested interest and now he is trying to see whether he can have his cake and eat it. Either he said it or he did not say it and if he did say it, then because that is the subject matter of the question that is being asked in this House, he should be directed to reply why he said that, or does he maintain that he did not say it?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I started off saying I did not say a vested interest and then I stopped, and I said hold on, if that was meant to imply that he had a vested interest (I do not remember what words I used), he had a vested financial interest then I certainly did not say that. What I may have said was that he may have had a vested interest in protecting his position, but quite honestly I honestly on my feet six months ago or two months ago whatever it was, I cannot recollect exactly what I said I do not even know what the question was and I still maintain that it is irrelevant to the question on the order paper.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister said *'I think that the Consultant Pathologist has a vested interest in defending his position'*.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is exactly what I have said twice in the last five minutes, that I was talking about his position.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Minister think that the present letter has anything to do with him having a vested interest in defending his position or the renewal of his contract?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I utterly reject the implications of that question and I refuse to answer it because there are implications on myself and on the Pathologist. All I will say is that the Pathologist's contract, to my knowledge, is not due for renewal in the immediate future, I have no idea when his contract ends, but it certainly, to my knowledge, it is not due for renewal. Mr Speaker with your permission, I will not continue to answer

questions on what is becoming a personal attack on someone who is not here to defend himself.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Let me make it absolutely clear that we are not attacking the Pathologist, we think he was a very brave man to write the original letter, and perhaps a less brave man to have written the second one. So there is simply no aspersions at all on that. We have to be satisfied that the concerns raised in the original letter have now been resolved, and is the Minister now saying that he is perfectly satisfied that there are now no problems in the laboratory?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It would take a braver man than me to say that there are no problems anywhere in the Health Service and I will not say that of the laboratory or of anywhere else. There are, as the Government have said many times, there are problems in the Health Service as there are in many other things in Gibraltar. There are problems in the Health Service and that is why the Government are investing so heavily in the new hospital, in a full review, in the top to tail changes that are being carried out. So I cannot stand up here and say the laboratory is perfect because it is not, and there are difficulties in the laboratory. What I am saying, that of the three issues raised by the Pathologist in that letter, the three have been addressed satisfactorily as he himself says. The management issue was addressed immediately, the staffing issue was solved within three weeks, it was addressed immediately and solved in the short term by employing extra people and then permanently within three weeks, and the resources issue that he highlighted, has been solved by the move into the new hospital and the new equipment there. In that sense, I am satisfied that the concerns he addressed have been addressed and have been tackled in the most professional and the best way possible.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I believe we were told at one of the previous Houses that there was a study that had been conducted specifically of the laboratory as part of this review, and that in fact results had not been received. Can the Minister say whether those results have been received and whether things are happening in connection with that or not?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I made a reference to it a little bit earlier. There have been clinical reviews of all the clinical areas within the GHA, and that is a work stream in itself and that is one of the last work streams which some of those reviews have only lately been finished and the Government are still awaiting the final report from the Healthcare Development Team based on those reviews. These are reviews conducted, let us be clear, not by GHA, not by the Government, conducted by the Healthcare Development Team to give them the information on which to base the recommendations, and that recommendation report on the work stream has not yet come to the Government. That includes not just the laboratory but all other clinical areas.



**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The position is that the laboratory one has not yet arrived. Is that the case? Presumably some have been finished and some have not, the laboratory is one of those that is not yet finished, is that correct?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, I do not think the hon Member is following what I am saying. What I am saying is that there is a work stream, I cannot remember the title of it, but there is a work stream that is called something like 'clinical review or review of the clinical areas', whatever the title is, and that is from memory I think there are 11 different clinical areas. Each of those clinical areas have been reviewed by people on behalf of the Healthcare Development Team and the reports have gone, I do not know whether all have gone or some have gone or most of them, although I suspect that most of them if not all of them are now in the hands of the Healthcare Development Team. The content of those reports into all the clinical areas compiling their own report as they are compiling the reports on all the other aspects that they are looking into, and that is the report that eventually will come to the Government, or the one we are expecting, their report on what those clinical reviews recommend.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So perhaps the Minister will be patient and confirm it if I have understood him correctly this time. So all the reports have now gone to the team, or does he not know?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

From memory I think that they probably have but I do not know because they do not come to me, I do not see them, they go to them and my understanding is that if they are not all already there they are about to be and they will be getting their report within weeks, the other side of Christmas.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

One of them is on the laboratory?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Correct.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Irrespective, what the Minister has said about the equipment side of the laboratory, is he saying that apart from that the Government are still awaiting recommendations from the Healthcare Development Team on the overall recommendations on the laboratory?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not sure that I follow that question, so I will say what the situation is and hopefully that will provide the answer. The Government are still expecting a number of work stream reports. One of those work stream reports is entitled 'review of the clinical areas' or some such language. It covers 11 different clinical areas including the laboratory. When that report comes to the Government it will include recommendations of the 11 clinical areas including the laboratory. That is the report that the Government are expecting on the laboratory. From memory I do not think the laboratory is addressed directly in any other of the work stream reports, but there may be side references to it, but the main one is in that work stream report that covers all the clinical areas.

ORAL

**NO. 2164 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

Can Government state whether there have been any previous incidents of a fire at KGV hospital in the last five years, and if so, how many and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2165 and 2166 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2165 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

Can Government state whether there have been any recommendations or reports from the fire service, regarding the installation of equipment for fire prevention or for dealing with the onset of a fire in KGV hospital, and if so, the dates in which such recommendations or reports were made?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2164 and 2166 of 2004.

**NO. 2166 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

Can Government state whether there have been any reports of previous incidents of fires at KGV Hospital, in the last five years, and as a result any recommendations of the action required were made from within the hospital administration?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

There have been no reported incidents of fire at the KGV in the last five years other than the incident on 3<sup>rd</sup> December, 2004.

In 1998 a review of fire systems at KGV Hospital was conducted by the City Fire Brigade. The report is dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 1998.

The City Fire Brigade and Independent Consultants Chubb Fire Security (Gibraltar) Ltd carried out independent different surveys throughout the GHA in June 2003 and January 2004 respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2164 TO 2166 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Were the recommendations of the City Fire Brigade in relation to KGV, were they accepted by the Government and introduced by the Government?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

In the immediate aftermath of the incident on 3<sup>rd</sup> December, GHA has taken immediate action to examine fire systems and the whole situation in regard to fire, not just in the KGV but also in other places in GHA. That review or that internal examination of systems is on-going and we are assessing what has been done in the past. The hon Member may appreciate that there may have been recommendations that say that there should be a fire extinguisher here, but that fire extinguisher may not be there but may be here, because someone has subsequently said put it somewhere else. An audit has been carried out to examine what the situation is today, and arising out of that audit there are a number of immediate actions that have been taken in the short term and longer actions that need to be taken in the longer term. That review is still on-going, the matter is sub judice by the Coroner, there is a

police investigation going on, there is a Fire Brigade investigation going on and the GHA itself, with its duty of care to patients and to staff, is carrying out its own investigation towards making sure its house is in order, and if it is not in order why it is not in order but it is premature for me to comment in this House on two aspects of it. One on the sub judice aspects of the case, which the hon Member is not asking about, and two on those aspects which are still under investigation internally. I do not have reports, I do not have the assessed situation in order to be able to answer minute questions. All I can say is that an immediate audit has been carried out in cooperation with the Fire Brigade, where things have been identified that need to be rectified they are being rectified immediately, in the immediate time frame, and where things have been identified that need to be remedied in the longer term, that is also being tackled.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

We are conscious that the recent incident is not something to be raised in this House until the full facts are known, but of course that does not alter what was the state of play before this incident occurred and whether in fact there was a report which was either acted upon or not acted upon. Not whether fire extinguishers had been a metre from the door or two metres from the door, but that would not require, would the Minister not agree, an audit of anything. Either there is a report somewhere which was considered and given effect to, or there is not. So (a) is there such a report?; and (b) has he been able to establish whether it was acted upon?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is exactly what I have said, there is a report dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 1998 which is not just one item saying move this table from here to there, it details a number of things. That is the investigation that is currently being carried out that has not yet been completed, looking at those recommendations and establishing what was done at the time, what was not done, if things were not done, and why they were not done if they were not done, and what needs to be done, and that is what is being established. I cannot answer the question because I do not have the information yet. I will be in a position to answer it at a later stage in a later House but until that investigation is completed internally, and I repeat that there are a number of people investigating, it would be pointless for me to speculate on inadequate information. I will not speculate until I have the full facts.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not asking the Minister to speculate. Presumably there are people who were there in 1998 when this report was made and who would be able to say either yes or no to a simple question like the one I am putting to the Minister. Has the Minister as Chairman asked that question? What happened with that report when it was made? Who did it go to? Was anything done or was it just sort of put to one side? That is all we are asking at this stage.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I understand the question and that is why the answer that I am giving is that it is not simply a question of saying the report says move the table and if so, who was told to

move the table and did he move the table. The report covers a wide number of things. There is an investigation going on at the moment identifying those individual recommendations and establishing if they were done, if they were not done, and why they were done or not done and I cannot answer at this moment in time until I have the results. It is not me carrying out the report, it is not me asking the question. Let me put it this way, the incident occurred at 3 o'clock or 2 o'clock in the morning, by 5 o'clock I was in St Bernard's Hospital and so were the senior management team, some of them had been there a lot before. Since then and with immediate effect the investigation started, within hours of the incident, and it is still on-going and I cannot answer the question because no one has given me a complete answer. It is not a simple question did some one move the table, the question is on all the recommendations in the report, and until those answers are given I am not in a position to provide the answers.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

With all respect to the Minister, he seems to have been contaminated by the illness that he accuses my hon Colleague of, that he listens to what I say and then he repeats the same thing as if I had said nothing. Well let me be more specific, can he say to whom the Fire Brigade addressed its report when it made it?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

To the Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, and there are no records in the Health Authority of whether the Chief Executive did anything with that report? Forget the audit of going to the hospital and finding out where the fire extinguisher is, I am not asking about that and I am not asking about the incident. I am asking if there is a report and it goes to a body, then presumably that body must have somewhere some written note, minute or record or something of what happened with the report after it was received. Is that something that the Minister is aware of or not?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It seems that I am not the only one who is catching the virus that the hon Lady opposite has. I have already answered that several times, that is what we are investigating. Of course there is a paper trail, of course if there is a report and it is addressed to the Chief Executive of the GHA and it says do this and that and this and that, of course there is a paper trail and that is what is being investigated, what the reports contains and what was done and how it was done. I cannot speculate on what the answer is because I do not have the facts, and until I have reports on what the facts are, the hon Member may shake his head all that he likes but if he thinks I am going to answer and either make up the answer or imagine it or try to foresee what the answer is going to be, I am not prepared to do that. I will give the answer in this House when I have the information. At this moment in time I do not have that information to be able to give a substantive answer. When I have it I will give it, I do not have it at this moment in time.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not asking the Minister for the voluminous answer that he will have eventually when the audit trail is complete. Just like I asked one specific question 'who did the report go to?', and he said the Chief Executive, then my second question was, 'is there a record whether the report was in fact ignored or action was initiated?' not the detail of the action but the policy reaction to the report.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That I can answer. I told the hon Member there is a paper trail, the report was obviously received, there are people who have exchanged correspondence on it and there is talk about what should be done or what should not be done, so yes, in that sense it was obviously accepted and it was obviously actioned. What is being investigated is the degree of the action.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, but the Minister confirms that action was taken then but he does not know exactly what it was or to what degree it complied with the recommendation, but he can confirm that there was a response and there was action.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I confirm at this stage that the report was received and that people were dealing with the report and that there was action taken. What the degree of the action, whether that action was one per cent or 99 per cent, until I see it written in front of me that says this is what was done and this is what was not done, if in fact some things were not done or some things were done, until I see that as an assessment by people who were doing the assessment I cannot circulate but the report reached GHA from the Fire Brigade saying do this and do that. What I do not know at this moment in time is exactly what was done or what was not done. I do not want to speculate, I do not have the information.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister also confirm that in fact he has said that there was no previous record of a report of a fire, so that report from the Fire Brigade was not as a follow-up to an incident. What was it a routine inspection? It was not prompted by an incident having taken place and the Fire Brigade having to attend, is that correct?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I honestly do not know the answer to that question. The question was have there been any fires in the last five years, there have not been any fires in the last five years but 1998 is obviously more than five years. I do not know whether the 1998 report was as a consequence of an incident or not. I remember hearing in conversations that there had been a previous incident some time in the past, more than five years previously, but that was not connected with this. Whether one thing followed the other or was as a consequence of the other I do not know.



ORAL

**NO. 2167 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV during the month of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 2168 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2168 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV during the month of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted into KGV during the months of October and November 2004.

**NO. 2169 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

Can Government confirm whether they have received any recommendations from the Clinical & Governance Audit team with regard to the KGV psychiatric unit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2169 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

This seems to conflict with the information that I was given by the previous Minister for Health, the Hon Dr Linares, who said that the audit would be looking at KGV and they would be making recommendations as regards KGV.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Instead of trying to catch the Minister out, the hon Member should phrase her questions more carefully. The question is 'have we received any recommendation?', and the answer is No Sir, as I said before, because this is part of the work service that looks at the clinical areas, that looks at the clinical reviews and the reports have not yet been received. The question is have the reports been received and the answer is no. If the hon Member wants to know if there has been a clinical review of the KGV psychiatric unit, then she should ask that and the answer to that is yes Sir, there has been and the Hon Dr Linares was right, but she should ask the question to which she wants the answer.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, if there has been then he has received it and that is my question. Can Government confirm whether they have received any recommendations from the Clinical & Governance Audit team with regard to the KGV psychiatric unit? That was my question.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The answer was no.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore I will ask the Minister, are the Government expecting then to receive any recommendations from the Clinical & Governance Audit team with regard to the KGV psychiatric unit?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The answer is as I said a little while ago, that it is a work stream which includes all the clinical areas which includes the KGV psychiatric unit, and there has been a clinical review of KGV, as my hon Colleague said last year or in a previous answer, and it is part of the work stream called 'clinical reviews' or whatever the title is, the recommendations of which have not yet been received by the Government. Please would the hon Member listen to the answer because it will come up again. There are other questions in the order paper that ask the same question, and anywhere where there is a clinical review the answer is the same. No, we have not yet received the review, we are not expecting to receive the clinical review, we are waiting for the recommendations of the Healthcare Development Team and we have not received the clinical recommendations from the Healthcare Development Team.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As usual the Minister always covers himself with the fact that everything that is wrong with the Health Services is going to be tackled by the Healthcare Development Team report. That is absolutely now, in my mind, correct when I say that whenever we ask the Government anything to do with the Health Services, they always go back and they always try to defend their position by saying '*well we have received it, or we are looking at it, or we will receive it and we will be looking at it*'. All I have said is a question that I have put saying 'can Government confirm whether they have received a recommendation?'. Now whether the Hon Dr Bernard Linares told me previously that they would be looking at it, well all that the Minister needed to say was yes Sir, they will be looking at it, they have not looked at it or they are looking at it and we will receive it in due time. That is all.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I will not be tempted into saying the same things that I have already said. The House has heard me and people listening on the radio will have heard me, that the question has been answered as asked, and then the supplementary has been answered when eventually it was asked by myself to myself and then repeated by the hon Member. What I cannot let go is the quip which the hon Member is so fond of making that the Government shield behind the Healthcare Development Report. The Government do not shield behind the Healthcare Report. The Government have had the guts, and I salute my Colleague the Hon Dr Linares for being the person to initiate it, he has had the guts to do what she was never prepared to do and what she never did when she was Minister, which is to examine the problems of the Health Service, which we all know existed both in her time, before her time and after her time, to tackle them in

depth, to look at them, and to be tackling them and to be solving them. She can pretend as much as she likes by throwing red herrings to the wind, as she does when she appears on television and she appears in interviews, the reality is that the Government are tackling the problem and the problem, as far as can be tackled, will be solved. It is no good for the hon Member now pretending she is not listening because that is what she usually does, and then she comes back with the same question, the Government are not hiding behind the report, the Government have had the guts to do the report, are accepting the recommendations, have accepted all of the recommendations that have been presented to date, are actioning the recommendations and whenever we say that we are actioning them, she then gets up and starts criticising what we are doing. When we have not yet done them or when we are about to do them, she gets up and criticises us for not doing it, and then she appears on television and says the Government are doing nothing. Well, the hon Member cannot have it each and every way. Either she accepts the fact that we have had the guts to do the report and that we are doing what needs to be done, or she does not. I know she does not like it but that is what is happening. What she cannot do is in one breath criticise us for saying the Health Services has problems, then to criticise us for employing experts to tackle it, then to criticise us for solving it by saying we are spending too much money in solving it, and then presumably when we start implementing the recommendations, she will change her tack as she does in other subjects, and she will be criticising us allegedly for taking too long to do it. She better make up her mind, either she wants the Health Services fixed or she does not and that is what the Government are doing, fixing it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister, if he wishes to get on his high horse, then I will remind him that they have been eight years in Government and when we were in Government I did not require experts from outside to come to pay them thousands and thousands of pounds to fix our Health Services. That is the difference between that Government and when we were in Government.

ORAL

**NO. 2170 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CONTRACT OFFICERS**

Can the Government confirm what salary Mr Frank McGurrin is being paid by the Gibraltar Health Authority, in view of the fact that they confirmed in answer to Question No. 1594 of the last meeting of the House, he was not a member of the Gibraltar Health Care Development Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2171 and 2172 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2171 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE UNIT**

Can Government confirm what is the actual value of the services being provided by Mr John Langan, through the Clinical Governance Unit, which is included in the overall cost to the Government of the Audit they have commissioned?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2170 and 2172 of 2004.

**NO. 2172 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PA TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Can Government confirm that a new post of personal assistant to Mr McCutcheon, new Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority, has been created?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 2170**

The cost to the Government of the employment of Mr F McGurrin was £57,451.75p. Mr McGurrin returned to the UK on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2004 on termination of his employment.

**Answer to Question No. 2171**

Mr John Langan was on contract directly to the Modernisation Agency of the NHS and not to the Government or to the GHA. The cost of his services are therefore included in the overall cost to the Government of the contract with the Modernisation Agency.

**Answer to Question No. 2172**

A post of Personal Assistant to the Chief Executive has not been created. However, the administrative support for the new executive team has not yet been finalised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2170 TO 2172 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Minister for Health mentions the figure of £57,451 in relation to Mr Frank McGurrin, who he says left on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2004, can he actually say for what period the £57,451 is related to?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

From 1<sup>st</sup> April to 8<sup>th</sup> December of this year.



**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If, as the Minister said in answer to Question No. 1594, that he was not a Member of the audit, how was he recruited?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

By the Modernisation Agency.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Modernisation Agency, the first time we hear about this, is related to what, a UK modernisation agency?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, the hon Member may be misunderstanding my answer. The Modernisation Agency is the part of the NHS which is contracting the Healthcare Development Team. It is a department, or a section, I do think I have used the words 'modernisation agency' before but I may not. To be clear, the Healthcare Development Team are part of the Modernisation Agency, which itself is part of the NHS, and when I say by the modernisation agency, technically I think I am right but it may be that they were contracted by the Healthcare Development Team rather than the Modernisation Agency. The point is that it is not the Government or the GHA.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So Mr Frank McGurrin was paid £57,451 for a period of eight months, am I correct?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

From 1<sup>st</sup> April to 8<sup>th</sup> December, whatever that period of time is in minutes, hours, days, weeks or months.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is that after tax or before tax?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The cost to the Government of the employment of Mr McGurrin was £57,000. Whether that was before tax or after tax I would need notice of the question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can he not say what is the cost as regards the services being provided by Mr John Langan?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have already answered that question.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

But he has not said the cost so he has not answered it.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have already answered the question in my original answer. He was not employed by the Government or by the GHA.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, and if he was employed by the GHA the Government must know what the cost is.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The Government contracted the Modernisation Agency who provided the Healthcare Development Team. The Healthcare Development Team does not consist of Mr Langan, it consists of a number of people. The numbers have shrunk and grown, or grown and shrunk over the period they have been here. They have included Mr Langan. The Government contracted the services of the Modernisation Agency for a lump sum, and that includes all the staff that they have decided to bring with them of their own choice.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So what the Minister is saying is that even though they contracted the services of the Clinical Governance Unit, they do not know what is the cost to the Government of the services of Mr Langan?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is not a cost to the Government. The cost to the Government is the contract of the Healthcare Development Team, which has been disclosed in this House in answer to previous questions. I cannot remember whether there are any in this particular order paper, there have been numerous questions on what the contract is costing, that includes the cost of Mr Langan plus all the other people who make up the Healthcare Development Team. It does not consist of one or two bodies, it consists of a number of bodies and that number has been changing as, for example, when the clinical reviews were being done, they have included more people who have been brought in to do the clinical review, and his costs are included in that overall sum. It is not an identifiable individual cost as the others or not, it is part of the overall contract.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Perhaps the hon Gentleman can help us in this respect. What has been the tax treatment of any of those individuals who have been providing services in Gibraltar pursuant to that contract? For example, are they Category 3 or Category 4 individuals, like the new individual who has now been contracted?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not know the answer to that question, I would need notice of that question. It is not within my remit to enquire as to the tax position of the individuals who make up the Healthcare Development Team. I honestly do not know the answer to that question. Thinking about it, I suspect that it may have a UK tax element to this but I do not know I am speculating and I should not. This is a contract with the Healthcare Development Team. It is not payment to individuals.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

My understanding is that it is very much a Gibraltar tax, if somebody is providing services to Gibraltar and is earning monies in Gibraltar, earning an identifiable portion of monies which is what this debate is about, but certainly I have to accept his answer that he does not know what it is and that we should give notice of it. I am sure we will for the next time.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It is a matter for the tax authorities and not for me.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

With respect, in relation to that latest intervention, we were provided with the information in relation to the new contract but we were told that the individual would be, I think, Category 4 in relation to the three-year period. It is that type of question that we will want an answer to when we give notice of it.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, it is a different situation altogether. The contracts of Dr McCutcheon and the other new members of the GHA, I think they were Category 2 and not Category 4 but again I am treading on areas that are outside my remit.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

They are Category 2.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Then let us forget it is Category 2. It is not.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Unless they are paid £2 million.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, it might be Category 3 but it is not an area that I am very familiar with, I bow to the hon Member's expertise on that rather than mine, but the new members who are now being recruited are on a different arrangement. They are directly recruited, directly employed and directly contracted by the GHA and are being paid by the GHA. In the case of the other people who have come, the Government have been paying a lump sum to a corporate entity. How that corporate entity rewards its employees.....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

As far as Question No. 2172 is concerned, I recall that the Minister said that the new post of Personal Assistant to Mr McCutcheon, who is the new Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority, has not yet been created. That is what he said.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, has she said 'has not yet been created' or 'has not been created'?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Not yet been created. That is what I heard the Minister saying.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, that is not what I said. What I said was that the post has not been created. However, the administrative support for the new executive team, not just Dr McCutcheon but for the whole of the new executive team, has not yet been determined. So, it has not been created yet but I am not saying it will not be created. It may be created or it may not be created, but at this moment in time the strict answer to her question is no, it has not been created.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the Minister has mentioned the support team, are we talking about that the Government could actually employ more people than one as a support team, because if he has mentioned support team we are talking about more than one individual? Is that the possibility that could arise in the future?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Let us get the words right. I have not used the words 'the support team', the words that I used were 'however the administrative support for the new executive team has

not yet been finalised'. Now, that means exactly what it says, the new executive team which consists of three people, at the moment we are still juggling on what the support will be. In some cases the offices that they are moving into may already have, and in one case has, administrative support and does not need any more. In others it may need reshuffling of existing resources and in others it may mean employing new resources. Maybe in one, maybe in more than one, I do not know, that is being assessed at the moment. Now she will come back and ask me 'have the Government now decided whether how many.....' and when she asks me the next time round I will give her the answer as it is at that moment in time.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, he can mock me and he can make fun of whatever he wants to make fun of but if he actually says things in this House and he says that the Government have not yet decided and that there might be or there might not be administrative support, then obviously it is my duty as an Opposition Member, does he not agree, in the next House of Assembly meeting to come and say 'well what has happened?'. That is normal as far as an Opposition is concerned.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have no quibbles with the hon Member doing her thing or her duties as an Opposition Member in whatever way she thinks fit. What I am resigned to, and that is why I was pulling her leg, is that knowing her style she will now enter into her computer the words of the question which will now reappear whenever she presses the return button of the computer, for the next few Houses of Assembly the question will regurgitate itself and the question will be 'has the Government, or has the GHA, or has the Government now decided what administrative support it will apply?' and I am saying to her that I am resigned to that question being asked for the next couple of Houses or until such time as the answer is given, because I look back on the record and the hon Member has asked so many questions today and over 50 per cent of them are exactly the same words that she was asking, not just the Hon Dr Linares but that she was asking the Hon Keith Azopardi before. It is just the same words with the dates changed.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I mean as far as I am concerned I give up with him, but I have to keep on asking.

**NO. 2173 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items, and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting periods 5, 6 and 7 of 2004, in respect of which £2.50p per item was paid by patients to the dispensing pharmacists?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2174 to 2180 of 2004.

**NO. 2174 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items, and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS prescriptions for accounting period 8 of 2004, in respect of which £2.50p per item was paid by patients to the dispensing pharmacists?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2173 and 2175 to 2180 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2175 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods 5, 6 & 7 of 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2173, 2174 and 2176 to 2180 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2176 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting period 8 of 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2173 to 2175 and 2177 to 2180 of 2004.

**NO. 2177 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods 5, 6 & 7 of 2004/2005 as a result of their having increased prescriptions charges from £1.20p to £2.50p?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2173 to 2176 and 2178 to 2180 of 2004.

**NO. 2178 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for period 8 of 2004/2005 as a result of their having increased prescription charges from £1.20p to £2.50p?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2173 to 2177, 2179 and 2180 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2179 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50p for the accounting periods 5, 6 & 7 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2173 to 2178 and 2180 of 2004.

**NO. 2180 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50p for the accounting period 8 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

The hon Member should note that the information supplied is only in respect of complete periods where all pharmacists have submitted their accounts.

**Answer to Question 2180**

**Answer to Questions 2173 & 2174**

| PERIOD | PRESCRIPTIONS | ITEMS | COST        |
|--------|---------------|-------|-------------|
| 5      | 5416          | 13384 | £172,823.51 |
| 6      | 6162          | 16475 | £222,760.61 |
| 7      | Incomplete    |       |             |
| 8      | Incomplete    |       |             |

**Answer to Questions 2175 & 2176**

| PERIOD | PRESCRIPTIONS | ITEMS | COST        |
|--------|---------------|-------|-------------|
| 5      | 12266         | 43650 | £515,749.79 |
| 6      | 14112         | 53435 | £649,258.12 |
| 7      | Incomplete    |       |             |
| 8      | Incomplete    |       |             |

**Answer to Questions 2177 & 2178**

When the prescription charges were amended, the Government made all medicines free for pensioners and additionally, after charging only for the first three items on the prescription, supplies all further medicines free of charge.

It is not possible to calculate the extra revenue raised within any degree of accuracy but it is estimated to be in the region of £11.5k for periods 5 and 6 of 2004/2005. Periods 7 and 8 are incomplete.

**Answer to Questions 2179 & 2180**

| 2004/2005 | Items      |
|-----------|------------|
| Period 5  | 3117       |
| Period 6  | 4295       |
| Period 7  | Incomplete |
| Period 8  | Incomplete |

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2173 TO 2180 OF 2004**

### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is a bit difficult to digest the information when I have been handed an answer to nine questions all in one go, but would the Minister not agree that the items, as far as Question Nos. 2173 and No. 2174 are concerned, have steadily been increasing and obviously therefore the cost?

### **HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have to say that I have utterly no sympathy for the hon Member's stomach or difficulties of digestion. I have offered to supply the hon Member with these figures on a periodic basis outside Question Time of this House so that she has the time to digest them and then she can come back and ask supplementary questions at leisure. It will save a lot of the time of this House and it would make the proceedings much more productive, from her point of view, because she would be able to ask as many supplementary questions as she wanted. However, to deal with the second part of her answer I do not have the comparative data in front of me so I cannot comment on her supplementary. If indeed she is right and the number of items is increasing it is obvious from that that the cost would be higher, and she asked me why and speculating, which I should not do, but from pure speculation if she is right it is obvious that there are a number of reasons. Firstly, on the increase of items is that demographically the population is increasing at the higher levels of age, there are more older people alive now than 20 years ago and those older people are living longer and they obviously take more medicines and more drugs than they tend to do when they are younger. It may also be due to the prescription habits of individual GP's where some GP's prescribe more and others prescribe less, and that changes over a period of time. Thirdly, that the costs have gone up is obviously due to two reasons. (1) If she is right and there are more items, then it follows de facto from simple arithmetic that the total costs will be higher, but it also follows that because the cost of drugs increases year by year, even if the numbers remain static, the costs themselves would increase.

### **HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, it seems that I do my homework more than what the Minister does because I have got all my figures here and I have spent hours analysing the statistics and I think that it is only fair to say that the Government and the Minister for Health should take an interest and should know what is happening as far as the policies that they have implemented, more so in relation to the £7.50p which people are now paying for items and after which they are free. Therefore, I would urge the Minister to do the exercises that I have done and he will see that the policy of having introduced the three items which pay a total of £7.50p and after which the patients do not require to pay for them, has had the opposite effect of what the Government intended to do originally, which is when they said in this House that they were increasing prescription charges to stop the so-called abuse of the system, and here we are with a Government who have introduced a system where people are only obliged to pay for three items after which everything else, apart from the three items, is free of charge. Therefore would the Minister not agree that if the items have increased it has been because the Government have introduced a system which has failed them?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

What the Minister certainly agrees is that the electorate did not agree with the hon Member, who was predicating exactly that line during the last Election and obviously people did not believe her and did not take it into account. Be that as it may, the Minister takes a very great interest in the situation as regards prescriptions, especially because what is my concern is the total turnover in prescribed drugs and the cost to the GHA and to the Government, and that is where the Minister takes an interest and that is where the GHA take an interest. If the hon Member is patient, so that I can give her more information so that she can have more questions for the next time round, if the hon Member has patience and waits for the various work streams to come on stream, she will find that there is one which deals specifically on prescriptions and where we are doing exactly that. Examining not because she has brought it up but because two years ago when the works started, it would have been identified in the diagnostic report and it is part of the work streams and we are looking at prescription habits of individual doctors, how pharmacists dispense their drugs and quite a number of associated issues. Not the bee in her bonnet that the hon Member has, which she may or may not be right, I am not saying that she is not. She may or may not be right on the capping of the £7.50p but that is only one item on which she has the bee in her bonnet and she asks 10 or 15 questions in every House of Assembly. What we are looking at is the overall prescription picture and how that can be brought down whilst at the same time maintaining the service and giving people the drugs that they need without any restrictions on the prescription of those drugs. That is what we are doing and that is what needs to be addressed, not one little item in the whole menu.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The one item that I have brought to the attention of the Government and having heard the Minister talking about the three items which pay a total of £7.50p, therefore what he has just said to me confirms that what I have said in this House previous to the hon Member being Minister for Health, and now according to the figures that I am getting confirms that we have been right, that the policy has failed. Not only has their policy failed the Minister is saying that they are going to look at the overall question of prescriptions, which then confirms to me that the figures that he has been providing plus his predecessors, confirm that the items that are above the three which pay a total of £7.50p have been increasing considerably, because now we have had two different policies and now with the present Minister for Health can he say why they are looking at the overall policy of the question of prescriptions? Why?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have already answered.



ORAL

**NO. 2181 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the Pharmacists as dispensing fees from 19<sup>th</sup> July 2004 to end of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2182 to 2186 of 2004.

**NO. 2182 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the Pharmacists as dispensing fees from 19<sup>th</sup> July 2004 to end of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2181, 2183 and 2184 to 2186 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2183 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government confirm how much has been paid to Pharmacists for periods 5, 6 & 7 of 2004/2005, as a result of the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2181, 2182 and 2184 to 2186 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2184 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government confirm how much has been paid to Pharmacists for period 8 of 2004/2005 as a result of the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2181 to 2183 and 2185 and 2186 of 2004.

**NO. 2185 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to Pharmacists for the periods 5, 6 & 7 of 2004 and the comparable figure for the same periods in the previous year in respect of £1.80p per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2181 to 2184 and 2186 of 2004.

**NO. 2186 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to Pharmacists for period 8 of 2004, and the comparable figure for the same period in the previous year in respect of £1.80p per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

The hon Member should note that the information supplied is only in respect of complete periods where all pharmacists have submitted their accounts.

**Answer to Question 2186 of 2004**

**Answer to Questions 2181 and 2182**

|          |            |
|----------|------------|
| Period 5 | £78,570.00 |
| Period 6 | £96,183.00 |
| Period 7 | Incomplete |
| Period 8 | Incomplete |
| Period 9 | Incomplete |

**Answer to Questions 2183 & 2184**

|          | <b>15% Importation</b> |
|----------|------------------------|
| Period 5 | £67,271.71             |
| Period 6 | £84,685.84             |
| Period 7 | Incomplete             |
| Period 8 | Incomplete             |

**Answer to Questions 2185 & 2186**

|          | <b>2004</b>                 | <b>2003</b>                 |
|----------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|          | <b>25 July – 10 October</b> | <b>27 July – 12 October</b> |
| Period 5 | £78570.00                   | £80,960.40                  |
| Period 6 | £96183.00                   | £75,857.40                  |
| Period 7 | Incomplete                  | £84,340.80                  |
| Period 8 | Incomplete                  | £84,475.80                  |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2181 TO 2186 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Minister has just said that the Government would be looking at the overall question of prescriptions, is he also saying that they will be looking at the deal or agreement that they have with the pharmacists as regards the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines, because when we look at the figures we have seen from 1999 to 2003/2004 that there has been an increase of about £100,000 average in every financial year? Is he saying that they will also be looking at the agreement that they have with the pharmacists in view of the increases that have occurred from these years?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The word 'overall' in the English language has an obvious meaning, and that means everything in the context in which I answered the question and to which the hon Member is referring.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the Minister not accept that the figures which I have here in front of me which he has provided, that the 15 per cent addition to the cost of the medicines has increased dramatically to the tune of what I have said is £100,000 average every year?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Fifteen per cent of a certain number is bound to get bigger if the number gets bigger, and we established in the previous question that the number was getting bigger so it follows that the 15 per cent must also increase.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The fact that it is getting bigger, are the Government saying that they are satisfied that it is getting bigger?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore, will the Minister confirm whether the agreement with the pharmacists has a review date?



**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not know, I would need notice of that question, I do not know if it has a review date.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see, but when the Minister said he was looking at it overall he meant the overall and therefore he does not know whether the agreement with the pharmacists has a review date or not.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is a non sequitur if ever I have heard one. This Minister has said several times already that he is looking at the overall prescription situation to see how it can be improved for everybody, the pharmacists, the patients and the GHA and that means that we can make savings, which I am sure we can, because there are obvious areas where without taking away any medicine that is necessary for anybody, savings should be made. I am sure that savings can be made but then to link it to whatever she linked it that I have now forgotten, was completely uncorrected. That is what the Minister is saying, we are looking at everything and that everything is everything.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I cannot understand why the Minister says he is ignorant of the fact whether there is a review date or not when I have actually asked a specific question about the pharmacists and about the conditions in relation to the agreement that they have. All I am saying is, and I think the Minister should know or perhaps if he does not know perhaps he will inform me either through a letter or later in this meeting of the House, all I am saying is whether he knows when the review date of the agreement with the pharmacists is when, in a year's time, two year's time? That is all I am asking.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Okay, what I am answering is that I do not know if it has a review date, that it is not the subject of the question, that I need notice of the question and that if the hon Member wants to know then she has various courses open to her. She can wait until the next House and ask me the question again, phrased in a different way or ask me a different question, or she can write to me and ask me but this is not the subject of the question, it has nothing to do with dispensation of medicines, specifically what the review date is I do not know because I have not had notice of the question. If she wants to know she should write to me as she does so often and I will provide her with the information. I have already said that I do not think it has a review date, at least no one has told me that it has a review date.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will be writing to the Minister as I have just said, but when he says that he does not think that there is a review date, what does it mean that the agreement with the pharmacists have been made for how many years? Does the Minister for Health

know how long the agreement with the pharmacists has been made for? That is what I am asking, if he does not know, fine I will write to him and he can give me the information later.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Good, I look forward to the letter.

**NO. 2187 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Can the Government now confirm whether they know what the staff composition will be of the Pain Clinic once it is transferred to the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The position is as stated in answer to Question No. 1548 of 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2187 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Which is that the Government are not sure yet. Is that correct?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, it means that the situation is as given in answer to Question No. 1548 of 2004. It was actually answered together with Question No. 1549 and the answer is on the answer to Question No. 1549.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes, and what I am saying is that the answer to Question No. 1548 is that the Government were still not sure.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member seems to have a different answer to the one that I have in front of me. It says nothing about not being sure in mine.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So what does the Minister's answer to Question No. 1548 say?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am very tempted to say what used to be said to me when I was on the Opposition side of the House, that that is a public document and it has already been given to her, and when she asked the Question she was given a copy of the answer. So why is she asking me what the answer is? That is what I used to be told but as I criticised the treatment so I will have the grace, if she smiles again, I will have the grace to tell her what the answer was in Question No. 1548 because I have no difficulty in giving her the answer. So see, although she was claiming before that she does her homework, obviously she has not done her homework if she does not know what the answer was to Question No. 1548, why is she asking the question again? But I will give her the answer. The hon Member will be delighted to hear that as part of the ongoing work of the Healthcare Development Team there have been reviews of the clinical services but not all these have been presented to the Government. Government are therefore not currently in a position to confirm the exact staffing position after transfer to the hospital. However, the Government are pleased to confirm that facilities have been made available in the Europort building to accommodate the Pain Clinic which will transfer together with all the other services. That is what was said and that is the answer, that the Pain Clinic will be transferred and that it will be transferred with the staff that it has. I fail to see the question whether we know what the staff composition will be. The staff composition will be what the staff composition is at the moment subject to any recommendations that the Clinical Reviews produce in the future. That is the answer put pure and simply.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That is precisely why I am asking the question, because he said subject to any recommendations and all I wanted to know was whether they had received the recommendations which would change the composition.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I said half an hour ago that we would come to another question where I would have to say that we still did not have the recommendations from the Clinical Review, and we do not have the recommendations on the Clinical Review and there will be other questions where the answer will be the same. The Pain Clinic will transfer with its staff as it is at the moment and subject to recommendations that we may or may not receive, subject to recommendations that we may or may not accept, the staff will change or might not change, but at the moment it will move with its staff to Europort. There is no magic in it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it not a fair question to say 'why have the Government not been able to coordinate the receipt of the recommendations before the transfer to the new facilities so that entry into the new facilities can be on the back of the implementation of those new recommendations?'. Is there a specific reason for that other than gross inefficiency?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Well that assumes there is gross inefficiency which obviously there is not. The answer is very simple because it is two separate processes. The new hospital is one process and the Clinical Review Team is another one. In an ideal world, I share the principle of what the hon Member is saying do not get me wrong, I have said myself when I took over the job I have said and I have said it more than once, 'I wish there was a years separation between one and the other'. I am not quite sure which is ideal to come first because both can be argued but it would have been preferable to have had a years separation either to settle into the new hospital before getting the results of the Clinical Review, or vice versa but we are where we are. The hospital has extended, the termination date has extended, the Clinical Review is on course and the two have, to my mind not fortunately, coalesced, but that is where we are and there is nothing I can do to change that.

**NO. 2188 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MOD PERSONNEL**

Can the Government state whether they have been approached by the Ministry of Defence in order to explore the possibility of their personnel being able to access services provided by the Gibraltar Health Authority when St Bernard's Hospital is transferred to the Europort Building?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No proposals have been made either to Government or the GHA.

ORAL

**NO. 2189 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can Government confirm what has been the expenditure for study leave, up to the end of October 2004, which is included in sub-head 30, School of Health Studies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2190 and 2191 of 2004.

**NO. 2190 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether the figure of £150,000 he provided in answer to Question No. 1558 of 2004, as being the amount budgeted for this financial year, regarding study leave, relates only to medical practitioners or it also relates to the School of Health Studies, something he said he would look into at the last meeting of the House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2189 and 2191 of 2004.



ORAL

NO. 2191 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can Government confirm what has been the expenditure for study leave, up to the end of November, which is included in sub-head 30, School of Health Studies?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question 2191 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2189**

The expenditure for study leave up to the end of October 2004 was £58,360.70

**Answer to Question 2190**

The expenditure for study leave includes all staff within the Health Authority both clinical and non-clinical grade.

**Answer to Question 2191**

The Expenditure for study leave up to the end of November 2004 was £61,094.70

**NO. 2192 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can the Government state whether users of the Primary Care Centre experience delays when making appointments over the telephone?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Telephone lines for appointments are open from 8.30 am straight through to 3.00 pm. The many callers seeking appointments tend to do so during the first half of the morning and this causes unavoidable delays. The GHA is very aware of this situation and the whole process of booking an appointment at the Centre has been reviewed in work stream number 7 of Phase II of the Healthcare Development Programme. This work stream has made a number of recommendations regarding ways to improve the appointments process. A period of consultation is now under way with staff of the GHA and User Groups.

ORAL

**NO. 2193 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can the Government confirm the number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the year 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2194 to 2200 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2194 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre during the month of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2193 and 2195 to 2200 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2195 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can Government state what was the total number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre during the month of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2193, 2194 and 2196 to 2200 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2196 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can Government state how many house-calls were attended to by Health Centre doctors during the month of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2193 to 2195 and 2197 to 2200 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2197 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NUMBER OF HOUSE CALLS**

Can Government state how many house-calls were attended to by Health Centre doctors during the month of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2193 to 2196 and 2198 to 2200 of 2004.



**NO. 2198 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre during the month of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2193 to 2197, 2199 and 2200 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2199 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can Government state what was the total number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre during the month of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2193 to 2198 and 2200 of 2004.

**NO. 2200 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

In view of erroneous statistics given in this House, can the Government confirm the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the years 2001, 2002 and 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question 2200**

**Answer to Question 2193**

GP attendances

90965

**Answer to Question 2194, 2195, 2198 & 2199**

| <b>DEPARTMENT</b>  | <b>OCTOBER</b> | <b>NOVEMBER</b> |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Audiology          | 385            | 147             |
| Dietician          | 90             | 83              |
| Clinic Sister      | 2320           | 1637            |
| School Health      | 298            | 283             |
| Speech & Language  | 224            | 209             |
| Mental Welfare     | 206            | 170             |
| GP Clinic          | 8276           | 8605            |
| Dental             | 1352           | 1658            |
| Child Welfare      | 774            | 793             |
| Nurse Practitioner | 332            | 338             |
| Dermatologist      | 185            | -               |
| Orthopist          | 114            | 121             |
| Optometrist        | 121            | 86              |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>15110</b>   | <b>14653</b>    |

**Answer to Question 2196 & 2197**

**House Calls**

October 433

November 523

Cont.

**Contd Answer to Question 2200 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2200**

Out-patient attendances PCC

| <b>Clinics</b>               | <b>2001</b> | <b>2002</b> | <b>2003</b> |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>GP Clinics</b>            | 91673       | 91615       | 90965       |
| Nurse Practitioner           | -           | 1373        | 6062        |
| Dermatologist                | -           | 28          | 229         |
| Dietitian                    | 727         | 897         | 863         |
| Dr Higgs (Special Clinic)    | -           | -           | 88          |
|                              |             |             |             |
| <b>Eye Department</b>        |             |             |             |
| Orthoptist (Deidre)          | -           | 1050        | 1453        |
| Optometrist (Isabella)       | -           | 42          | 799         |
|                              |             |             |             |
| <b>Child Welfare Clinic</b>  |             |             |             |
| Clinics                      | 9373        | 9937        | 8645        |
|                              |             |             |             |
| <b>School Health Service</b> |             |             |             |
| Immunisation Clinic          | 7915        | 8853        | 4636        |
|                              |             |             |             |
| <b>Nursing Duties</b>        |             |             |             |
| Nursing Clinics              | 9053        | 12206       | 13333       |
|                              |             |             |             |
| <b>Dental Department</b>     |             |             |             |
| Dental Clinics               | 15912       | 14358       | 16406       |
|                              |             |             |             |
| <b>Speech and Language</b>   |             |             |             |
| Clinics                      | 2027        | 2338        | 3153        |
|                              |             |             |             |
| <b>Mental Welfare</b>        | 1102        | 1085        | 1093        |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2193 TO 2200 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Minister agree with the findings in the Healthcare Development Report that there is a 2 per cent compound annual growth rate as far as the number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the year 2003?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

As has been said before in this House, the Minister does not have to agree or disagree with the contents of the diagnostic report, which is the work of the Healthcare Development Team on which the 20 work streams are based.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Does the Minister not know, has he not actually looked at the figures and seen that there is indeed a 2 per cent compound annual growth rate?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Not lately, no, my reading material has consisted of other things but if she claims that that is what the Healthcare Development Team did it says, then I presume it is correct. That is what they said, I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of their calculators.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So he agrees with them then?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is not what I said.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, if he always starts to mention the fact that there is being a review and that the Healthcare Development Team is looking at it, if they come up with a statement then he either agrees or disagrees with them.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have said it before and I will say it again, the diagnostic report is not a recommendation to the Government, it is an analysis done by the Healthcare Development Team. I do not have to agree or disagree and this is something that goes back to my first Question Time when she asked 50 questions or thereabouts, all on the diagnostic report and we told her very clearly that the diagnostic report was

not a report of recommendations, it is the basis of an analysis on which the Phase 2 work has been carried out and it is not up to me to tell the hon Member whether I agree with any part of that report or whether I do not. What the Minister and the Government have to agree with is the recommendations emanating from the Phase 2 work streams that are based on that report. The report is a gathering of evidence and it is done by the Healthcare Development Team, and I have said it before and I apologise if I am being repetitive.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am not asking the Minister to agree with recommendations. This is not a recommendation from the Healthcare Report team, this is a statement that they are making that there is a 2 per cent compound annual growth rate in June 2003. Will he agree with that assessment? I am not saying that whether he agrees with the recommendation or not, I know full well what the Government have done with previous reports whether they agree or they do not agree with the recommendations, of course sometimes they will agree and sometimes they will not. We know, we have seen it in the past, all I am saying is whether he agrees that there has been a 2 per cent compound annual growth rate, that is all, I am not telling him to agree with the recommendation, I have not said anything about the recommendations.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have already answered the question and I do not intend to say anything else on the matter.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

He has not answered it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

With respect, I understand that the Minister is saying we as a Government have not gone through this part of the report and decided whether we agree or whether we do not agree with it, we have asked them to go on to the second stage which is to provide its recommendations where we will make a recommendation by recommendation of whether we agree with them or not, but I think that it is fair for the Minister to be asked a specific question in relation to a specific statement which arises in the first part of the Clinical Governance review and to ask him in this House whether in relation to that particular statement the Government agrees or disagrees with a particular remark. I understand that they did not want to take a position yea or nay in relation to the whole of the report but I think it is fair to direct their attention to one particular remark and to ask them what their view on it is.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Certainly whether it is fair or not fair is a different thing altogether but that it is certainly in the right of the Opposition Member to ask whatever she likes. The position which I have taken, and which I have taken before and which I will take again, is that the Minister or the Government do not have to form an opinion and that

is what I have said. Asking me the question three times, as the hon Lady has said asking me the question three times, will not make me change the answer. If that was the view of the Healthcare Development Team, fine, that was the view but there is no reason why the Government should take a view on any aspect of it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Question No. 2200 says, 'In view of the erroneous information that has been given in the House, can the Government confirm the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the years 2001, 2002 and 2003?'. If the Government look at the answers that have been given in the House they will see that I have been given for 2003, which is the figure that I have here with me which I have simply added very quickly, is 152,397 and if they care to look at the Abstract of Statistics, which since I have pointed out to them all the different figures that have appeared in contrast to what has been given to me in this House and what has appeared in the Abstract of Statistics, they will see the Abstract of Statistics gives a figure of 181,507 and therefore I would ask the Minister to look and to see which is the correct figure.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

We have been down this road before and I do not intend to go back and check every single figure that the hon Member has been providing in the last 20 years that she has been in Opposition. If she feels that a figure is wrong in the information that has been provided then I invite her to write to me and to say 'I think this figure is wrong for this reason' as she did in the past, I will then investigate this figure and I will confirm to her whether the figure that I have given in this House or my colleagues have given in this House have been correct or not correct. I cannot answer for the Abstract of Statistics or for the Healthcare Development Team, if she feels a figure given in answer to a question by myself or one of my predecessors is incorrect, then I invite her to write to me and I will investigate that figure but I am certainly not going to in answer to a question say, well all the figures for the Primary Care Centre for the years 2001, 2002, 2003, carry out a massive checking of every single figure not without an indication of why I should. If she feels that a figure is wrong I will get it checked but not a blanket question to check every single figure.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It seems to me incredible that the Minister is sitting there and does not care whether the figures that he provides in this House are correct or not correct. Then when an Abstract of Statistics from the Government is published and I get a different answer with a different figure it seems to me incredible that the Minister is saying that I should carry out the exercise. It is his duty, he is on the Government side of the House, he is the Government, he is providing the figure to this House and what I am telling him is.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Point of order. The hon Lady and the hon Gentleman of course are free to debate statistics for as long as they like, but honestly on a point of order I do not see that the hon Lady having just heard the answer that she has had from the Minister, how she can retort by saying it is incredible that the Minister does not care if the information



that he gives in this House is wrong. The Minister far from making it clear that he does not care whether the information given is right or wrong has told the hon Lady the opposite. The Minister has said to the hon Lady if she believes that any information that he has given in this House, he or any of his predecessors, is wrong then please write to him and he will have the matter investigated. Now how does she deduce from that, given her obligation to be accurate in this House, how does she deduce from that that it is incredible that the Minister does not care about the accuracy of the information he gives in this House.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Very simple, because if I ask in this House what are the out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the years 2001, 2002 and 2003 and I get conflicting figures, and I find out, how is it that he does not find out himself?

**MR SPEAKER:**

May I express a view of this line of questioning? The hon Lady has asked a question to which an answer has been provided, the hon Lady is perfectly entitled to query any discrepancies which she observes in the answer, the Minister has certain options open to him. He can answer those queries if he can there and then, he can say 'I do not know' or he can say the gist of the answer is 'give me the opportunity and write to me pointing out exactly where you see discrepancies and I will have it looked into'. Up to that point I think we have all understood but I do feel that Question Times, in my limited experience here, often tends to develop into mini debates on issues, the view expressed by the hon Lady afterwards about not caring, it is not for me to take a view on caring or not caring but that really boils down to debating points rather than pursuing questions in supplementaries. I hope that assists both sides.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If the Minister provides a figure for me in the House for the year 2003, does he not check that that figure coincides with the figures given in the Government Abstract of Statistics which is totally different?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No, the hon Member for someone who has been a Minister in the past, seems to have an incredible lack of either memory or how things are done. The Minister is asked a question in the House by the hon Lady opposite, that question is then looked at by officials and the statistics produced. It is not checked with outside sources, it is produced by the GHA from within and the answer given and the answer that I have given today is a direct copy of answers that have been given in the past. She has asked me to confirm the figures for 2001, 2002 and 2003 and it is not that they have been re-calculated, it is that they have been copied from previous answers so I fail to see why she says there is a conflict. They are a direct copy of information provided in the past so therefore there is no conflict. If the hon Member thinks that the figures are inaccurate because they are not the same as figures she has seen elsewhere, then as my Colleague has said and I will say again for the last time, she can point out which figures she thinks may be wrong and I will get that particular figure checked and we will confirm or otherwise whether the previous answer was wrong or whether

it is not, but what I will not do is be invited and accept an invitation to check every single figure from time immemorial because the staff of the GHA have better things to do like looking after patients.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will write to the Minister because the figures that I have been given in the past do not coincide with the figures I have been given now in this House. So I will write to the Minister and I will also write to the Minister and give him the figures that appear in the Abstract of Statistics of the Government as well, which do not coincide either with this figure that I have been given today and the figures that I have been given previously, and I will write to him.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think, if I may, the one issue which remains outstanding is what happens in the circumstances when the Minister is written to, he diligently checks the figure and finds that the figure is wrong? He will inform his opposite number that the figure is incorrect but what happens then to the record in Hansard? I think we have to find a mechanism so that the record in Hansard is amended. Perhaps the easiest way may be for the Minister to copy his answer to the Chair and for the Chair to cause that to be included in Hansard. It is an issue which has come up before which is to ensure the figures are provided in Hansard. Where a Minister either through the mechanism of an Opposition Member writing to him or otherwise finds later that a figure provided in the House turns out to be incorrect, the Abstract of Statistics is another issue but where a Minister finds that an answer he has given in the House is incorrect and therefore that answer is in Hansard, I think it is fair to the public who may or may not wish to rely on that in future, to have something there which shows that that figure is incorrect and perhaps we should all apply our minds to how that happens.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Can not a suitably phrased question be put for Question Time for the next sitting of the House?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Perhaps that is the only way to deal with it.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Will the Minister confirm that the answer given under number so and so was wrong and that the true answer is so and so.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Perhaps.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I want to say this so that it goes on record. The figures that I have been given today as far as the out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre for 2003, given today by the Minister, is 147,725 and checking on the figures that I have been provided with in this House for 2003, the figure is 152,397. Then we go to the Abstract of Statistics and the figure for that year is 181,507, so therefore I will let him know and I will write to him and I will tell him that the figures are incorrect again.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Let me reiterate what I said before that I am not answerable for the Abstract of Statistics, I will answer for the accuracy of the figures that have been given and if the figures are wrong I will correct them as I did the last time and they went into Hansard but I will not go and check the Abstract of Statistics, let us be clear.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

What I have said in my intervention is not referring to the Abstract of Statistics but referring to the question which relates to 2003 which was provided to me by his predecessor and which he has provided to me today, and they are completely different.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Minister in a position to confirm whether the source of the information is the Abstract of Statistics is in fact the Health Authority or not? Normally, I have not looked at it myself, but normally in the Abstract it tells at the bottom where the information came from.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I suspect that it would be but we had this discussion the last time, first of all to say whether one is right and the other one is wrong one has to make sure that one is comparing apples to apples. For example, when we come to a question very shortly when the hon Member thinks she is asking one question and in fact she is asking another one. In this particular case if I had taken her questions literally, if we look at Question No. 2193 the hon Member asked me '*can the Government confirm the number of GP attendances at the Primary Care Centre?*'. Now that I have taken to mean and presumably because she has not challenged it, I have taken it to mean how many people go and see the doctors. It could also more properly be taken to mean how many doctors go into the Health Centre every day, so she should first of all make sure she phrases her questions correctly and secondly, if the Abstract of Statistics may not be providing the same basis for the calculation. That is the first thing that needs to be established and this happens in other questions.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No the Abstract of Statistics does not indicate the number of GPs that see patients in the Health Centre.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just hopefully wrap this up? If it were to be established, subject to that caveat, if it were to be established that three official sources provide a different statistic for the same variable, then it would be perfectly legitimate for the hon Lady to say 'look, these are three Government sources of information, the GHA Report, the Minister in the House and the Abstract of Statistics, now which of the three is right?'. That would be perfectly legitimate. What the hon Lady should not do is assume that the information given in answers in Questions is wrong. It might be the Abstract that is wrong, there may be a difference between her question and what the Abstract of Statistics says, there is a whole sort of possibilities, or one of the other sources that she is reading from may be wrong, but if it is established once she has written to the Minister if it is established that there are different figures given for the same thing exactly in three different Government sources, then the Government of course would accept not necessarily the Minister for Health because his question may be right, it may be the Abstract of Statistics that is wrong and that is not his responsibility, unless of course the source is the GHA in which case he is ultimately responsible but we first have got to establish in an objective way that there is actually a contradiction in the statistics that have been provided. I suggest that the hon Lady without getting up now to repeat her point which we all now understand, writes to the Minister and explains why she believes that the information is inaccurate and the Minister will investigate and if we establish that there is a contradiction between the statistics of course the Government have an obligation to clarify the situation, inside this House as well as in correspondence to the hon Member.

**NO. 2201 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government confirm whether the statistics given for the years 2001, 2002 and 2003, in connection with the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre also include all the departments as given in replies to Question Nos. 781 and 1553 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 2203 of 2004.

**NO. 2202 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – FRONTIER WORKERS**

Can Government state how many frontier workers are currently registered with the Primary Care Centre under the GPMS, and of these can they give a breakdown of Gibraltarians, Spanish nationals and other nationalities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

A total of 5369 frontier workers are registered with the Group Practice Medical Scheme as at 14 November, 2004. While it is theoretically possible to give a breakdown by nationality it would involve a disproportionate amount of administrative effort to obtain these statistics and provide the answer in the form requested by the hon Member because patient records are not classified by nationality.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2202 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are these records computerised?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Not yet.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it the case that frontier workers register when they obtain employment in Gibraltar and start paying social insurance, and does anything happen if they leave or is this a reflection of a historical position and not necessarily a current position?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It is exactly the question that I have asked myself and I am investigating.

**NO. 2203 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can the Government confirm why in answer to Question No. 1553 of 2004, there are no figures available for patients attending Physiotherapy at the Primary Care Centre, for the month of September and if the figure is now available can they provide it?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

I can confirm that the statistics that I have given the hon Member in answer to Question No. 2200 in connection with the total number of attendances includes statistics from all the departments of the Primary Care Centre.

With regard to the statistics provided with answer to Question No. 1553 of 2004, the hon Member may have realised that four of the rows contained data in respect of visits to the community and not in the Centre itself. These were house calls by GP's, District Nurses, Occupational Therapists and Physiotherapists.

In order to avoid any further confusion, I have limited the information in answer to Question No. 2200 to conform strictly to what has been requested without the additional information.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2201 AND 2203 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So this is where probably the explanation lies. If I get an answer to Question No. 781 where I have 13 departments of the Health Centre and then in answer to Question No. 1553 I get 18 departments, I get an extra five departments which were not included in answer to Question No. 781, but it surprises me that I should have house calls included in the out-patient attendances of the Primary Care Centre when always house calls have been the subject of another question.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is precisely what I am telling the hon Member, that in the last answer in answer to Question No. 1553, she was given information over and above what she was asking for and in order to avoid confusion in answer to Question No. 2200 now, I have restricted it to calls and departments and visits to the Health Centre and not to

those in the community. Therefore physiotherapists should never have been in in the first place and now they have been left out completely.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I suppose OT as well because that is the community as well?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have named the four departments. House calls by GP's, by District Nurses, by Occupational Therapists and by Physiotherapists.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Fine but am I getting the figures now?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

She has asked me to confirm whether the statistics include all departments as given in replies and the answer is yes, they include all departments. I am confirming it.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, but is the Minister saying then that I should subtract from Question No. 1553 the five departments that he is saying, house calls, physiotherapists and OT?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Can I suggest that the hon Member waits until she gets a written answer and then maybe she will follow it? Question No. 2201 is whether statistics given, she asked the question I do not have to read it, and similarly she has Question No. 2203. If I may I will repeat the answer because obviously she has not followed the answer. I will read the answer again. I can confirm that the statistics that I have given the hon Member in answer to Question No. 2200 a few moments ago, the list that she has in front of her, the schedule I have just given her.....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have not got it.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

In answer to Question No. 2200 a few moments ago I have given her the schedule. Of course she has got it, I have just given it to her. So I can confirm that that schedule contains the total number of attendances and it includes statistics from all the departments in the Primary Care Centre that she has always asked for. I have



eliminated the four departments that were put in by error in answer to Question No. 1553, so that she can compare with the previous answers that have been given.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will be writing to the Minister because they do not tally with previous answers. This is a nightmare. I remember the Minister's phrase when he said comparing apples with apples but here I am comparing apples that are rotten so I will write to him.

ORAL

**NO. 2204 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm how many non-entitled patients have been admitted to St Bernard's Hospital during the month of October of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 2205 of 2004.

**NO. 2205 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm how many non-entitled patients have been admitted to St Bernard's Hospital during the month of November of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Fourteen and eight non-entitled patients have been admitted to St Bernard's Hospital during the month of October 2004, and November 2004 respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2204 AND 2205 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When we are talking about non-entitled patients can consultants decide what fees they charge the non-entitled patients?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Private practice no longer exists in the Health Authority.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I see, then why are they not entitled?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

This is the months of October and November and private practice finished on 1<sup>st</sup> December.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So it means that from now on nobody is entitled to private practice.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well there is fee paying, but one pays the hospital not the doctor.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The hon Member should realise what non-entitled means. It is not the same as a private patient.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Exactly, a fee paying patient.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the statistics for December, let us see if we have understood the answer correctly, will be fee paying patients, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, as of 1<sup>st</sup> December nobody. If by the phrase 'private practice' what is meant is receiving treatment and paying a fee to the doctor, which is what most people understand by private practice, that will not happen after 1<sup>st</sup> December. There will continue to be non-entitled patients, not least in the Port visiting sailors, shippers and people of that sort, they will pay because they are not entitled to free care but they will pay the Health Authority not the doctor that delivers the treatment.

**NO. 2206 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can the Government confirm whether the figures they have given in reply to Questions in this House, in connection with out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital, for the years 2001, 2002, 2003, all include casualty and all out-patient clinics, and if not can the Government supply this information?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2206 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I will write to the Minister to give him different figures that I have been provided for different years in this House.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have not provided any figures. She has asked me whether they include casualty and out-patients and the answer is yes Sir, what different figures is she talking about?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That the figures do not tally, does the Minister not understand that? I would like to dwell on this Question No. 2206 because in fact the figures that I have got for 2000, 2001 and 2002 all relate to clinics and casualty, and from then on I am given clinics, A&E, Dressings and Physio, so of course they do not tally because I am being given different departments every time I ask the question.

ORAL

**NO. 2207 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

In view of certain erroneous statistics given in this House, can Government confirm the number of in-patient admissions at St Bernard's Hospital for the year 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2208 to 2211 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2208 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital during the month of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2207 and 2209 to 2211 of 2004.

**NO. 2209 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital during the month of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2207, 2208, 2210 and 2211 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2210 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital during the month of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2207 to 2209 and 2211 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2211 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital during the month of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question 2211**

**Answer to Question 2207**

In-patient admissions

| 2003      |      |
|-----------|------|
| January   | 542  |
| February  | 515  |
| March     | 542  |
| April     | 520  |
| May       | 518  |
| June      | 480  |
| July      | 499  |
| August    | 533  |
| September | 500  |
| October   | 496  |
| November  | 531  |
| December  | 509  |
| TOTAL     | 6185 |

**Answer to Question 2208**

In Patient Admissions  
528

Average No of patients  
155

**Answer to Question 2209**

In patient admissions

500

Average no of patients per day

151

**Answer to Question 2210**

|         | Clinics | A & E Clinic | A & E Dressing | Physiotherapy |
|---------|---------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| October | 1365    | 1826         | 519            | 708           |

**Answer to Question 2211**

|          | Clinics | A & E Clinic | A & E Dressing | Physiotherapy |
|----------|---------|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| November | 1386    | 1574         | 542            | 467           |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2207 TO 2211 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am afraid I will be have to write to the Minister again because on this occasion he coincides with the Abstract of Statistics, which is 6,185 regarding Question No. 2207 but in relation to Questions that have been given in this House previously, the figure is different which is 6,179, so I will write to him.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Much as I love receiving letters from the hon Member, I would ask her to note that during January and February I will have a little minor distraction like the moving to a new hospital, so she will forgive me if I do not give a lot of attention to her letters for a little while.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It does not matter because then if we have another meeting of the House I will put another question.

**NO. 2212 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – WAITING LISTS**

Can Government give details of the third review team recommendation which relates to the elimination of all surgical waiting list backlogs before the introduction of a scheduling system for planned surgery?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

To enable the implementation of a fully scheduled service for all planned surgery the backlog of patients currently on surgical waiting lists needs to be removed. This removal process is being managed in a variety of ways including the validation of all current waiting lists, the implementation of new theatre schedules and the recruitment of two Surgeons.

ORAL

**NO. 2213 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state how many private patients were seen to or treated at St Bernard's Hospital

- (a) as out-patients; and
- (b) as in-patients during the month of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2214 of 2004.

**NO. 2214 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state how many private patients were seen to or treated at St Bernard's Hospital

- (a) as out-patients; and
- (b) as in-patients during the month of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Ten private in-patients were treated in St Bernard's Hospital during the month of October 2004 and six during November 2004.

Numbers of private out-patients seen or treated during this period cannot be provided as this data is not available.

**NO. 2215 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – WAITING LISTS**

Can Government provide the latest comparable waiting lists for public and private patients covering all specialities, giving a breakdown of each, for both out-patients and in-patients, which also includes those who require surgical interventions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2216 of 2004.



**NO. 2216 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm what criteria they use for considering patients wanting to access our health services, to be considered as private patients?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 2216**

As from 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2004 no private medicine is being practised within the GHA. Patients who are neither entitled to receive free treatment under the provisions of any legislation nor of a reciprocal agreement which may be in force, may be charged a fee payable to the GHA.

**Answer to Question No. 2215**

With regard to the rest of the information requested by the hon Member with regard to waiting lists, this is set out in the schedule that I hand to her.

Answer to Question 2216 of 2004

Answer to Question 2215

OUTPATIENT PUBLIC & PRIVATE WAITING TIMES

| SPECIALITY          | CLINICS                                                                                           | SURGERY                                                                                          |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| OTORHINOLARYNGOLOGY | Adults 6 Weeks<br>Children 8 weeks.                                                               | Adults 24 Months.<br>Children 12 Months.                                                         |
| GENERAL SURGERY     | 20 Weeks.                                                                                         | Up to 1 Year depending on procedure.                                                             |
| GENERAL MEDICINE    | 7 to 9 Weeks.                                                                                     |                                                                                                  |
| PAEDIATRICS         | 3 Weeks.                                                                                          |                                                                                                  |
| OPHTHALMOLOGY       | 10 Weeks.                                                                                         | Routine Surgery 2 Months.<br>Cataract Surgery 6 Weeks.                                           |
| ELDEROLOGY          | 1 Weeks.                                                                                          |                                                                                                  |
| PAIN CLINIC         | 1 Week.                                                                                           |                                                                                                  |
| PSYCHIATRY          | 1 to 3 Weeks.                                                                                     |                                                                                                  |
| GYNAECOLOGY         | Urgent cases 1 Day<br>1 Week for cases requiring attention soon.<br>4 Weeks for routine cases.    | 1 week for urgent<br>3 weeks for cases requiring attention soon<br>12 weeks. for routine surgery |
| ORTHOAEDICS         | Urgent cases 1 day.<br>2 Weeks for cases requiring attention soon.<br>7 months for routine cases. | Waiting time for surgery varies 2 Weeks<br>depending on intervention.                            |

There is no waiting time for emergencies.

**NO. 2217 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DISTRICT COMMUNITY SERVICES**

Can the Government confirm, in view of the reply given by the Minister for Health in answer to Question No. 826 of 2004 and No. 1589 of 2004, that they intend to improve resources within the District Community Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

It is Government policy to improve all services to the public whenever and wherever possible. Whether this requires an improvement in resources is a matter that needs to be considered on a service by service basis.

In respect of the District Community Service, the Government will consider this as part of the many and varied changes that are already taking place within the health service as part of the overall review being carried out.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2217 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I take it that the famous review again is looking at this matter, but will the Minister not agree that he has actually said previous to this Question on the same matter, that the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Team uses international comparisons when looking at service provision and that this is not the same as making formal recommendations for change, but it simply adds to the debate. Therefore, what the Minister is saying is that when it suits them they say that the Healthcare Development Team has international comparisons and therefore does not apply to the manner in which they arrive at certain recommendations, and it is up to the Government to decide whether or not they accept the recommendation or not.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It does not mean that at all. If the hon Member has quoted two answers to two previous questions and she has chosen one, in answer to Question No. 826 and the position remains the same, I have told her that the present complement of the District Nursing team is able to handle the existing workload.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So if they are able to handle the existing workload it means that there is not going to be any change in the department.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is a statement not a question.

ORAL

NO. 2218 OF 2004

THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO

**GHA – ELECTIVE SURGERY**

Can Government state how many persons there are presently waiting for elective surgery in each speciality?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question 2218 of 2004**

The persons presently waiting for Elective Surgery in each speciality are:-

|                     |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| Ophthalmic          | 20  |
| Orthopaedic         | 404 |
| Gynaecology         | 44  |
| Otorhinolaryngology | 153 |
| General Surgery     | 129 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2218 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

When the Minister issued a press release on 27<sup>th</sup> July saying that patients were able to, with the consultants, agree on scheduling, that press release said that that would be done once the backlogs were eliminated. Seeing that there is here, especially in orthopaedics 404, does it mean that the scheduling will be able to be carried out irrespective of whether there is a backlog or not, because that is what the press release said?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Lady has just asked that and has had the answer in the answer to the previous question. Amongst the means being employed to remove the backlogs are, and therefore enabling scheduling to commence, obviously one cannot schedule people whilst there are still people waiting historically. So before scheduling gets off the ground, before current patients can be scheduled, one has got to get rid of the people who have been waiting there for months. It is already working quite well in gynaecology but in orthopaedics it cannot start until the second Orthopaedic Surgeon comes on stream and they both have access to more operating theatres, both of which come with the move to the new hospital now in February, at which stage the 404 figure will start to fall rapidly to the point where the scheduling can then commence in orthopaedics. But the scheduling has already started in gynaecology for example, and in ophthalmology.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore, what the Chief Minister is saying that when we look at ENT and we look at general surgery, the scheduling will not be able to start until the backlog is also eliminated but does it mean that there is only one at the moment and there is only one general surgeon, does it mean that the Government.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the Government had various options to eliminate this. We could have gone down the route that we used for ophthalmology which is basically to bring in this team of visiting surgeons to operate.....

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

A theatre is not needed.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, but that is different, it is simple, it did not need a theatre, it is a standard operation, it is a 20 minute intervention, after care is less important for these things. For general surgery and ophthalmology and I suppose ENT as well, we went the other way. We said better have permanent in-house resources but that requires a

second surgeon. There is no point in having a second surgeon until we have got more operating theatres, because at the moment they have not got enough access to theatre because they have got to share the theatre between all the operating disciplines. So once we have the new operating theatres and the surgery techniques started in the day surgery theatres that are also available in the new hospital, and the new second general surgeon has come, the scheduling system will begin. The scheduling system will not, if this is what she is getting at she is right, the scheduling system does not start from day one because from day one in the new hospital the first task is to beat down the historical waiting lists. When they are under control then one can kick off with the scheduling as has already happened in the two disciplines that I mentioned earlier, ophthalmology and gynaecology.



**NO. 2219 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many long stay elderly care patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital during the month of October 2004, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2220 to 2222 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2220 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many long stay elderly care patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital during the month of November 2004, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2219, 2221 and 2222 of 2004.

**NO. 2221 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the month of October 2004, of the beds occupied by elderly persons who have been formally discharged, how many fell into each of the three categories identified by the Government specifying sex and age:-

- (1) Elderly persons living alone;
- (2) Elderly persons needing support;
- (3) Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2219, 2220 and 2222 of 2004.

**NO. 2222 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the month of November 2004, of the beds occupied by Elderly persons who have been formally discharged, how many fell into each of the three categories identified by the Government specifying sex and age:-

- (1) Elderly persons living alone;
- (2) Elderly persons needing support;
- (3) Others able to be looked after?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question No. 2222 of 2004**

**Answer to Question Nos. 2219 & 2220**

The number of long stay elderly patients during the months of October and November 2004 remained unchanged. The breakdown is as follows:-

**Age Groups**

|           |   |            |         |
|-----------|---|------------|---------|
| 65 to 70  | = | 3 females  | 0 males |
| 71 to 75  | = | 3 females  | 3 males |
| 76 to 80  | = | 6 females  | 3 males |
| 81 to 85  | = | 23 females | 3 males |
| 86 to 90  | = | 10 females | 2 males |
| 91 to 95  | = | 7 females  | 0 males |
| 96 to 100 | = | 2 females  | 1 male  |

Total number of females 54.

Total number of males 12.

**Answer to Question Nos. 2221 and 2222**

Ten patients have been formally discharged. Of these ten patients five elderly are living alone.

All elderly patients require some sort of support be it physical, emotional or social. All patients who have been officially discharged are able to be looked after.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2219 TO 2222 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Government confirm whether all of these patients will be moved to Europort or whether other arrangements will be made for them?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think as the hon Member has been told now on more occasions than I am sure she should need, some of these are being allocated beds in the extended wing of Mount Alvernia when that is available. The new facilities at Mount Alvernia.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Will the new facilities at Mount Alvernia be ready before the hospital actually opens?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I remember that she asked that very question last time. The new hospital is opening in February, Mount Alvernia new wing is operating touch and go but that is no big deal, if Mount Alvernia is not ready they will have to be temporarily accommodated in the new hospital then.

**NO. 2223 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

How many elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of October 2004, giving a breakdown of sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 2224 of 2004.

**NO. 2224 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

How many elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of November 2004, giving a breakdown of sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 2223**

Thirty-six elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia and are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of October 2004.

Breakdown of sex and age is as follows:

Female = 28  
Male = 8

65 – 70 = None  
71 – 75 = 1  
76 – 80 = 7  
81+ = 28

**Answer to Question No. 2224**

Thirty-nine elderly citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia and are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of November 2004.

Breakdown of sex and age is as follows:

Female = 31  
Male = 8

65 – 70 = None  
71 – 75 = 1  
76 – 80 = 7  
81+ = 31



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2223 AND 2224 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I would like to inform the Government that I have detected another error in previous Questions in this House. I will refer to my Question No. 56 of 2004 when the Hon Mrs Del Agua told me that there were 37 patients occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital. She then said that the information would be sent to my hon Colleague, the Hon Mr Bruzon, and lo and behold I look at the information and I look at the same month and the same year and she gives him the figure of 39. Could she please confirm by writing either to him or to myself whether the figure is either 37 or 39?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am not sure I understand what she wants me to do. If she is saying that my Colleague has given her a different answer, is that what she is saying?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Yes.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If she has already received an answer from my hon Colleague, I fail to see why she is asking me the same question again, to be perfectly honest. But if she has just to see whether we can give her different answers, then we shall have to consult and see why we have given her different answers.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, it is not that the Minister for Health has given me a different answer, it is the Hon Mrs Del Agua in answer to Question No. 56 of 2004 she answered a similar question and gave me 37 persons awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia for the month of December 2003. Then she wrote to my Colleague the Hon Mr Bruzon and for the same month and the same year she gave him the figure of 39. All I am saying is could she write and confirm that it is 39 or 37, that is all.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The question arises from an answer to a Question that asks for the statistics in respect of October and November 2004.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I thought I would take the opportunity since we are talking about the same, the elderly citizens. If we are talking about elderly citizens awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia and how many of these are occupying a bed, then I put a question in for these months but then I look at the statistics that I am given in the previous meetings

of the House. It is not that I have the time in this House to look. It was only about three months ago and all I am saying is that seeing we are talking about elderly citizens, I have just taken the opportunity of telling the Hon Minister for Social Affairs if she can confirm which figure is the correct one, because I have been given one and my hon Colleague has been given another.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Seeing that it is my question but I am not expected to answer, can I suggest to the hon Member that she writes to my Colleague explaining what it is that she wants to know?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I have gone one better this time. I am asking her to write to me to confirm whether it is either 37 or 39 in December 2004.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I cannot understand if the hon Member is saying that I provided her with an answer and in the same Session of the House I wrote to her Colleague with a different answer, if I have already provided a verbal answer why should I feel a need to write to her Colleague?

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, she has not understood. She wrote to him and previous to writing to him she gave me the figure. When she wrote to him and gave him what was supposed to be the same answer to the question that I asked, I got 37 and he got 39.

**MR SPEAKER:**

Miss Montegriffo, your experience of this House is far greater than mine is or ever will be, but I cannot see how the line adopted now falls into the category of a supplementary to the Hon Minister for Health on this Session. You are free to take it up in correspondence with the Minister for Social Affairs.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It is only that it so happened that at the time that I asked this question a few months ago, it was not the Minister for Health that answered it, it was the Hon Mrs Del Agua.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It was a year ago.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No it was not a year ago.

**MR SPEAKER:**

It was Question No. 56, a long time ago. We are now two thousand and something.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

It was Question No. 56 of 2004.

**MR SPEAKER:**

A long time ago.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Well, but all I am saying is that if I have taken the opportunity of looking.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It was January of 2004.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The question relates to 2003 and it was not put a year ago. Now if the Government are not interested fine, if they do not want to give me the answer then fine.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I suggest the hon Member write to the Minister who will then reply.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

I will try to look at the answers and try to decipher what it is that she wants and if I can provide the information I will.

ORAL

**NO. 2225 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ST BERNARD’S HOSPITAL**

Can Government confirm whether patients are still having to wait for several hours at St Bernard’s Hospital before being admitted, because of beds not being readily available for them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2226 and 2227 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2226 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ST BERNARD’S HOSPITAL**

Can Government confirm how many routine operations were cancelled at St Bernard’s Hospital due to the non-availability of beds in October of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2225 and 2227 of 2004.

**NO. 2227 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ST BERNARD’S HOSPITAL**

Can Government confirm how many routine operations were cancelled at St Bernard’s Hospital due to the non-availability of beds in November of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 2225**

It is not usual for patients to have to wait for several hours for admission due to the unavailability of beds. Patients sometimes have to wait for results from tests carried out before a decision can be taken whether to admit. Once it has been decided to admit the patient in the majority of cases a bed is allocated within an acceptable period of time. Nevertheless and very regrettably, it is occasionally inevitable to have to wait for an extended period, especially if there are other patients who require admission of a more urgent nature.

**Answer to Question Nos. 2226 & 2227**

Nine elective operations were cancelled in October 2004 and none in November as a result of non-availability of beds.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2225 TO 2227 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I am afraid that I have caught another discrepancy. This relates to Question No. 139 of 2004 and Question No. 229 of 2003, which gives for 2003, 21 operations cancelled. I have looked at the Gibraltar Health Authority Annual Report for the year 2003 and it gives 27 operations cancelled. I am referring to Question No. 2226 and, therefore, in answer to Question No. 139 of 2004 and in answer to Question No. 229 of 2003, for the year 2003 I have been given.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Another point of order. The hon Lady asks a question for the month of October. When she is given a figure the next words that come out of her mouth cannot then be

'ah I have spotted another discrepancy because in 2003 you told me', she might say 'well thank you very much for the information in respect of October and November 2004. I have just noticed that last year you got it wrong when you answered this same question.' Her response to the figure for 2004, October and November, cannot be discrepancy.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I did not say it was a discrepancy between November and October, but fine. What I will do then is I will put another question in next time and I will ask the Minister to confirm whether there have been 21 operations cancelled for the year 2003 as the information which I have been given in this House, or whether the Gibraltar Health Authority Annual Report for the year 2003 is correct, because we are talking about a difference of six.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Ask a question about the Gibraltar Health Authority Report.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

No, it just proves that every time there is a report and I compare it with the information I am given by the Government, there are discrepancies everywhere.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, what it proves is that if notice is given of a question there is a chance that the person being questioned has the information available or the ability to rebut the allegations, otherwise we sit here quietly listening to the hon Member allege discrepancies when the answer may in fact be not that there is discrepancy but that the hon Member is not comparing apples with apples. The hon Lady sits there asserting that she has found discrepancies in 2003 and we have no alternative but to take her word for it, but that should not be interpreted by her as an acceptance by us that she is right. I bet in many of these cases there is an explanation for what she calls a discrepancy. In others there may not be. In others there may be an error, but the fact that we cannot now from memory tell her what happened in 2003 or the figures, proves nothing except the fact that she has not given notice of the questions that she is now seeking to ask in this House. That is all it proves.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

That is why I said that I would be writing to the Minister so that he could confirm which figure is correct.

**NO, 2228 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MRSA INFECTION**

Can the Government confirm whether the Gibraltar Health Authority is looking at alternative hospitals in the UK to replace St Mary's in view of persistent reports of patients having suffered greatly due to MRSA infection?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No, the GHA is pleased with the service offered to Gibraltar patients by St Mary's Hospital, Paddington.

MRSA and controlling the spread of infection is a major issue for all hospitals worldwide. According to the official Department of Health data, St Mary's actually has one of the lowest rates of MRSA infection for a specialist London teaching hospital.



**NO. 2229 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can the Government state, during this financial year, what has been the number of Sponsored Patients treated in the UK and at what cost, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 2230 of 2004.

**NO. 2230 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – PATIENT REFERRALS**

Can the Government state, during this financial year, what has been the number of patient referrals to the UK and at what cost, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question 2230 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2229**

The number of sponsored patient referred to the UK for the current financial year to date is 621. The cost identified to date is £1,174,905. (This figure is subject to change). The number of patient referrals to the UK for financial year 2003/2004 up to December 2003 is 574 with a cost on ex quota patients of £913,804.

**Answer to Question 2230**

The number of patient referrals to the UK for the current financial year to date is 913. The cost identified to date is £1,174,905 (This figure is subject to change). The number of patient referrals to the UK for financial year 2003/2004 up to December 2003 is 859 with a cost on ex quota patients of £913,804.

**NO. 2231 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ALGECIRAS CLINIC**

Can Government confirm how much has the Gibraltar Health Authority spent in sending patients to the Algeciras Clinic for scans during the financial year 2004/2005 with the comparable figure for the same period last year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2232 to 2234 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2232 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health stage how much money was spent by the Gibraltar Health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for scans in October of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2231, 2233 and 2234 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2233 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health state how much money was spent by the Gibraltar Health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for scans in November of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2231, 2232 and 2234 of 2004.

**NO. 2234 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health state how much money was spent by the Gibraltar Health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for scans in November of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Question No. 2234 is not being answered as it is identical to Question No. 2233.

The information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule that I hand to her.

**Answer to Question 2234 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2231**

The total amount spent in the financial year 2004/2005 in sending patients to Algeciras Clinic is £159,254.89.

The comparable figure for the same period last year is £192,603.95.

**Answer to Question 2232**

The amount of money spent by the GHA with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for scans in October 2004 is £2,074.52.

**Answer to Question 2233**

The amount spent by the GHA with regard to patients being sent to Malaga clinic for scans in November 2004 is £870.52.



ORAL

**NO. 2235 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many patients have been given a choice of being treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as Sponsored Patients, and have elected to go to Spain during the month of October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2236 and 2237 of 2004.

**NO. 2236 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many patients have been given a choice of being treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as Sponsored Patients and have elected to go to Spain during the month of November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2235 and 2237 of 2004.

**NO. 2237 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Do Government agree that in view of the increased number of Sponsored Patients being treated in Spanish Medical Institutions, a suitable office to deal with their concerns, or subsistence and accommodation, should be opened in the hinterland in order to provide them with assistance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question Nos. 2235 and 2236**

All patients are given the choice to be treated in Spain as opposed to the UK at the time of referral when this is considered appropriate by the referring Consultant. 52 patients out of 163 have elected to go to Spain during the month of October 2004 and 46 patients out of 177 during the month of November 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 2237**

The Government are not considering opening an office to deal with Sponsored Patients in the Spanish hinterland.

**NO. 2238 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – MEALS**

Can the Government confirm how many employees will be involved in the production and transport of the meals to be delivered to patients in the Europort Hospital from the old wine factory area where the kitchen will be situated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Government can confirm that a total of 13 catering staff will be providing the service, which is the same number as at present. Transport of meals and domestic duties will also be provided within the current staffing provision.

ORAL

**NO. 2239 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COMPLAINTS REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how often the members of the new independent Complaints Review Panel have met to consider complaints from users of our health services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 2240 of 2004.

**NO. 2240 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – COMPLAINTS REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how many complaints have been lodged to the new independent review panel since it started to function to the end of November 2004, from users of our health services, specifying the date of each complaint?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Up to the end of November 2004, no complaints have been referred to the Independent Review Panel. There has been no need for the Review Panel to meet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2239 AND 2240 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Is it a condition of the Government that members of a panel have to be residents of Gibraltar?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

No.

**NO. 2241 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – GYNAECOLOGY SURGERY**

Can Government confirm whether scheduling surgery in the specialty of Gynaecology was implemented last October and how many patients have taken up the offer?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The preparatory work for the implementation of a pilot scheduled service in Gynaecology began in October. The essential work includes the development of new theatre schedules, new roles and responsibilities and patient information leaflets. The pilot initiative will go live in the New Year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2241 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Did the Minister say it would start in October or did he say that it would go live in the New Year? I did not quite understand.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The pilot has started, the preparatory work is being done and then the whole thing will go fully live in the New Year.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

So therefore, so far no patients have taken up the offer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There has been some scheduling already under the pilot scheme.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

If there have been some patients therefore, and I am asking how many there are, can the Minister say in the pilot scheme how many have taken up the offer?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have not answered that part of the question because quite honestly it does not really make sense because there is not an offer and acceptance between bidding and buying here, the way scheduling takes place is that patients come in and they are allocated a slot. It is not a question of offering and agreeing to take up the offer. So strictly the answer to that is that no patients have taken up an offer where an offer has not been made.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Therefore can the Minister say how many people have taken up the slot offered? Or is the Minister saying that nothing has been offered yet? If the Chief Minister has said that there is a pilot scheme and that it has already started and some people have been offered a slot, if they have been offered have they accepted?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

With the word 'slot' she has to be careful. The way scheduling works is that instead of being put on a list for somebody who needs an operation and then going home and waiting to receive a letter in due course saying to come in on 31<sup>st</sup> June or such and such a date, there and then they try and agree a date before they go home, 'how about 23<sup>rd</sup> December is that convenient at 3 o'clock?'. There and then they make appointments rather than send one home and write informing when the intervention is going to be done. So it is not a sort of a slot, they are not slots it is done by agreement there and then. There have been people, I am sure that the Minister can write informing on how many people have been scheduled as opposed to written to informing.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

It is still a pilot scheme, it is on-going.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the patients that have been scheduled, would they be people that have been scheduled between October and the end of this year, or would the scheduling have been in respect of what starts in January?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it was between October and December.



**NO. 2242 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – ORAL SURGEON**

Can the Government confirm whether they agree that when the oral surgeon of the Gibraltar Health Authority is away from Gibraltar that a locum should be brought in to cover for this specialty?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2242 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

The Minister must be aware that I have asked this question because of the case in hand that I wrote to him about, about a lady that had to be admitted and then on three occasions she was discharged because there were no beds, then she was offered a bed in Children's Ward depending on whether she fitted in the bed or not, then after the operation the patient got an infection and the oral surgeon left Gibraltar. I am sure he will remember about this case, and then the lady was told that she had to go to Cadiz because of the infection that she had and the nursing escort refused to go without a doctor because she might require a tracheotomy. Two hours elapsed before the patient was transported to Cadiz. After this horrendous story the Minister says that when the oral surgeon is away from Gibraltar there will not be a locum. Well I find it quite extraordinary because this is not what I think the lady was told when she complained. I think when she complained the new Complaints Procedure was not in place.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I am very well aware of the case. The patient concerned has come to me in my office and explained exactly what had happened to her, I in fact encouraged her to lodge a formal complaint because there were some aspects of what she told me that I found disturbing about the way she had been treated, not about the lack of an oral surgeon, and that complaint is as far as I know, I have not been notified that it is delayed, that complaint is in the process of being dealt with. The question is whether there should be a locum in all the time. There has never been a locum, there was not a locum when she was Minister and the statistics show that this was,

unfortunately, a series of circumstances compounded themselves to lead to this particular situation. The patient was transported to Cadiz where happily she was operated on and she was given the treatment and when she came to see me she was recovered from the experience but still upset enough to want to lodge a complaint. As I said I encouraged her to do it but it is like everything else, in relation to the size of Gibraltar, to the demands for this type of surgery and the statistics for this type of incidents, does not warrant the expense of having a locum in place. This is a one on one and we would have another locum in at the weekends as well. The expense does not warrant it when we have cover elsewhere.

**NO. 2243 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – DIALYSIS REPORT**

Can Government confirm what were the total expenses involved in the report they commissioned on dialysis, which was carried out by Professor Terry Feest?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The cost of the report produced by Professor Terry Feest amounted to £10,115.23p.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2243 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

I suppose that the Government did not agree with the recommendations of Professor Terry Feest, as he said that the La Linea Unit was sufficient for our needs. I suppose that Mr Terry Feest did not realise how unfriendly our neighbours are.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I think we covered this in a previous question and I remember distinctly telling the hon Member that there had been three recommendations in the report and the Government had in fact by choosing to have dialysis in Gibraltar, had in fact taken an option which had not actually been covered by Professor Feest. Be that as it may, we are where we are, it is past history, the report was made, the decision was made to provide dialysis and that is where we are.

**NO. 2244 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CANCER REGISTER**

Can Government state whether there is any evidence to suggest that the incidence of cancer in Gibraltar is increasing, according to the cancer register of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The incidence of cancer as recorded on the Cancer Register has remained fairly steady over the five-year observation period since the register was started by this Government.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2244 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Except that I would ask the Minister whether he is willing to provide me with the figures, when we were in Government we did a study and I have got the figures with me but we did it on a yearly basis, we did it from 1980 to 1991 and when I looked at the report of the Gibraltar Health Authority Annual Report, as he rightly says, it is done on a five year basis. It says that this continues to be interim figures and due to the registry being constantly updated with new data on past years, the above figures will not be directly comparable with those published in previous reports. That is what the Report of the GHA says. Therefore all I am asking the Minister is if he can provide me with the figures from when it started for five years, on a yearly basis. Is it not possible to have complete figures for the first five years?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I have in front of me provisional figures dating back to 1999 which is the first year when the Cancer Register was in full force. These are provisional figures, I have been advised, and not intended yet for unqualified publication. The Director of Public Health tells me that the data is currently undergoing audit because there are a number of factors that have still to be quantified. For example, it is known that there are cases that are not directly reported to the Cancer Registry and therefore he is having to establish a system of gathering this data in different ways to what it has been gathered up to now. There is also a need to check the information that has been gathered so far and in short, he tells me that the figures will not be ready for

publication for at least another year, but the indications of the first five-year spread are that the figures that we have so far are fairly steady but the figures cannot be published yet because he is not happy with their accuracy.

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Are the Government intending to look at the figures once they are as accurate as possible and look at other EU States and compare the incidence of cancer in Gibraltar to other EU States, are they intending to do that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We have had this conversation before in Question Time. This was the whole purpose of creating the Cancer Registry, to get reliable statistics that could then be meaningfully compared with European average statistics to see whether indeed it is true, as many people believe, the incidence of cancer not in Gibraltar in particular but in the general geographical region, is higher than it should be. Certainly, if the evidence is that that is so, then we will certainly wish to pursue it and commission further external consultant studies, that is the whole purpose of gathering cancer statistics.

**NO. 2245 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – STRESS MACHINE**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm whether authorisation has been given by those who donated the treadmill, so that it can be upgraded and used for stress testing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The position remains as stated in answer to Question No. 1539 of 2004.

**NO. 2246 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

Can Government state how many inspections in relation to the handling of asbestos have been carried out in respect of the works being carried out aboard the vessel ROTTERDAM at Cammell Laird, the date of those inspections, the parties that carried it out (including the names of any sub-contractors that might have been engaged by the Environmental Agency), what equipment has been used in taking any readings that might have been taken, what the findings of those inspections has been and what actions, if any, have been taken as a result?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Health & Safety Inspectorate are empowered under the Control of Asbestos at Work Regulations 1997, and as such have carried out the following inspections and meetings.

Since notification of the works and prior to any works commencing four meetings were held:

1. 19<sup>th</sup> July 2004 with Cammell Laird's Health & Safety Manager,
2. 26<sup>th</sup> July 2004 with the City Fire Brigade and the Environmental Agency,
3. 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2004 with the City Fire Brigade, Environmental Agency, Cammell Laird Health & Safety Manager, the Director of Cuddy Group Multi-Disciplined Contractor and a representative of the St John's Ambulance,
4. 18<sup>th</sup> August 2004 a meeting was held on board SS Rotterdam to familiarise the emergency services involved with the site.

The Health & Safety Inspectorate carried out inspections of the equipment, the preparation for the works and the laboratory.

Further inspections were carried out by them on 9<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> September, 7<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, 21<sup>st</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> October, 4<sup>th</sup> November and 8<sup>th</sup> December 2004.

Daily analysis of air monitoring throughout the work site is being carried out by RPS Analyse, independently of the Cuddy Group who are carrying out the asbestos removal works.

Daily analytical reports are inspected by the European Safety & Health Consultants BV and Cammell Laird Health & Safety Manager and the Health & Safety Inspectors.

No action has been necessary as work has been carried out in compliance with the necessary legislation and standards. As there are a lot of dates and details and names, I am happy to provide the Opposition Member with a copy of my answer for his convenience.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2246 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am very grateful to the Minister. One of the things that my question also asks is what equipment has been used in taking the readings, and that question obviously is because we have had some debate about what equipment is available or is not available locally. I wonder whether the Minister can assist in that respect at all?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have referred to the air monitoring, it is a process to measure the fibres and particles in the air within the logical range, and I presume the consultants, and experts, and scientists involved have the necessary equipment to do that but I cannot give a name, I am a layman totally in these matters, but if he likes I can find out in more detail exactly what type of machinery or equipment is used.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I would indeed like that because notice has been given of that question. One of the constituent parts of the question asks what equipment has been used in taking the readings, just for the reason that I have already stated. Namely, that there has been some debate in this House as to what equipment is or is not available. Other than that I am grateful to the Minister.



**NO. 2247 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD – CASUAL WORKERS**

Can Government give a monthly breakdown of vacancies for casual workers opened with the Employment Agency by Cammell Laird or alternatively in the shipping industry for the months of October and November 2004 giving a breakdown of how many of these have been filled by Gibraltarians?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2248 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2248 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY SCHEME**

Can Government state whether in the months of October and November 2004 there has been any increase in the number of persons that have been placed in employment, giving a breakdown by age and sex, in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No. 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 and 2249 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2249 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYMENT REGISTER**

How many Gibraltarians were added to the unemployment register during the months of October and November 2004 giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247, 2248 and 2250 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2250 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the months of October and November 2004, were registered with the Employment Agency giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2249 and 2251 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2251 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT**

Can Government state how many Terms of Engagements were registered with the Employment Agency in the months of October and November 2004?

- (a) including directors; and
- (b) excluding directors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2250 and 2252 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2252 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – VACANCIES FILLED**

Can Government state of the vacancies filled in the months of October and November 2004, how many were for part-time employment giving a breakdown by sex as follows:

- (a) Gibraltarians; and
- (b) other nationals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2251 and 2253 to 2270 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2253 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

Can Government give details of the number of employment contracts terminated in the months of October and November 2004, giving a breakdown by nationality and industry?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2252 and 2254 to 2270 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2254 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the months of October and November 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2253 and 2255 to 2270 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2255 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – DETACHED WORKERS**

Can Government state the number of workers that were registered with the Employment Agency as “Detached Workers” in the months of October and November 2004 giving a breakdown of their trade and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2254 and 2256 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2256 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians registered as unemployed with the Employment Agency in the months of October and November 2004 were registered as looking for part-time jobs giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2255 and 2257 to 2270 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2257 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many of the Gibraltarians employed in the months of October and November 2004, were registered with the Employment Agency as unemployed giving a breakdown by age and sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2256 and 2258 to 2270 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2258 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF WORK PERMITS**

Can Government state the number of work permits issued in the months of October and November 2004 giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2257 and 2259 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2259 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE – FIXED PENALTIES**

Can Government state how many fixed penalties have been imposed on employers and in respect of how many employees in the months of October and November 2004 under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance, under which sections of the Ordinance, each penalty has been imposed and whether the penalties have been paid or the matter is being pursued through further prosecution?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2258 and 2260 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2260 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATIONS (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE – PROSECUTIONS**

Can Government state how many prosecutions have been commenced under the Employment Regulations (Offences) Ordinance in the months of October and November 2004, the date of filing of any such prosecutions and the penalties, if any, imposed by the courts in respect of any prosecutions which may have been completed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2259 and 2261 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2261 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – JOB CLUB**

Can Government state how many persons have used the facilities provided at the Job Club in the months of October and November 2004 giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2260 and 2262 to 2270 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2262 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NON-EEC NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals in the months of October and November 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2261 and 2263 to 2270 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2263 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state what was the total number of employment contracts for Spanish nationals registered with the Employment Agency in October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2262 and 2264 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2264 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SPANISH NATIONALS**

Can Government state of the Spanish nationals employed in the months of October and November 2004, how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2263 and 2265 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2265 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – OTHER BRITISH**

Can Government state of the “Other British” employed in the months of October and November 2004, how many were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2264 and 2266 to 2270 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2266 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – MOROCCAN NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many Moroccan nationals employed in the months of October and November 2004 were new entrants to the local labour market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2265 and 2267 to 2270 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2267 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

Can Government state what was the expenditure by the Employment Agency on wage subsidy in the months of October and November 2004, and the number of people and of employers involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2266 and 2268 to 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2268 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

What was the number of employment contracts registered with the Employment Agency in respect of private employers excluding Government-owned and joint venture companies in the months of October and November 2004, giving a breakdown by nationality of employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2267 and 2269 to 2270 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2269 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – SELF-EMPLOYED**

Can Government state how many persons were registered as self-employed with the Employment Agency in the months of October and November 2004, giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2247 to 2268 and 2270 of 2004.

**NO. 2270 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NUMBER OF CONTRACTS**

Can Government state how many employment contracts were registered with the Employment Agency for frontier workers in the months of October and November 2004, giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

As explained earlier, I will be providing the hon Member with complete substantive answers to these Questions early in the New Year, covering the quarterly statistics. I do not want to be pedantic but there are two questions which are repeated. Just for convenience they are Question No. 2250 and No. 2257, they are completely the same and Question Nos. 2258 and 2254, if I am not mistaken.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2247 TO 2270 OF 2004**

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

As a matter of courtesy, even as a point of order, I would like to say that for Question Nos. 2248 to 2270 I will be unable to answer directly, they may go down in this House for the record in Hansard but I will not be able to provide at the end of it all, at Question No. 2270, a direct answer to these statistical questions. It has been the practice and the policy of the Government to issue statistics on a quarterly basis rather than a monthly basis. The Questions are addressed to the months of October and November. I will of course be entirely happy at the end, well after December and early in the New Year, to provide the hon Member with all the data and statistics that he is seeking here.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I just want to clarify, as a matter of policy, is it because the Government obviously have the information for October and November.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes indeed, we have the information for October/November. The thinking behind this approach, this policy, is that any statistician will know a broad range sample gives us



more indication of trends and patterns than just an incidental figure for one particular month. So it is indeed more useful to the hon Member and to us. It is not a way of covering up, on the contrary the trends may show bad news rather than good news but at least it is true news or as true as we can get.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The question is phrased as the question has always been phrased in this House, directing itself to the number of months that have passed since the last meeting, in order to enable the Opposition to continue its own statistical collation of data which relates to the monthly information provided from Government Members. Can I press the Minister to provide me with this information if he has it?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will as I say, after we have the complete quarterly returns. Only a moment ago we were talking informally about coming together and issuing statistics and talking about them ourselves, and passing statistics from the Government to the Opposition precisely to ensure that our political analysis of these statistics are as verifiable as possible.

**NO. 2271 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government now state how many employers have been sent questionnaires for the October 2004 Employment Survey Report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A total of 1,396 forms have been sent out to employers in respect of the October 2004 Employment Survey Report.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2271 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say how this compares with the numbers that were sent out last year, which I think was an increase on previous years?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, if I am not mistaken the figure for 2003 was 1,298 forms sent out. If he wants earlier years, as he said, they were lower. In October 2002 it was 1,082 and October 2001 it was a bit higher, 1,136 (I mean higher than 2002 not 2003). But that is the forms sent out and not the returns.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am aware of that but in fact last year I think the results showed that there was a very high response rate and that part of the increase in the results, in terms of the private sector, I think was attributed to failure of response in earlier years rather than the fact that there were new ones. Does the Minister have any indication, for example, that on this occasion when we were talking about an additional 98 employers being contacted, to what extent those are new employers or people that the Department has not caught up with before?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am afraid I have not got an indication of how many were the recurring employers and how many were new employers that were now receiving the questionnaire which they had not received before but it may be interesting to the hon Member to know that by the 15<sup>th</sup> of December, of the 1,396 forms sent out we already have 826 completed questionnaires and 176 on top of that returned but with nil returns. That is a total of 1,002 altogether returned. A reminder was issued to the rest, to 633 employers, on 26<sup>th</sup> November so we are hopeful that by the end of the month we may have an even higher return rate than last year.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How many did the Minister say the reminders were?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

633.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It does not add up.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That is what they have given to me.

ORAL

**NO. 2272 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the comparable breakdown for October 2003 of all employee jobs by industry, sex and nationality as given in Table 12 in respect of the 986 employers who returned filled questionnaires for October 2002 and October 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2273 and 2274 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2273 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the comparable breakdown for October 2002 of all employee jobs by industry, sex and nationality as given in Table 12 in respect of the 986 employers who returned filled questionnaires for October 2002 and October 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2272 and 2274 of 2004.

**NO. 2274 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide the breakdown by industry of the 986 employers who returned filled questionnaires for October 2002 and October 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Statistics Office inform me that they have a problem with these three questions because the figure of 986 employers quoted in this Question does not tally with the figures that they have, which I can give him now as a form of table. In October 2001 we had 865 completed returns and 104 nil returns, that is 969 returns altogether. In October 2002 we had 1,043 total returns, 897 completed and 146 nil. In October 2003 to be complete, we had 1,290 total returns, 1,052 and 238 nil returns. They cannot detect what this 986 employers come from, I am stuck myself.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2272 TO 2274 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, given that I have to put a question and I cannot get an answer, if I could be allowed, will the Minister look at the answer that he gave me in the last House, when I asked a number of questions in comparing the results of October 2003 and October 2002, and I asked of those persons that had replied in October 2003 how many had been there in October 2002 and how many were new. It is as a result of the figures that he provided in the last House that I worked it out. I am not saying that my figure is necessarily 100 per cent accurate but the figure I came up with was that in comparing the return for 2003 and the return for 2002 on the basis of the information previously provided, I came to the conclusion that there were in fact the figure in my two questions who were the same employers in the two years. Therefore, if the Minister looks at those answers will he consider the value of knowing to what degree the change in more jobs has been from existing businesses that were there the previous year, and to what extent it has been from new entrants into the market? That is the purpose of the two questions but it is based on information he was kind enough to provide me in the House in the previous questions in the last meeting.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well the Statistics Office have given me a note as well covering those questions or those answers that I gave then. They say that, perhaps if the hon Member wishes to take the figures down so that they can eventually tally the analysis of the figures, there were 897 filled questionnaires for October 2002, of which they say as is evident from published information, 836 also completed the October 2003 Survey questionnaires. So of the 897, 836 were already included in the October 2002. These, they say, 836.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If the Minister will give way. He has told me the 897 were for October 2002 and the 836 for October 2003 but he has just said that they were already included in 2002.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes because they say that 836 of these 897 also completed the October 2003. So I deduced from that that they were part of the 897 lot. Then they also say, I am not too clear myself, 836 together with 216 new employers gave a total of 1,052 for the October 2003 Survey. The number of questionnaires completed, and then they go back to 2001 just simply to show the increases. They say the completed questionnaires for October 2001 was 865, yes I do confess that I am a bit lost myself actually with all these figures.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Assuming that in respect of the answer that the Minister has given, the figure of 836 is the one that on the basis of previous answers in my question I put down as 986, would it be possible to give the information that I have asked for in respect of the 836 that the office says were the same employers in the two years?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I agree with the hon Member, it should be possible on whatever figure we have floating around, it should be possible to give the breakdowns in Table 12 that the hon Member is seeking. I am afraid the Statistics Office have not done so but I will insist that they do on whatever figure they think is the true figure.

-----  
**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would like to clarify in relation to Question Nos. 2272, 2273 and 2274, where the Minister for Employment said the answer was not provided because the Statistics Office was not very clear where the figure of 986 came from in those three questions, which ask for a breakdown of the 986 employers that were included in both surveys in October 2002 and 2003. I have gone back and checked and in answer to Question No. 1636, where I asked 'of the 1,290 employers who responded to the October 2003 survey, how many were not included in the 1,043 who replied to the

2002 survey?', and the answer I had to that was, '304 out of 1,290'. It is deducting the 304 from 1,290 that I got the 986 as being the number of employers that had been included in 2003 and were also there the preceding year. I am saying this so that we have it for the record and because it might help for the provision of the answer which I have been promised subsequent to the meeting.



ORAL

**NO. 2275 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EMPLOYMENT – REGISTER OF ASBESTOS**

Can Government state whether the factory inspectors have a register of asbestos of all Public Buildings including Schools?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2276 to 2280 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2276 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government confirm if asbestos is present in other blocks in Bishop Fitzgerald School and if so who has carried out this inspection?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2275 and 2277 to 2280 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2277 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state what type of asbestos was found in Bishop Fitzgerald School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2275, 2276 and 2278 to 2280 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2278 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state whether the asbestos found at Bishop Fitzgerald School was removed or encapsulated?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2275 to 2277, 2279 and 2280 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2279 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GCFE**

Can Government state whether the asbestos found at the annex to the Gibraltar College of Further Education was encapsulated or removed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2275 to 2278 and 2280 of 2004.

**NO. 2280 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ASBESTOS**

Can Government state why children were not evacuated from the block where asbestos had been damaged and tampered with even while men wore protective clothing to deal with the said asbestos?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question 2275**

The Health & Safety Inspectors do not keep a register of asbestos of all public buildings in Gibraltar (including schools). Legislation does not require the keeping of such a register by the Health & Safety Inspectors. What legislation requires in relation to the keeping of records of asbestos works as per the Construction (Design, Management, Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1998, is that a contractor keeps at the work site a Safety File to include any pertinent asbestos works “assessments”.

On completion of works the contractor is required to pass on to the client the Health and Safety File to be kept and updated as necessary whenever any further works are carried out to the building. It would then be the Health and Safety Inspectors duty to check these “assessments” as and when necessary during the course of an inspection.

**Answer to Questions 2276 to 2280**

The Government can confirm that asbestos is present in other blocks at Bishop Fitzgerald School. We do now have a complete register of the location of all these asbestos in Bishop Fitzgerald School in detail. The inspection and the register was carried out by GJBS, Environtech (UK firm) who specialise in these matters, and by Safety Services locally and of course by our own Health and Safety Inspectors.

This asbestos was originally discovered in Summer 2003 and then it was encapsulated according to recommended health and safety procedures. Blue, white and brown asbestos was discovered.

The asbestos found at the annex to the Gibraltar College of Further Education was also encapsulated as recommended.

Children were evacuated from the block when the latest incidence occurred before any hazardous work had commenced. No children were present when the workmen dealt with the said works.

At the completion of the works, this is not in the question but I want to add it as it is important especially in the context of Mr Picardo's question about machinery testing airborne asbestos, at the completion of the works extensive tests were carried out by RPS Analyse BV which is a specialist firm from Holland presently working on the SS Rotterdam. These tests demonstrated the total absence of any airborne asbestos fibres or particles in the building. Let me say that all these questions were answered by the Government in detail in public statements which were issued on 27<sup>th</sup> October initially, and then on 4<sup>th</sup> November with regard to the second incident and I would certainly recommend the hon Member to read these statements which give him more details than I have been able to give in these questions, as I am sure he is concerned on some of the safety issues, understandable concerns, which of course we share, will be as in our own mind once and for all greatly assuaged.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2275 TO 2280 OF 2004**

##### **HON S E LINARES:**

I appreciate the Minister's answer. Yes there is definitely concern but what concerns the Opposition or at least myself, is not the fact that there are asbestos and I am sure there are many buildings in Gibraltar in which there is asbestos, what concerns me is that a procedure that does not seem to be in place in case of asbestos being either dealt with or asbestos being discovered. In this case it seems as if the men came in with protective gear, the children were still in the classrooms and they intended to proceed with the works and therefore it was the teachers themselves that realised that the men with protective gear were coming in, and I do not think there is an element here of me trying to blame the Minister, it is a question of procedure a question of having, like the Minister well knows we have in schools with fire drills, the children are all very well drilled in case of an emergency. They know exactly where to go, they know exactly what to do, they know that they do not have to run, they know where they have to assemble in order for children not to be left behind in schools. In this case I think that the Department and schools should be made aware that there should be a procedure in case asbestos is found. I am not saying that they start running like they do in fire, but there must be some type of procedure that if somebody suspects that asbestos has been damaged or tampered with, that the procedure goes into place and then that everybody is safe, because as the Minister knows it is the particles in the air, like he explained before, it is the particles in the air that is the danger. So the question is would the Minister not agree that there should be a standard procedure across schools and public buildings may I add, just in case somebody finds asbestos?

##### **HON DR B A LINARES:**

Of course I agree that there should be a procedure, clearly outlined for operational purposes in the school. I do not think there was a lack of procedure, in fact let me just make clear that when the men, what there was was perhaps a bit of lack of communication perhaps, but this sort of thing happens in any sort of critical moment. The men came with all this impressive gear and that created a certain degree of panic but the point was that the children were evacuated before these men, dressed

up with all this gear, actually got down to whatever they had to do. They were evacuated and that is a fact. So that is the important thing. As I say it is not lack of procedure. By the way there is always room for improvement, as I say in terms of communication and the hon Member may know that at the moment the Department is communicating with the Union in order to establish lines of communication. We have agreed to make sure that all sides in these critical moments know exactly where they stand and what they have to do in parallel with the fire drills, I think that was a good example.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I understand that the men did not start the works before the children were evacuated but the men were proceeding to do the work and no teacher was informed, and as the Minister well knows, the teachers were up in arms at the fact that these men walked in, and I appreciate that the Minister has just said that there was a lack of communication, of course there was a massive lack of communication not a slight, a massive lack of communication where one gets men walking into a building with protective gear to actually start handling the asbestos whilst the children were there. It was the teachers who alarmed, of course and naturally alarmed, took the decision of evacuating the children. It was not the company or the people who were actually going to deal with the asbestos who said 'hold on, before we start dealing with the asbestos we better evacuate this place'. This just goes to show the lack of procedure that there was on whosever part it was in order to have the children safe before the works were done. May I add, I think it was a brave decision taken by the teachers because then subsequently they were reprimanded for taking that decision. I do not know whether the Minister was aware but they were actually told off for taking a decision for the safety of children, and later on it transpired that nobody had informed the teachers that asbestos was going to be handled. This is what I mean by a lack of procedure and lack of communication definitely.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know, I do not quite agree with his account of the facts and of the incidents on that occasion, I think he is elaborating himself and I suppose it is easy to do so because as I say in these situations there is always an emotional aspect, a certain amount of panic but I do not agree that this alarming epithet that he has used to describe the situation in Bishop Fitzgerald at the time. As I say any way, for his satisfaction and mine, we are now making sure that there are lines of communication so that whenever anything resembling that sort of incident we can actually stem that natural sort of panic and anxiety that arises on the part of those at the times and as I say we have this in hand.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just one last point is that if the procedures and all the review and things that the Minister is currently doing in order for this not to happen again could be extended to other schools. I think it is not only Bishop Fitzgerald who has asbestos, I suspect that there are buildings built probably in the 1950s or 1960s that would be rife with asbestos. Therefore what I am urging the Minister to do is that any procedure that might be put in place for Bishop Fitzgerald, that it is extended to all other schools as is any fire drill or any drills and other procedures that are taken in the schools.



**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I have taken that for granted of course.

**NO. 2281 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Can Government state whether they have a written policy on Health and Safety and if so could a copy be given to this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Department has recently circulated a draft Health and Safety policy to all schools and also to NASUWT locally for comments. Suggestions from all these parties will be incorporated into the written policy before submitting to Government for approval.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2281 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does the Minister have an indication on time as in when this written policy will actually be written?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

We have the draft already written and proposed to these stakeholders. We depend on their promptitude to reply but certainly we want to do it as quickly as possible. I cannot give a particular date in the calendar.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is it possible that once this policy has been finalised that the Opposition get a copy?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Once this policy has been completed it will become a public document.

**NO. 2282 OF 2004****THE HON S E LINARES****EDUCATION – ASBESTOSIS**

Can Government confirm whether some teachers have requested to be tested for asbestosis and has this been complied with?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Some teachers of Bishop Fitzgerald School have requested to be tested for asbestosis. However, given the professional medical advice available, the Department is now bound to write to every teacher informing them of the risks associated with entering what is actually a long-term medical surveillance programme, especially since these tests require periodic chest X-rays, which have some risk of causing by themselves lung cancer and other cancers. The risk obviously increases the more often chest X-rays are taken. However, and I say this without prejudice, it is pertinent to point out further that our Public Health Director in the context of these incidents in Bishop Fitzgerald, consulted the Health Protection Agency in the UK of all the circumstances related to the asbestos incident in Bishop Fitzgerald School and their advice, that is the advice of the Health Protection Agency in the UK, was as follows, as I say I take this as a statement from the Health Protection Agency without prejudice without necessarily meaning that I am holding anybody to that. I quote, *“it is unlikely that staff or pupils have been exposed to asbestos fibres from the cement wall panels, so further medical examination may be unnecessary and of limited benefit. In any case, medical examination and investigations such as chest X-ray and lung function tests, will not show directly the presence of asbestos.”* I have said that without prejudice but I think we should all have the scientific facts before us before we take any practical steps that may be counterproductive.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2282 OF 2004****HON S E LINARES:**

In the second part of my question which says ‘has this been complied with’, because I understand that the teachers know the implications, they have had already spelt out the implications of tests and yet they insist that they want these tests done. Therefore that is why I have asked has it been complied with. I understand that the Minister is giving the teachers who are wanting these tests, ‘look these are the dangers of having the tests’. In itself X-rays obviously X-rays one is exposed to radioactivity and all this, but they still insist that they want this done. That is why I

asked if it had been complied with. In order to just add on, if the teachers know the risk of having these tests and yet they still want to have the tests, will the Minister oblige to have these teachers tested?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well that is not my information. All I have from the teachers is a very short statement saying 'we want these tests for asbestos related problems' and a list of names. Whether they individually, each of them, know the risks involved I have no evidence of that. I did say in my answer that it is the duty of the Department of Education to put before each teacher exactly the scientific and technical aspects of all this, and it is only in that context and as a response to that and it has not just been an informal 'okay let us go ahead with it', it will have to be legally a disclaimer, a detailed disclaimer form and it is only in that context that the Government will then be prepared to make a decision.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister satisfied with the statement which he has read out which was provided to Dr Vijay Kumar in relation to the likelihood of infection of children and teachers at Bishop Fitzgerald?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am a layman, I cannot be either satisfied or dissatisfied with the statement made by a specialist agency in the UK but it is another bit of evidence that should be put before the Opposition and ourselves and that must be weighted accordingly as coming from a specialist agency, an official agency, but I am not in the position Dr Kumar may be, and he is satisfied but I will have to judge it on its own merits.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

All of us are laymen in this specific technical medical issues, but none of us are laymen in language and if the Minister had read out a statement from the United Kingdom saying that there was absolutely no risk whatsoever that the students had been infected, or that it was highly unlikely that anybody had been infected, then I think all of us would have been substantially reassured. But in fact what the Minister has said is that the report simply said that it was likely that individuals may not have been infected. We also hear for the first time in this House that teachers are asking to be tested. Now I hear what the Minister has to say about the likelihood that the test itself may be problematic, but put into the context of the statements that the Minister himself made on television at the time that this was an issue when he was referring to the statements of the Opposition as being alarmist, is the Minister not actually very concerned that something may have happened at Bishop Fitzgerald School so that specialists in the United Kingdom are not able to say that there is absolutely no risk whatsoever that none of our students and none of our teachers were infected?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I think the statement by the Health Protection Agency, although I was prudent enough to say that I cannot commit myself to being either satisfied or dissatisfied, I think this carries a lot of weight. It comes from an official specialist agency and the hon Member has turned it round and actually softened it up a bit. It is actually what they say, so further medical examination may be unnecessary and of limited benefit and then they explain why. In fact this has been explained to me by clinical people after that. Actually these X-rays and function tests of the lungs do not show in any way, they do detect a problem with the lungs and with the heart, it does not necessarily relate to asbestos infection, it could be something else. The asbestos infection cannot be specifically and directly identified through any of these tests.

**NO. 2283 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – WORKLOAD AGREEMENT**

Can Government state what is their policy on the workload agreement in relation to teachers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The workload agreement has resulted in the UK in the removal from teachers' duties of a number of duties which they consider should be carried out by non-teachers which they are employing now. The local teachers association, NASUWT, has not yet made formal representations to us, perhaps because they realise, this is speculation, that the situation in Gibraltar is very different from that in England where we enjoy much more generous pupil/teacher ratios than is commonplace in the UK. Government will study any proposals submitted to us by NASUWT.

**NO. 2284 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – POST 16 EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

Can Government state whether the Post 16 Education committee have met to discuss the proposed recommendations of the Tomlinson Report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Post-16 Education Committee has not met to discuss the recommendations of the Tomlinson Report. It will do so when a clearer picture emerges as to what will and what will not be implemented in England, especially given the contradictory statements currently being made by leading political figures in UK. In any case, it was agreed with Mrs Sue Rogers of the NASUWT, and I was present at that meeting with her some time ago, that they themselves were caught up in the uncertainty of the situation and we agreed that they would liaise with the Department locally as the implications for teachers of the Tomlinson Report become clearer.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2284 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I understand the predicament the Committee is in, in the sense that we have to look at how the UK goes, spans out in relation to the Tomlinson Report but that does not stop the Committee, like any interested party, to read the report together, to go through the recommendations, to see, because I have had the pleasure of having had bedtime reading of the Tomlinson Report going through the whole report and therefore there are many, many parts which could be started to at least look into and implement. Things like vocational training, the way we are handling our vocational training, the way we can have diplomas introduced, and all these issues could be discussed by the Committee, and how if they get into place in Gibraltar we have to get into place because of the examination requirements for further education, that there are many issues in the Tomlinson Report that the Committee could be going through. Why do we have to wait? I understand what Sue Rogers was saying, it is the same issue as when the National Curriculum came in where the National Curriculum was bunged by the Tory Party then, Gibraltar analysed and they did so, the teachers, before it was implemented and all the reports were looked into before they were implemented, they were implemented in the UK and then we waited a year to see the effects of the National Curriculum in the UK and then we did it to localise the whole system. What I am trying to say is that I do not see why the Committee now has to not meet until there is any movement in the UK. I think that the

Committee should meet, they should meet to discuss the consequences at least of any of the recommendations of the Tomlinson Report. So the question is would the Minister urge his Committee to meet and at least go through the Tomlinson Report to discuss issues that might arise from the reading of the Tomlinson Report?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Members of the Committee are all highly professional people, I am sure, as many other teachers and educators in our service they are quite familiar with the Tomlinson Report and it has been bedside reading for them, as it has been for the Opposition Member, but obviously yes, there is no question that they will meet either formally or informally in a sort of debating background to discuss what the issues are. In fact we do that all the time and the hon Member should know that in schools, in staff rooms, in the Department of Education offices, these professional matters as they emerge from the Tomlinson Report are continually being discussed and debated. What I understood from the question was have they met formally in terms of recommendations and all that, well I do not think they have but that is no reason why at any moment of time, and I do not have to urge them they are people who have their own initiative in these matters, they will get together for academic discussion and debate of the contents of the Tomlinson Report. May I just incidentally, it seems to me that the Tomlinson Report recommendations are geared more to structural examination and the vocational aspects of schools which will indeed require induction and training, re-training of many teachers in the new context, but not necessarily directly in terms of conditions of employment of teachers. That is why I think the Union is also holding back and I can tell the hon Member that Mrs Sue Rogers has not come back to us as yet.



**NO. 2285 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – RECRUITMENT & RETENTION ALLOWANCES**

Can Government state what is their policy in relation to the allowance given for recruitment and retention to local teachers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The recruitment and retention allowances ceased to be paid in UK to those teachers employed after 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004. This follows the abolition of such allowances at a national level in the UK leaving it entirely in favour of individual school-based allowances.

**NO. 2286 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CO-EDUCATION AT SECONDARY LEVEL**

Can Government state whether they favour the implementation of co-education at secondary level?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Yes, the Government in principle favour the implementation, conceptually, of co-education at secondary level, and in the New Year the Department will be constituting a working committee to make recommendations on an operational level as to how co-education could be implemented. This committee will have very wide representation, including of course the Unions, parents and it is in the light of that that we will proceed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2286 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

So therefore the Government confirm that they are in principle in favour and are therefore going to recommend to be implemented.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

One cannot deduce from what I have said something as blanket as that. This is not how Government proceed in order to be operationally correct and prudent. What I have said is that there is a working group that will look at all aspects of the implementation of co-education and it is in the light of that, that was the phrase I used, then the Government will decide whether it is feasible or not feasible, or valuable or not valuable, or beneficial or not beneficial in terms of actually making it a reality. I hope the hon Member understands the nuances and the qualifications there, which are important if any enterprise is going to be effective and correct.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I understand what he has just said which is that he is trying to get a consultation process I presume and all this. What time span does the Minister think that this sort

of report or recommendation will be in place in order to have a clearer picture of whether we are going to have co-education or not?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The time span will depend entirely on the time span that the working group feel themselves need in order to make effective, solid and meaningful recommendations to Government. We are dependant on that, it is impossible in the abstract and a priori to give time spans on matters which are as I have said a moment ago quite complicated and complex.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I say this because the Minister continues like in the Post-16 time span, when I asked for the time span he tends to leave it very open. Surely there must be, I understand that the committee has to meet, consult, time goes by but we are talking about whether it will take weeks, months or years and the Minister does not give an indication as in 'I suspect it would take two to three years or two to three months', an indication at least because if not nothing ever happens, it does not move on. There does not seem to be a light at the end of the tunnel.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

These things, these blanket allegations that nothing ever happens, all things are happening all the time and I do not apologise at all for being open as he put it in terms of time spans. I do prefer for professionals, experts, scientists, to give solid advice and take their time in measuring and assessing sensitive matters like co-education and other issues related to education, rather than just rush into it for the sake of scoring points, after all Government are very often being accused of actually just being propagandistic and populist, well I am not like that, not certainly in a sensitive area and difficult area like education. That requires time.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I have not said that I am opportunist or that his Government is propagandistic or anything like that, he is just bringing out these issues which I think are quite irrelevant to the debate we are trying to have in relation to the question. I understand that certain things have been done, yes, I admit to that, the change in school hours did happen but there is a clear example where the Minister in his manifesto stated that during their legislature he would implement the changes of school hours and therefore it happened. In the case of co-education all I am asking for is the same indication that was given for the other issues, because I know that this debate has been running around Gibraltar's professionals for nearly 30 years easily. There was motion in the GTA in 1974 and another one in 1976 that they should be pushing for co-education and now here we are in 2004 and we are still discussing the issue. That is why I am saying if the Minister can give us any indication of time span but if the Minister does not want to do so he is perfectly entitled not to do so.

**NO. 2287 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS**

Can the Minister for Education state why the hours of community use of schools have not been extended after the change of school hours?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Community use of schools start at 6.00 pm. This enables the schools to be properly cleaned after the school hours before the start of community use. In any case, users usually finish work after 5.00 pm and as far as we know there has been no demand from the users for an earlier start.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2287 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I disagree with the Minister in the fact that we understand some users finish work at 5.00 pm, some do not, not everybody finishes at 5.00 pm. There are some associations that work with school children themselves and the cleaning for me is not a very good excuse if I may put it that way, because the cleaning used to happen before and school used to finish later. Now that the schools are finishing earlier it is an opportunity to give more fixtures of community use to associations and clubs in order for them to have at least 45 minutes, which could be a session for children, some sessions last 45 minutes and therefore it could be an extra session that school children could use. Therefore the opportunities that might be given is great and I think the Minister should consider this. I am suggesting this because I have had users coming to me and saying, users especially with children or who do clubs with children, outside entities not school clubs, that they would appreciate having an earlier start. For example, if they started at 5.00 pm rather than at 6.00 pm.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I believe another factor for the late start for community use is that before 6.00 pm the schools themselves run a lot of activities with the children as part of the extra-curricular programmes of the schools, before they actually pass on and open up facilities to other external users. In any case, all these factors that he has mentioned I am sure have been weighed and taken into account by the relevant parties, the Department and the Head teachers, the caretakers and that they have weighed up all

these practical options and come to the conclusion that at this stage anyway, especially since there does not seem to be any swell of demand otherwise, that at this stage the situation is operationally good. I do not know but I am sure that these people are knowledgeable in their field to know how to tie in the different uses of the school.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I would urge the Minister to consult the users because the users have, and I do not know whether they have made formal representations, but they have actually said that they would appreciate that. So it is just that one point that I am trying to make is very simple, ask them because the Minister says that the professionals might have asked and I understand that they have looked into it, well I would urge the Minister to question them whether they have done anything about asking users. About the point of the schools using the premises after school for their own activities, well again if the schools used to use it before from 4.15 pm to 6.00 pm, now they have another extra 45 minutes to use it and therefore all the better, but there are many occasions where gyms, the big gyms that have been constructed are empty and it is because the school does not use it. Therefore the users might have an opportunity to use it. I am just suggesting this to the Minister to have a look into it.

ORAL

**NO. 2288 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SCHOOL LUNCHES**

Can Government state how many pupils stayed for lunch in the years 2002/2003, 2003/2004, 2004/2005 giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2289 to 2291 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2289 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LUNCH SUPERVISORS**

Can Government state whether Lunch Supervisors are considered Government employees and do they enjoy the same conditions as other Government employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2288, 2290 and 2991 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2290 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LUNCH SUPERVISORS**

Can Government state how many cleaners in schools are also employed by Serviceall Ltd to be lunch supervisors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2288, 2289 and 2291 of 2004.



**NO. 2291 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – LUNCH SUPERVISORS**

Can Government state why the pupil/supervisor ratio in Bayside is much higher than Westside?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

**Answer to Question 2288**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule which I hand to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 2289**

Lunch supervisors are employed by Serviceall Ltd and are therefore not Government employees. Government awarded the lunchtime supervisors tender to Serviceall Ltd, who employs these ladies to work exclusively in our schools. Consequently they do not have the same conditions as Government employees.

**Answer to Question 2290**

The Department realises that cleaners do undertake other work, such as lunch supervisors. It has no objection provided the other employment does not interfere with their commitment to the Department. At present six permanent and pensionable and 13 supply cleaners also double up as lunchtime supervisors. That is a total of 148 lunch supervisors altogether.

**Answer to Question 2291**

This is due to the different logistics and in fact even the geography of the two schools. In Bayside it is considered better, given these factors, to have one sitting so that a larger number of supervisors are required, whereas in Westside they have two sittings which makes a saving on a number of supervisors required at any particular time.

**Answer to Question 2291 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2288**

Number of pupils staying in school for lunch

| <b>SCHOOL</b>      | <b>2002/3</b> | <b>2003/4</b> | <b>2004/5</b> |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Bayside            | 848           | 844           | 815           |
| Westside           | 564           | 395           | 321           |
| Sacred Heart       | 259           | 247           | 230           |
| Bishop Fitzgerald  | 447           | 413           | 434           |
| St Joseph's Middle | 314           | 346           | 334           |
| St Anne's Middle   | 415           | 411           | 388           |
| Hebrew             | 30            | 23            | 20            |
| St Mary's First    | 153           | 160           | 155           |
| St Paul's First    | 244           | 249           | 253           |
| Notre Dame         | 232           | 229           | 225           |
| Governor's Meadow  | 279           | 307           | 301           |
| St Bernard's First | 110           | 113           | 123           |
| St Joseph's First  | 296           | 284           | 307           |

All figures based on the September/December Term

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2288 TO 2291 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Considering that the lunch supervisors are not considered Government employees and therefore the cleaners are, and the Minister has stated that there are six permanent that double up, which I think is fine because the wages of anybody would be double and therefore it would be considered like having a job, half and half if we put it that way, is there any objection as there is not obviously with the cleaners, that other type of employees do the same? For example, I am thinking of somebody who might have a Government employment that want to be lunch supervisors in their own time, is there any objection?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I should not think so. Any Government employee in any sphere, is that what the hon Member means, Government employees elsewhere or in private sector whatever?

**HON S E LINARES:**

In whatever, whether it is Government or private.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There are people who have two or three different jobs and if they are accepted and selected by Serviceall as available and suitable for the job of lunch supervisors, I should think there is no objection whatsoever.

ORAL

**NO. 2292 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CLASSROOM AIDES**

Can Government state why out of the five classroom aides in St Paul's, four are on a supply basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 2293 of 2004.

**NO. 2293 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CLASSROOM AIDES**

Can Government state what is the criteria for being included in the list for supply classroom aides?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

A number of classroom aides are employed on a supply basis because their services may not be required on a permanent basis. The need for specialist assistance may change as children change also in their trajectory throughout the school moving for example into more integrated and included in mainstream schools, therefore not requiring any more the particularised attention of a classroom aide. The Government, however, are considering the creation of more permanent and pensionable posts within the classroom aide complement.

Classroom aides who are on the supply list are selected by a Departmental selection board which of course includes Head teachers and advisers. Only applicants found suitable for this type of sensitive work are placed on the list, even on the supply list.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2292 AND 2293 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I appreciate the answer but when I stated this question there are five and four were on supply, some of them are needed and some might not be needed, quite frankly I do not understand why they are not needed when for example, there are supplies on three, four, five years on supply on a full time basis. This is the question where it is not only in St Paul's, the case is in many other places where classroom aides are there for three, four and the next year they have the same job again. I would not even like to think that it is illegal under the new directive where people under contract for a certain time are entitled to the job, so again I would like the Minister to look at this because it is an issue where for example, if somebody being a classroom aide is on a supply list and is employed for three, four years constantly, if they need a mortgage, young people who need a mortgage they are not allowed to get a mortgage because they have not got a full time job. There are many consequences to that and what the Government seem to be doing is using the word 'supply' for certain people and just keeping employing them year after year, after year, I think that it should be done away with. Either they are given a contract and I think we have had this debate before in this House, we either give them a contract where they

are told they are needed for three years, 'there goes the contract for three years, after three years thank you very much you have finished your job'. What cannot be done is get them on the supply list, put them on a permanent supply which is a contradiction in terms, and I have said this before, one cannot have a supply a person who is supposed to be covering for another person, just being bunged in on a permanent basis. So I would urge the Minister to get on with laying out a contract. Apparently Personnel is supposed to be laying out the contract, well Personnel should be laying that contract quicker, if I may.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, I can assure the hon Member that the Government are very conscious and attentive to this situation. I think we have had this debate before, I think the Chief Minister himself showed understanding in respect of the Hon Mr Bruzon's point in which he made a very useful distinction between the permanent and pensionable status and a contractual arrangement which is fair and that he did give assurances in that respect. The hon Member asks me to look into this well I can assure I have a bit of a vested interest in this respect since my wife is precisely in that bracket of supply.

ORAL

**NO. 2294 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BAYSIDE SCHOOL**

Can Government state the number of pupils in Year 10 in the years 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 in Bayside?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question No. 2295 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2295 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – WESTSIDE SCHOOL**

Can Government state the number of pupils in Year 10 in the years 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 in Westside?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule that I hand to the hon Member.



**Answer to Question 2295 of 2004**

Number of pupils in Year 10 at Bayside and Westside Schools  
(figures as at 30 September 2004)

| <b>SCHOOL</b> | <b>2001/2002</b> | <b>2002/2003</b> | <b>2003/2004</b> |
|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Bayside       | 196              | 220              | 199              |
| Westside      | 186              | 192              | 191              |

**NO. 2296 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BULLYING IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state what is their policy on bullying in schools and what actions are being taken to tackle this problem?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The policy of the Government on bullying is that it is of course totally unacceptable. Management of schools is, and should remain, in the hands of head teachers, and any head teacher that seeks guidance from the Department of Education in relation to dealing with bullying would receive appropriate guidance and advice.

**NO. 2297 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – VOCATIONAL TRAINING SCHEME**

Can Government give a breakdown by sex of the number of students who joined the Vocational Training Scheme in 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2298 to 2300 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2298 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EDUCATION – VOCATIONAL TRAINING SCHEME**

How many persons have registered for the Vocational Training Scheme in Tourism Trades which was advertised on 20 October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2297, 2299 and 2300 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2299 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GCFE**

Can Government give a breakdown by sex of the number of students who joined the Gibraltar College of Further Education in 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2297, 2298 and 2300 of 2004.

**NO. 2300 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CONSTRUCTION TRAINING CENTRE**

Can Government give a breakdown by sex of the number of students who commenced training in the Construction and Training Centre in 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is set out in the schedule that I hand to the hon Member.

**Answer to Question 2300 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2297**

Breakdown by sex of the number of students who joined the Vocational Training Scheme by years

| <b>VOCATIONAL TRAINING SCHEME</b> |             |               |               |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>YEAR</b>                       | <b>MALE</b> | <b>FEMALE</b> | <b>TOTALS</b> |
| 2000/01                           | 70          | 59            | 129           |
| 2001/02                           | 86          | 61            | 147           |
| 2002/03                           | 82          | 94            | 176           |
| 2003/04                           | 84          | 103           | 187           |
| 2004/05<br>(up to 10/12/04)       | 46          | 58            | 104           |

**Answer to Question 2298**

A total of 12 persons (4 females, 8 males) registered for Vocational Training Scheme in Tourism Trades which was advertised on 20 October 2004.

**Answer to Question 2299 of 2004**

Breakdown by sex of the number of students who joined the Gibraltar College of Further Education by years

| <b>GIBRALTAR COLLEGE – New Students</b> |             |               |               |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>YEAR</b>                             | <b>MALE</b> | <b>FEMALE</b> | <b>TOTALS</b> |
| 2000/01                                 | 129         | 37            | 166           |
| 2001/02                                 | 91          | 48            | 139           |
| 2002/03                                 | 96          | 54            | 150           |
| 2003/04                                 | 105         | 95            | 200           |
| 2004/05                                 | 145         | 114           | 259           |

| <b>GIBRALTAR COLLEGE – Total No. of Students</b> |             |               |               |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>YEAR</b>                                      | <b>MALE</b> | <b>FEMALE</b> | <b>TOTALS</b> |
| 2000/01                                          | 161         | 52            | 213           |
| 2001/02                                          | 171         | 68            | 239           |
| 2002/03                                          | 169         | 73            | 242           |
| 2003/04                                          | 186         | 130           | 316           |
| 2004/05                                          | 212         | 170           | 382           |

Contd

**Contd Answer to Question 2300 of 2004**

**Answer to Question 2300**

Breakdown by sex of the number of students who commenced training in the  
Construction and Training Centre by years

| <b>CONSTRUCTION TRAINING CENTRE</b> |             |               |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| <b>YEAR</b>                         | <b>MALE</b> | <b>FEMALE</b> |
| 2000/2001                           | 16          | -             |
| 2001/2002                           | 24          | -             |
| 2002/2003                           | 27          | -             |
| 2003/2004                           | 24          | -             |
| 2004/2005                           | 24          | 1             |



**NO. 2301 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EDUCATION – INDIVIDUAL TRAINING PROGRAMMES**

In respect of the schedule provided in answer to Question No. 1623 can Government clarify and provide further information in respect of what courses had been funded for “ITP” (£397,703.14p) and “Children from Abroad” (£8,415.60p)?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

As I had promised to provide the information in writing to the hon Member after the last Session of the House, I wrote to him with the required information, my letter of 10<sup>th</sup> December, but if he wishes to have this information now on record in Hansard I hand to him a written reply.

**Answer to Question 2301 of 2004**

ITP (Individual Training Programmes) include Bar Vocational Courses, Postgraduate Certificate of Education Courses and all distance learning courses.

“Children from Abroad” covers payments made to Robert Beiso for organising numerous school trips to Spain. This was in connection with the link with Los Barrios and other activities (such as the visits to ERA in Chiclana, recycling plants, Granja El Dorado (farm), reforestation project). He also organised visits to and from Los Barrios of teachers and other officials. This is in respect of a consideration to Mr Beiso (at an hourly rate of £30.77p) and other expenses (for example, subsistence, transport et cetera).

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2301 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful to the Minister, his letter arrived after the notice of questions and it is for that reason that the question was put.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I understand.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As a supplementary can I ask the Minister to confirm that the ITP has included the funding of scholarship courses, despite the contrary impression having been given I think whilst we were speculating about what that Head covered?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am not sure what the hon Member means by scholarship courses. All funding in terms of courses for further education, higher education, go by the name of scholarships. The scholarships which are included under the ITP are the Bar Vocational Courses, the Postgraduate PGCE and distance learning courses.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is there a specific reason why those are being funded under ITP and not as scholarships from the other Heads?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, I think they are seen more in terms of training, skills development, rather than just purely university degree courses.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this a new policy that was introduced in the last financial year for the first time?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not think so. I think it has been common practice in the past but I am not too sure of my facts in that respect.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not a fact that the questions that were put the last time were because of the increase in the expenditure shown under the Gibraltar Development Corporation in this Sub-head, which was much higher than the previous year and that in fact in comparing one year with another, this was one of the items which the Minister was not able to give us a full explanation on at the last Question Time?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

These Individual Training Programmes. Well, that I agree is what I promised, I was not able to provide specific information on that at the last meeting and I promised to seek the information and deliver it, which I have done.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, that is not my question. My question is in the Estimates, the original budget for this item, which is on page 121 Appendix B of the GDC, which says 'training and development courses other'. The budget in 2002/2003 was £991,000 and the budget for 2003/2004 was £960,000, the outturn was £1,284,000, the questions were to try and identify the reason for the increase. Now the reason for the increase being that ITP was there introduced during the course of the year and had not been budgeted for at the beginning of the year. Since the budget in the current year is now down again to £870,000, is it that in the current year there is not a provision for this?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I am afraid I cannot answer that question. For budgetary considerations I would have to enquire further before I can give any reliable answer to that. Again, I promise that I will try to find a solution. Yes, I am informed that the reason for the reduction in this year's Estimates is that these grants will now revert back to the scholarship vote in the Consolidated Fund.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So then the position is in fact that they moved there last year but now they are going to go back to the Scholarship Fund which is shown in Appendix N, is that correct?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Not in its entirety but some will go back to the Scholarship Fund. Some had gone there and they are going back there where they came from.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That seems to be the position but I have just asked the Minister whether it was a new policy that was introduced last year and he thought it had always been there, so I take it then that it was introduced last year but it has been reconsidered and is now going back to where it usually was. In terms of the cost that is included there I think

when we asked in the last meeting of the House, in Question No. 1623, the Minister told us that the actual maintenance grant to the individual was not included, has it been included or not? Can the Minister confirm whether in fact that information was correct? I think the last time I asked specifically in one of the supplementaries whether the award to the individual, that is the maintenance to the student doing this postgraduate thing, came out of this Head and I think the answer was no, but I am not sure in the light of the information provided today whether that answer was accurate.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No the postgraduate courses are now being paid by the Department of Education & Skills in the UK. They grant maintenance to the tune of £6,000 which is even higher than our maintenance grant here, and they pay the tuition fees as well. So a number of applicants for PGCE this year have not been granted local support, local funding, because they are being paid by the UK.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No that is not my question. My question is, when I asked in supplementary to Question No. 1623 last year about the composition of the individual training programme, the ITP, I asked is the scholarship, the amount of maintenance money given to the student, coming out of there and the answer I got was no. It seems to me that in light of the information provided today that answer might not have been correct and I am seeking confirmation of whether in fact it was or was not correct.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, the maintenance is included in the lump sum that is given towards tuition, out of that fund as well.

**NO. 2302 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EDUCATION – DRUG REHABILITATION PROGRAMME**

Can Government state whether in the months of October and November 2004 there has been any increase in the number of employers participating in the wage subsidy pilot scheme that was approved under ESF for persons who have completed a Drug Rehabilitation Programme and others who meet the categories stated in answer to Question No. 730 of 2002 now in operation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

As with Question Nos. 2247 to 2270, as I explained at the time, the information required is not yet available, rather it is available for the months of October and November but will not be issued by the Government as much as policy practice until we can provide a quarterly return.

**NO. 2303 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – WAGE SUBSIDY**

In relation to the answers to Question Nos. 1624 of 2004 and 1625 of 2004 are Government now in a position to provide the information sought in those questions as previously provided in respect of those within the ESF funded programmes and in the fuller manner previously provided by the Minister for Social Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

This information too was included in the letter dated 10<sup>th</sup> November 2004 which I sent to the hon Member, which as he explained before was received after he formulated this question. If he wishes this information to be recorded in Hansard, I now pass him a schedule with the information requested.

## **Answer to Question 2303 of 2004**

### **Information requested in respect of questions 1624 and 1625**

“1. Under our estimates we have wage subsidies split between (a) EU Projects and (b) Other.

- (a) wage subsidy projects which have been approved at EU funding level and for which GOG has committed itself for matching funds in the 45/55 per cent split. These include “Venia” (for Drug rehabilitation, ex-offenders, et cetera) and “Focus” (our main ESF Wage Subsidy scheme for long-term unemployed).
- (b) “general purpose” GOG fully funded.

I can confirm that during the period from April to September we have had a total of 20 new employers and 30 new wage subsidised employees under ESF funding. All these come under the EU “Focus” scheme.

As regards “Venia”, no new employer/employee has joined this financial year (because there has not been any demand).

It is to be understood that wage subsidised employees will not always be on the increase – such is not a cumulative figure. Just as new employers/employees join a wage subsidy scheme others may be completing the full twelve months or terminating (for whatever reason) before the end of the twelve months.”



**NO. 2304 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EDUCATION – GCFE**

Can Government explain the nature of the payments of £1,163, £20,773 and £26,820 by the College of Further Education for the financial years 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 respectively, shown under Revenue Subhead – Other Reimbursements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The sums shown in the question are not the three figures that the Department has reconciled with Treasury. These figures should be as follows: 2001/2002 is £1,202.34p, 2002/2003 is £22,856.34p and 2003/2004 is £27,726.55p respectively. They are not all, as stated in the question, in respect of charges made by the College of Further Education. The figure for 2001/2002 indeed is in respect entirely of charges made by the College of Further Education in terms of a number of things, private examination fees, fees for adult classes. Now, the revenue charged by the College of Further Education shown under Revenue Sub-head “Other Reimbursements” is in respect of administration costs for exams as I have just explained.

Other charges included in the figures for 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 are in respect of overpayments made to scholarship holders and also for the hiring of lecture rooms at Bleak House are also credited to this revenue. Hence the difference between the figure of 2001/2002 and the much higher figures of 2002/2003 and 2003/2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2304 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The figures in my question are related to the answer that I got at the last meeting of the House in respect of the increase from £500,000 to £1,250,000 between the original estimate and the forecast outturn in respect of Head 5 Sub-head 6 Other Reimbursements, where the receiver of the revenue is the Accountant-General. I am still trying to figure out how this system works where the receiver of the revenue is the Accountant-General but at the time that I asked the question what I was told was that the Departments mentioned were the ones that were receiving the money. Now is this money paid by the Department to the Accountant-General or by the public to the Department?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Reimbursements from the Department to the Accountant-General and the figures, I am told, have been reconciled with Treasury.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not questioning the accuracy of the figure, all I am pointing out is that I am using the figures provided previously, and in the previous answer one of the sources identified was College of Further Education, implying that this was money that the College of Further Education presumably had returned to the Treasury because the receiver of the revenue is the Accountant-General. Now the Minister has said this is fees, what is it that the College collects this from the people who use these things and then pass it to the Treasury, is that the position?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well the Department does, yes. Obviously, administratively the College receives the payment of fees and through the Department of Education it is passed on to Treasury, the Accountant-General.

**NO. 2305 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EDUCATION – NON-EU CHILDREN**

Can Government state when the policy was introduced that children residing in Gibraltar without a residence permit should be admitted to Government schools and since then how many such children have been admitted and in which years?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

No non-EU children residing in Gibraltar without a residence permit have been admitted to Government schools. However, given the sometimes long waiting time for the issuing of such permits from a purely administrative point of view, the Department allows children to be registered when it is advised by the Civil Status that the permit will be issued in due course. In such cases, parents are informed that should such permits not be issued for some reason or other, then the children will no longer be allowed to attend school unless they become fee paying from that time.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2305 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, this seems to address a different issue than the source of the question. The source of the question is that at the previous meeting of the House I was told that the Government had actually dealt with children that were not legally in Gibraltar in anticipation of being given a permit, on the basis that these children were here and that the choice was either deporting them or allowing them to be educated. Now this is not the same category of people that the Minister has just mentioned, I take it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, in effect it is because the Government took the policy decision that either it enforced immigration laws and expelled from Gibraltar and physically saw out illegal child immigrants, for want of a better word, in other words illegal undocumented persons who were of school attending age, either the Government applied the law and had them expelled from Gibraltar, or otherwise had a moral obligation to provide them with schooling. What was not acceptable, we came to the conclusion to, was that the Government should turn a blind eye to their presence for lack of courage to apply the immigration legislation and then deny them free schooling. In other words, that there were children in Gibraltar, in Gibraltar with the knowledge of the

Government, but to which the Government was denying a free education. The way that that was dealt with was that in effect they get residence permits. So it is true that these people are getting residence permits as a means of compliance with the Education Ordinance that requires that in order for entitlement to free schooling.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I hear what the Chief Minister has to say, which is in fact the same as he said the last time which is what prompted the question. The point is that is it not the case that the answer given by the Minister for Education that people arriving and wanting to go into school are told 'you are being admitted into school in anticipation of your being granted a permit', is not quite the same situation as he is describing.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a different scenario.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is a different scenario and I am asking about the scenario I am trying to identify, how many people were affected by that policy decision, that was the question?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The one I have described.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is right, yes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We do not have the information here but from memory, it was somewhere between 10 and 15, probably nearer 15 than 10 my instinct tells me, but it was a figure of that order. Remember there had previously already been a regularisation exercise so some were admitted because their parents and their own status was regularised under various amnesties, and then there is this rump that had not been regularised and that were admitted through this route. If the hon Member wants to know the exact figure, the information is available and can be obtained for him.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I would be grateful if the rest of the information sought in the question would be provided, that is the years when this happened, when the policy decision was taken and when this took place.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can we be given some further information as to the criteria applied there? Was it related to the number of years that the parents had been in Gibraltar or the number of years that the children had been in Gibraltar without a residence permit and without the benefit of education?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, my understanding of the way, certainly what was intended, is that it is not subject to criteria. I think the policy is that in respect of children of which the administration is aware that they are in Gibraltar and the administration chooses not to enforce the statutory rights to have them or to seek the necessary judicial orders to have them seen out of Gibraltar, that they are then admitted into schools on the basis that these children should not be allowed to fester as non-persons. Either they are illegal immigrants who should not be in Gibraltar and they are seen out of Gibraltar, or they are admitted into schools, but they should not fall in between either of those so that they are here with the knowledge of the administration but denied schooling. So there is not a criteria beyond that.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

But are there not some individuals in a situation where they are in Gibraltar without a residence permit, where the Government are aware of that, where they are not being excluded and where the relevant department is saying to them or to their parents who are legally in Gibraltar, *'this is the cost of schooling and if this cost is not met your children will not enjoy that schooling'*.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not aware that that is the position, that is precisely what the policy was intended to eradicate. It is possible that children have been introduced into Gibraltar unlawfully recently and they have not been brought forward and have been put in the Loreto Convent or somewhere like that, but that was precisely the situation that this policy was intended to address, because these children were either being denied schooling, or their parents were usually of very limited incomes, were making huge sacrifices themselves so as not to deny their children schooling, paying fees at private schools. Some of them were outside of school and some of them were busting a gut to keep their children in the Loreto Convent, and that is precisely what the Government's policy was designed to relieve them of, the dilemma between denying their children school or otherwise relatively poor people having to pay fees.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister for Education tell us whether he is aware in fact of instances such as that which we are debating, which may not yet have been dealt with under this Head and who are still pending introduction into schools despite their parents having been told *'this is the cost of education, if you cannot afford it your child is not getting an education'*. I assume this is not something we can continue to do indefinitely, there must be a limited number of solutions.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No it is not. Sorry, I know he asked the Minister but if I could just answer the very last bit. No, I do not think there can be any limit, we must enforce our immigration controls. We must not allow children to come in if we do not want them to come in and if they do come in clandestinely and they are discovered, then they should be either seen out of Gibraltar or educated, but I do not think there are any circumstances in which this community can know that there are children of school age in Gibraltar, choose not to apply the immigration legislation to them and then deny them education. So that is not to say that we want an endless number of people from Morocco in our schools, I think there is a limit to that capacity in our resource but the immigration laws cannot be applied at school level, they have got to be applied at border control levels and they have got to be applied at immigration law enforcement level, and it cannot be applied by default simply denying children schooling if they get in and are not seen out.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

As far as the Department of Education is concerned, when people come to the counter to enrol operationally in practical terms, we immediately either ask for the identity card to show legal residence or otherwise, that is the thrust of the answer I have given to this question, refer the matter to the Civil Status and Immigration Control who will then advise us as to the status of that person. It might fit within the categories that the Chief Minister has described and if so, and in such cases we then proceed with the process of enrolment.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I take it from that that the Minister for Education is telling me that he is, in answer to my question, not aware of any case where there is a child who might not yet have been enrolled who would fall within this category?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

As a matter of fact I am aware. There are two or three children in that situation but that is purely in terms of procedure and administratively that this process has not been gone through as yet.

**NO. 2306 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**NEXT DAY SERVICE MODEL**

Can Government state how the Post Office has performed against the seven Working Practices agreed in the New Next Day Service Model the Hon and Gallant Ernest Britto referred to in the Budget Session of March 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Only six of the seven working practices form part of the Next Day Service Model. Number 5 referred to by the Hon Mr Britto in his budget speech in 2003 does not. The other six working practices are working to the satisfaction of the Government, as indeed is working practice No. 5.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2306 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

How has the Post Office measured the performance of these six working practices?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

By ensuring that the mail is delivered within the next day, which is what the agreed practice stipulates, and that is monitored and the results are actually in a very high 90 per cent of mail received and delivered.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

The Minister says 90 per cent, however, the practices said all mail so what measures are being taken to improve this from 90 per cent to satisfy what was originally set out as the target?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I have said over 90 per cent not 90 per cent so therefore the figure is actually in excess of 90 per cent and quite near 100 per cent. The only thing is that this is being monitored over a period of a year and as soon as the year is over we will be able to

gauge the exact percentage, but the figure is very much near to the hundred, well over 90 per cent.



**NO. 2307 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – ISLAND PROJECT**

Further to the answer to Question No. 1905 of 2004, can Government say what was the nature of the work produced by Triay, Stagnetto, Neish – Island Project Queensway Quay which cost £16,200?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Triay, Stagnetto, Neish provided legal advice to the Development and Planning Commission in relation to the outline planning application for the project known as the Island Project at Queensway Quay.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2307 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister in a position to say what the advice exactly related to?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This was before my time, but I understand that there were objections to the project from certain parties who took legal advice themselves and made representations about the granting of the outline planning permission on a point of law, which basically was in respect of whether the Development and Planning Commission had the authority to be able to grant an outline planning in the sea and not on land. Therefore, there was advice granted to the Development and Planning Commission on this issue. I think it will be remembered that subsequently there was an amendment in the law before this House in order to address this issue and to clarify the matter for the future.

ORAL

**NO. 2308 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FUNICULAR SERVICE**

Do Government support the construction of a funicular installation from Casemates to Rock Gun?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 2309 of 2004.

**NO. 2309 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FUNICULAR SERVICE**

Has an environmental impact assessment now been submitted in respect of the application for planning permission for a funicular by 21<sup>st</sup> Century Rock Ltd?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

An environmental impact assessment in respect of the funicular project has not yet been submitted. The Government await the outcome of the assessment before taking a view on the project. Subject to environmental impact assessment the Government, in principle, support this project as an addition to our tourism infrastructure.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2308 AND 2309 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The position of his predecessor in that Department, which he made known after he left the DTI was one where he was not very favourable to the project, that may have been his own personal position and not the position of the Government, but what about on heritage considerations, the Minister referred to the environmental impact, do the Government not see whether any heritage considerations, given that it is on the north side of the Rock?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Let me say that the Heritage Trust and the Heritage Lobby is part of the Development and Planning Commission and their views have been made known to the Commission and the Commission has taken a view on the matter awaiting the environmental impact assessment, but if there was any violation of our main heritage sites the project would not be allowed to proceed. Obviously the environmental impact assessment would address that issue and point that out.

ORAL

**NO. 2310 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MICROWAVE ANTENNA LINK STATION**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of a microwave antenna link station at British Lines Road and were any representations received in respect of this project?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2311 to 2316 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2311 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**MARINA BAY COMPLEX LTD**

On what date was outline planning permission granted to Marina Bay Complex Ltd in respect of an application to construct a multi-storey car park/commercial development?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2310 and 2312 to 2316 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2312 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – THOMPSON’S COTTAGES, NAVAL HOSPITAL HILL**

Has the application for planning permission for the construction of three houses at Thompson’s Cottages, Naval Hospital Hill been granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2310, 2311 and 2313 to 2316 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2313 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – THOMPSON’S COTTAGES, NAVAL HOSPITAL HILL**

Can Government say how many representations have been made to the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed development at Thompson’s Cottages, Naval Hospital Hill?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2310 to 2312 and 2314 to 2316 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2314 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – GRAND MAGAZINE, ROSIA MOLE**

Can Government say how many representations have been made to the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed developments at Grand Magazine site and Rosia Mole?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2310 to 2313, 2315 and 2316 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2315 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – GRAND MAGAZINE, ROSIA MOLE**

Has planning permission been granted to Commercial Developments Inc Ltd to construct a residential development at Grand Magazine site and bathing and sub-aqua facilities at Rosia Mole?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2310 to 2314 and 2316 of 2004.

**NO. 2316 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – 2 BUENA VISTA ROAD**

Has the application for planning permission to construct seven houses at 2 Buena Vista Road been granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Planning permission was granted for the microwave antenna link station at British Lines Road. Two representations were received in respect of this project.

Outline planning permission has not been granted to Marina Bay Complex Ltd for the commercial development/multi-storey car park.

Planning permission has not been granted to the proposed development at Thompson's Cottages. Two representations were received in respect of this proposed development.

Planning permission has not been granted in respect of the proposed development at Grand Magazine and Rosia. Five representations have been received. One of these carried 65 signatures.

Planning permission has not been granted in respect of the proposed project at 2 Buena Vista Road. Let me just add that when this question was written, the Development and Planning Commission had not met as it did last Friday and in fact the proposal in respect of Thompson's Cottage and Grand Magazine and Rosia were discussed, so there have been developments since then but I would not want to make it known across the floor of the House, seeing that the applicants may not have yet been informed of the outcome.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2310 TO 2316 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Minister says therefore, will we know now in relation to Question No. 2312 and No. 2313, in relation to Question No. 2314 that it was not granted, does that mean that the Development and Planning Commission has not yet discussed the matter and that is why it has not been granted not that it has been refused? Is that the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

In respect of which one?

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In respect of the others. For example, Question No. 2316, 2311 as well.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, Question No. 2316 which is Buena Vista Road. That has been discussed and we are in discussion with the developer over certain requirements, and the same applies to Marina Bay.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 2314 and No. 2315 which is the development at Grand Magazine and Rosia Mole, is it the case that planning permission has been refused or that it has not been granted because it has not been discussed yet?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The Grand Magazine and Rosia Mole were discussed at the meeting of the Development and Planning Commission last Friday and a decision was taken and will be communicated to the developers within the next few days I assume.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Just to clarify, it was not that planning permission was not granted, it is simply that it had not been discussed.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am not saying whether it was not granted or not, all I was saying is that there have been developments since the drafting of this question and I just did not want to mislead by saying that it had not been considered. It has been considered.

**NO. 2317 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – SEA AQUARIUM, OCEAN VILLAGE**

What condition was imposed by the DPC on the original application for a Sea Aquarium in the Ocean Village project, and for what reason?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

It is not appropriate to give confidential details of the sort requested in respect of a particular application.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2317 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether this is still at the discussion stage or whether it has been concluded one way or the other?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, certain conditions have been imposed on the development and the developers have asked for time to consider these and make further representations to the Commission, and this will probably happen in February next year.

**NO. 2318 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PIAZZA PROJECT**

Has the Piazza project now been handed over by the contractor to the Government?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2318 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

On what date did that happen?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This happened on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2004 when a substantial completion certificate was issued.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There was an issue which we have discussed before in this House relating to the delay in the completion of the project on the part of the developer and the Minister supplied me with the penalty clause listing the amounts that had to be paid depending how long the project over run. Can the Minister say whether that clause has been enforced and what amounts have been paid by the developer, or will be paid by the developer to the Government?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I would need notice of the question, if the hon Member wishes I would be happy to make the necessary information available to him.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If the Minister could write to me with that information I would be grateful.

**NO. 2319 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE – CAR PARK**

Can Government tell the House whether there have been any further meetings since September 2004 with the persons interested in building an underground car park at Grand Parade, and if so when and with what result?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

There was a further meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2004. The Government, however, are not willing to divulge details of what was discussed at that meeting.

All I am prepared to say at this stage is that the Government would wish there to be a public consultation exercise on the intended project of building a car park under Grand Parade. The results of the exercise will assist the Government in taking decisions with respect to the intended project.

ORAL

**NO. 2320 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – MEETINGS**

How many meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 24<sup>th</sup> September 2004 and on what dates?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2345, 2355, 2376 and 2377 of 2004.



**NO. 2321 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES**

What was the number and value of private motor vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since September 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2322 to 2325 of 2004.

**NO. 2322 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – GOODS VEHICLES**

What was the number and value of goods vehicles imported by:

- (a) individuals;
- (b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since September 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2321 and 2323 to 2325 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2323 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORTS – COMPUTERS**

What was the value and number of computer items imported into Gibraltar since September 2004 inclusive on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2321, 2322, 2324 and 2325 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2324 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY**

How much import duty has been collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from October 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2321 to 2323 and 2325 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2325 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY – BUILDING MATERIALS**

What was the amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since October 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The information is set out in the schedule that I hand to the hon Member.

### Schedule to Question 2325

#### Answer to Question 2321

- (a) Number and Value of private motor vehicles imported, September-November 2004

| <b>IMPORTED BY</b> |                    |                                |                         |                               |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                    | <b>Individuals</b> |                                | <b>Licensed Dealers</b> |                               |
| <b>2004</b>        | <b>Number</b>      | <b>Value<br/>(£ thousands)</b> | <b>Number</b>           | <b>Value<br/>(£ millions)</b> |
| September          | 23                 | 92.0                           | 694                     | 8.0                           |
| October            | 16                 | 49.6                           | 710                     | 8.1                           |
| November           | 23                 | 99.7                           | 447                     | 6.4                           |

#### Answer to Question 2322

- (b) Number and Value of Goods Vehicles imported, September-November 2004

| <b>IMPORTED BY</b> |                    |                                |                         |                                |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
|                    | <b>Individuals</b> |                                | <b>Licensed Dealers</b> |                                |
| <b>2004</b>        | <b>Number</b>      | <b>Value<br/>(£ thousands)</b> | <b>Number</b>           | <b>Value<br/>(£ thousands)</b> |
| September          | 5                  | 2                              | 5                       | 37                             |
| October            | -                  | -                              | 6                       | 34                             |
| November           | 5                  | 4                              | 5                       | 39                             |

#### Answer to Question 2323

- (c) Computer hardware imported, September-November 2004

| <u>Month</u> | <u>Value of Computers (£)</u> |
|--------------|-------------------------------|
| September    | 772,621                       |
| October      | 511,818                       |
| November     | 1,028,720                     |

As explained at the last meeting of the House, when an identical question was asked, it is not possible to provide a figure for the number of computers imported into Gibraltar, as it is individual components that are imported and not fully assembled computers.

#### Answer to Question 2324

Import Duty Collected at Land Frontier at the Non-Commercial Gate, October-November 2004

|          |         |
|----------|---------|
| October  | £12,883 |
| November | £17,782 |

Contd.....

**Contd Schedule 2325**

**Answer to Question 2325**

Import Duty Collected on Building Materials  
October-November 2004

|          |         |
|----------|---------|
| October  | £29,010 |
| November | £40,587 |

**NO. 2326 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FLIGHTS TO GIBRALTAR**

Can Government say whether any flight destined for Gibraltar has been allowed to enter a Spanish airport as an alternative when filing its flight plan, and if so what flight was it and on what date did this happen?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

No flight destined for Gibraltar has needed to divert to a Spanish airport since the restrictions on diversions were lifted by Spain with effect from 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2326 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The question actually asks whether the airlines have been allowed to enter a Spanish airport as an alternative when filing its flight plan and not whether they actually diverted there. Is the Minister able to say whether the airlines are now entering Spanish airports in the flight plan as an alternative airport?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

What I can tell the hon Member is that as from 3<sup>rd</sup> December the airlines were informed of the alternatives that they now had which basically eliminated the restrictions that had existed until that date. The actual need for that to have happened has not happened due to the fact that the need has not arisen. We will obviously have to test the system when the need is there but so far there has not been the need for that.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

As I understand the situation perhaps the Minister might be able to clarify it if I am wrong, but as I understand it when an airline is flying to a particular destination they file a flight plan before they leave wherever they are, in this case Luton or Manchester, once they file that flight plan there they will enter before leaving an alternative airport which might be used for emergency purposes or if the weather does not allow a landing at Gibraltar. This is before they actually leave and before



they arrive in the vicinity of Gibraltar and it is at that particular stage that they would enter the alternative airport in the flight plan. Before it was not possible to enter a Spanish airport. As we understand it from the reading of the situation, it would have been possible after that agreement was arrived at but we do not actually know whether this is happening or not. I would also draw the Minister's attention to the comments made by GB Airways who had at one particular point, this was in November though, said they had not received any official confirmation regarding any change of policy on the part of the Spanish administration. Can the Minister say, although there has not been a need to divert to a Spanish airport and I understand that, can he say whether in the actual flight plan Spanish airports are now being entered or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am afraid I cannot confirm that matter because I have not asked the airline. I have assumed that they have done. All I can say is that when GB Airways made that comment to the press in November, although the Spanish Foreign Secretary and the British Foreign Secretary had both jointly announced the fact that this was the case, it was not until 3<sup>rd</sup> December that an official communiqué was circulated which basically did away with the restriction and enabled the flight to be diverted to Malaga if required.

ORAL

**NO. 2327 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**AIRLINES**

Are any new airlines in discussion with the Government about flying to Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2328 to 2330 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2328 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FLIGHTS – GIBRALTAR/LONDON GATWICK**

How many flights between Gibraltar and London Gatwick airport were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis since October 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2327, 2329 and 2330 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2329 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FLIGHTS – GIBRALTAR/LUTON**

How many flights between Gibraltar and London Luton airport were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis since October 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2327, 2328 and 2330 of 2004.

**NO. 2330 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FLIGHTS – GIBRALTAR/MANCHESTER**

How many flights between Gibraltar and Manchester airport were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis since October 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

One new airline is in discussion with the Government.

No flight between Gibraltar and the airports of Gatwick, London Luton or Manchester was cancelled in October or November 2004. One flight to London Gatwick was rescheduled, following damage sustained on the ground on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2004.

The number of flights timetabled were as follows:-

|                              |                                 |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Gibraltar to London Gatwick: | 62 in October<br>54 in November |
| Gibraltar to London Luton:   | 31 in October<br>21 in November |
| Gibraltar to Manchester:     | 18 in October<br>17 in November |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2327 TO 2330 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the one new airline the Government are now having discussions with, is that in addition to the airlines that there were last time, and if so how many are there in total now?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is a new contact we have made in the last month.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

How many are there in total at the moment?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

We are actually actively in contact with five airlines at the moment.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister in a position to tell the House whether any of those would be a link to Morocco in some shape or form?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, all UK.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the questions asked previously where the Minister confirmed that Fly-Be and the South West was one area that was being looked at, is that still the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is still the case.

ORAL

**NO. 2331 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SEA TRADE MEDITERRANEAN CRUISE CONVENTION**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of attending and participating in the Sea Trade Mediterranean Cruise Convention and exhibition in Genoa?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2332 to 2334 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2332 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SEA TRADE IN GENOA**

How many persons made up the Gibraltar delegation to Sea Trade in Genoa and what offices do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2331, 2333 and 2334 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2333 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SEMINAR IN FINLAND**

Who were the delegates from Gibraltar that took part in the seminar on “Competitive Regions – Shaping Best Practice” in Finland recently and on what dates did the seminar take place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2331, 2332 and 2334 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2334 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SEMINAR IN FINLAND**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of Gibraltar's participation in the seminar "Competitive Regions – Shaping Best Practice"?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The extensive factual information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

## **SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 2334**

### **Q 2331**

The cost of attending the exhibition and conference was £17,067 as follows:-

|                                                     |         |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Construction, installation and dismantling of stand | £11,851 |
| Delegate fee                                        | £ 674   |
| Freight charge and expenses                         | £ 244   |
| Air fares                                           | £ 1,422 |
| Subsistence                                         | £ 477   |
| Hotel accommodation                                 | £ 2,399 |

### **Q 2332**

Three persons made up the Gibraltar delegation to the Trade Genoa, as follows:-

The Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Port Authority

The Director of the Gibraltar Government Office in London, who is also Vice-President of Medcruise

A junior officer from the Gibraltar Government Office in London.

### **Q 2333**

The two Gibraltar delegates at the "Competitive Regions – Shaping Best Practice" seminar were Victor Reyes and James Savignon, the EU Programmes Manager and the EU Programmes Facilitator, respectively. The seminar took place from 12-15 October 2004.

### **Q 2334**

The cost of participation was £2,982 as follows:

|                 |        |
|-----------------|--------|
| Flights         | £1,363 |
| Hotels          | £ 797  |
| Subsistence     | £ 603  |
| Travel Expenses | £ 219  |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2331 TO 2334 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The schedule which the Minister has just passed on to me, I have some queries in relation to items which are shown. It shows the total cost of Sea Trade as being in the region of £17,000. It says that three persons attended the seminar but I have a query in relation to the hotel accommodation which is shown as being £2,300 for three people. Is that because the conference was for a week, can the Minister clarify that?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The actual exhibition and conference went on, I believe, for five or six days. The attendance at this particular exhibition and conference was as I have said by three people, the Chief Executive of the Port Authority, who actually attends these conferences as a delegate because in addition to the actual exhibition hall there are also conferences that are going on where issues of a general interest within cruising and the cruising industry are discussed, therefore we need to have our eyes and ears there. The Director of the Government Office in London who is also Vice-President of Medcruise and therefore he attends not just to attend the exhibition but actually to participate in the Medcruise activity, and then we have a junior officer from the London office who actually went to the conference and exhibition to man the Gibraltar stand.

**NO. 2335 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SLOP OIL RECEPTION AND TREATMENT LTD**

Has the application by Slop Oil Reception and Treatment Ltd for a licence to carry out an activity described by section 192D of the Public Health Ordinance or an extension thereof been granted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2335 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say when this was granted?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, that was granted on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2004 for a period of two years.

ORAL

**NO. 2336 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF EUROPE'S MARITIME REGIONS**

In what capacity is the Gibraltar Government a member of AMRIE and APRI, the Policy Research Institute of Europe's Maritime Regions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2337 to 2343 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2337 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF EUROPE'S MARITIME REGIONS**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of Gibraltar's attendance and participation at the launch of APRI in Brussels in October?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2336 and 2338 to 2343 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2338 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF EUROPE'S MARITIME REGIONS**

What is the cost, if any, of Gibraltar's membership of AMRIE and APRI?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2336, 2337 and 2339 to 2343 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2339 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF EUROPE'S MARITIME REGIONS**

Can Government list the other members of AMRIE and APRI?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2336 to 2338 and 2340 to 2343 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2340 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF EUROPE'S MARITIME REGIONS**

Who were the other members of the AMRIE Specialised Working Group on maritime education and research that Gibraltar has been chairing for the past two years and what regions or interests do each of them represent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2336 to 2339 and 2341 to 2343 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2341 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF EUROPE'S MARITIME REGIONS**

How many meetings of the AMRIE Specialised Working Group chaired by Gibraltar have taken place in the last two years, where did they take place, and who represented Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2336 to 2340, 2342 and 2343 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2342 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF EUROPE'S MARITIME REGIONS**

Can Government supply to the Opposition in this House, for the record of Hansard, a copy of the policy paper influenced by Gibraltar that was produced by AMRIE and circulated to all MEPs following the Prestige incident?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2336 to 2341 and 2343 of 2004.

**NO. 2343 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF EUROPE'S MARITIME REGIONS**

Can Government say on how many occasions Gibraltar's interests were safeguarded at the initial stages of EU Directives as a result of our membership of AMRIE?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Gibraltar is a member of AMRIE as a Maritime Region.

There was no specific cost for attending and participating at the launch of APRI: this was timed to coincide with the October meetings of the AMRIE Specialist Working Groups.

There is no cost for membership or participation in APRI. The annual membership fee for AMRIE is 3,666 euros.

The members of AMRIE are listed in the Schedule I hand the hon Member. The members of AMRIE are automatically members of APRI.

The members of the Specialist Working Group on Centres of Excellence, which covers maritime education and research, are set out in the Schedule which I also hand to the hon Member.

The AMRIE Specialist Working Group on Centres of Excellence met on the following occasions in 2003 and 2004:

19 February 2003  
10 June 2003 \*  
14 October 2003  
18 February 2004  
17 June 2004 \*  
21 October 2004

\* - Gibraltar not represented at this meeting.

I now hand the hon Member a copy of the AMRIE position paper on the *Prestige*.

The Government cannot specify a specific number of occasions when Gibraltar's interests have been safeguarded.

AMRIE membership has specifically proven beneficial to Gibraltar in receiving prior warning of proposed EU policy, directives and regulations, and therefore able to gauge their possible impact on Gibraltar, considering how other EU members are reacting to proposals and comment on the proposals while still at the discussion stage, in the following areas:

- Places of refuge – creation of European Compensation Fund
- White Paper on Transport
- Ship to ship transfers of oil
- The development of the Trans-European Networks (TENsT) and the motorways of the sea
- The Marco Polo initiatives: research in the maritime field
- The I-Marq project on bathing water quality
- Market access to Port services
- Sulphur Dioxide emissions from ships, reduction of sulphur in bunker oil, and proposed directive expected in 2005
- Role of EMSA (European Maritime Safety Agency)
- Port security, and proposal for a directive in this field
- The proposed European Intermodal Loading Unit
- Double-hull tanker regulations
- Ship source pollution legislation, and the introduction of sanctions to combat it
- Short Sea Shipping issues
- Safety rules and standards for passenger ships

The work covered by AMRIE is spelt out in the Annual Report for 2003 which I hand to the hon Member. So in the Annual Report which is being handed over, all of these issues will have been covered.

Membership of AMRIE also allows networking with other European regions and ports in maritime matters, and offers an opportunity to lobby the AMRIE sponsoring MEPs. Membership also gives Gibraltar profile as a maritime region, which led to Gibraltar being invited to chair one of the working sessions at the High Level Conference held in Genoa in May 2004.

Now when reading questions earlier on the hon Member asked who represented us in this. I do not think it is covered in my answer, I have overlooked that but it is the Chief Executive of the Ministry for Trade, Industry & Communications, Richard Garcia, who is the Gibraltar representative on this forum.

ANSWER TO QUESTION 2343  
 SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 2339



## AMRIE Membership per Categories

AMRIE members are distributed in the following categories:

Regional Authorities,  
 Local Authorities,  
 Ports,  
 Research / Consulting  
 Training organisations,  
 Universities,  
 Trade Unions,  
 Classification Societies,  
 Industries  
 Associated members  
 Individual members

| Category / Name             | Country     | URL                                                                             |
|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Regional Authorities</b> |             |                                                                                 |
| Flemish Community           | Belgium     | <a href="http://www.lin.vlaanderen.be/awz">http://www.lin.vlaanderen.be/awz</a> |
| Satakunta Region            | Finland     | <a href="http://www.satakunta.fi">http://www.satakunta.fi</a>                   |
| Bremen Bundesland           | Germany     | <a href="http://www.europa-bremen.de">http://www.europa-bremen.de</a>           |
| Liguria Region              | Italy       | <a href="http://www.regione.liguria.it">http://www.regione.liguria.it</a>       |
| Tuscany Region              | Italy       | <a href="http://www.regione.toscana.it">http://www.regione.toscana.it</a>       |
| Malta Maritime Authority    | Malta       | <a href="http://www.mma.gov.mt">http://www.mma.gov.mt</a>                       |
| Marine Administration       | Isle of Man | <a href="http://www.gov.im">http://www.gov.im</a>                               |
| North Region of Portugal    | Portugal    | <a href="http://www.ccr-n.pt/">http://www.ccr-n.pt/</a>                         |
| Gibraltar                   | UK          | <a href="http://gibraltar.gov.gi">http://gibraltar.gov.gi</a>                   |
| <b>Local Authorities</b>    |             |                                                                                 |
| Brest Urban Community       | France      | <a href="http://www.mairie-brest.fr">http://www.mairie-brest.fr</a>             |
| Genoa - Province            | Italy       | <a href="http://www.provincia.genova.it">http://www.provincia.genova.it</a>     |
| Bizkaia - Diputacion Foral  | Spain       | <a href="http://www.bizkaia.net">http://www.bizkaia.net</a>                     |
| <b>Ports</b>                |             |                                                                                 |
| Turku - Port                | Finland     | <a href="http://www.port.turku.fi/">http://www.port.turku.fi/</a>               |

[http://www.amrie.org/members\\_category.htm](http://www.amrie.org/members_category.htm)

|                                                                        |                       |                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Genoa - Port                                                           | Italy                 | <a href="http://www.porto.genova.it">http://www.porto.genova.it</a>                       |
| Livorno - Port                                                         | Italy                 | <a href="http://www.portauthority.li.it/">http://www.portauthority.li.it/</a>             |
| Gijon - Port                                                           | Spain                 | <a href="http://www.puertogijon.es/">www.puertogijon.es/</a>                              |
| Bristol -Port                                                          | United Kingdom        | <a href="http://www.bristolport.co.uk/">http://www.bristolport.co.uk/</a>                 |
| Research / Consulting                                                  |                       |                                                                                           |
| D'Appolonia                                                            | Italy                 | <a href="http://www.dappolonia.it">http://www.dappolonia.it</a>                           |
| BMT - British Maritime Technology                                      | UK                    | <a href="http://www.bmt.org">http://www.bmt.org</a>                                       |
| CETENA Spa                                                             | Italy                 | <a href="http://www.cetena.it">http://www.cetena.it</a>                                   |
| CETEMAR                                                                | Spain                 | <a href="http://www.cetemar.com">http://www.cetemar.com</a>                               |
| Consultrans                                                            | Spain                 | <a href="http://www.consultrans.es">http://www.consultrans.es</a>                         |
| MIZ                                                                    | Germany               | <a href="http://www.miz-net.de">www.miz-net.de</a>                                        |
| Qinetiq (ex DERA)                                                      | UK                    | <a href="http://www.qinetiq.com">http://www.qinetiq.com</a>                               |
| Training                                                               |                       |                                                                                           |
| Maison de l'Emploi et de la Formation - Cherbourg                      | France                | <a href="http://www.mef-cherbourg.com">www.mef-cherbourg.com</a>                          |
| Universities                                                           |                       |                                                                                           |
| MBA in Shipping and Logistics, Copenhagen Business School              | Denmark               | <a href="http://www.shippingMBA.com">www.shippingMBA.com</a>                              |
| Turku university                                                       | Finland               | <a href="http://www.utu.fi/english/">http://www.utu.fi/english/</a>                       |
| Aveiro University                                                      | Portugal              | <a href="http://www.ua.pt">http://www.ua.pt</a>                                           |
| University of Ljubljana - Faculty of Maritime and Transport Studies    | Slovenia              | <a href="http://www.fpp.edu">http://www.fpp.edu</a>                                       |
| Plymouth University                                                    | UK                    | <a href="http://hydrography.plym.ac.uk/ims.htm">http://hydrography.plym.ac.uk/ims.htm</a> |
| Trade Unions                                                           |                       |                                                                                           |
| European Transport Workers' Federation                                 | European Organisation | <a href="http://www.itf.org.uk/etf">http://www.itf.org.uk/etf</a>                         |
| NUMAST                                                                 | UK                    | <a href="http://www.numast.org">http://www.numast.org</a>                                 |
| Classification Societies                                               |                       |                                                                                           |
| Lloyds Register of Shipping                                            | UK                    | <a href="http://www.lr.org">http://www.lr.org</a>                                         |
| Industries                                                             |                       |                                                                                           |
| Finnlines (Shipowner)                                                  | Finland               | <a href="http://www.finnlines.fi">http://www.finnlines.fi</a>                             |
| SET - Sistemi e Telematica (Elsag Bailey Group) (IT Solution provider) | Italy                 | <a href="http://www.elsag.it">http://www.elsag.it</a>                                     |
| EUROYARDS (Shipbuilding)                                               | Belgium               | <a href="http://www.euroyards.com/">http://www.euroyards.com/</a>                         |



|                                    |                 |                                                                     |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Genoa - <i>Chamber of Commerce</i> | Italy           | <a href="http://www.lig.camcom.it">http://www.lig.camcom.it</a>     |
| SINDEL ( <i>Simulation</i> )       | Italy           | <a href="http://www.sindel.it">http://www.sindel.it</a>             |
| Associated members                 |                 |                                                                     |
| Green Award Foundation             | The Netherlands | <a href="http://www.greenaward.org/">http://www.greenaward.org/</a> |
| Individual members                 |                 |                                                                     |
| Joop Elias                         | The Netherlands |                                                                     |
| Jens Froese                        | Germany         |                                                                     |

[http://www.amrie.org/members\\_category.htm](http://www.amrie.org/members_category.htm)

**Answer to Question 2343**

**Schedule to Question 2340**

Members of Specialist Working Group on Centres of Excellence.

| <u>MEMBER</u>                                            | <u>AREA OF ACTIVITY</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Maritime Administration and Port of Gibraltar – Chairman | Maritime Region         |
| Cetena (Italy) - Vice-Chairman                           | Research/Consulting     |
| Sindel (Italy)                                           | Research/Consulting     |
| Malta Maritime Authority (Malta)                         | Maritime Region         |
| MIZ (Germany)                                            | Research/Consulting     |
| Flanders Maritime Administration (Belgium)               | Maritime Region         |
| Cetemar (Spain)                                          | Research/Consulting     |
| Port Authority of Gijon (Spain)                          | Port                    |
| NUMAST (UK)                                              | Trade Union             |
| University of Plymouth (UK)                              | University              |
| Port of Turku (Finland)                                  | Port                    |
| University of Turku (Finland)                            | University              |
| Port of Cherbourg (France)                               | Port                    |
| Copenhagen Business School (Denmark)                     | Training Institute      |
| AMRIE Director                                           |                         |
| AMRIE Deputy-Director                                    |                         |
| AMRIE specialist staff (3)                               |                         |

ANSWER TO QUESTION 2343  
SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 2342



## AMRIE POSITION PAPER ON THE PRESTIGE INCIDENT

### 1. Background

- 1.1 The *Prestige* disaster off the Spanish coast raises a number of issues. The European Commission has responded by producing what some judge to be a hastily assembled document (Com (2002 681), 3/12/2002.Final) published as a political response to the disaster, some of whose recommendations may not deal with the root causes of the incident.
- 1.2 This Position Paper is produced essentially as a briefing document for AMRIE sponsoring MEPs, though it may warrant a wider circulation. The paper is not produced as a criticism of the European Commission, and certainly not Vice-President De Palacio whose obvious commitment to safety at sea has been amply demonstrated. Nor does it provide directly a commentary on the Commission Communication. Rather does it attempt to draw attention to what AMRIE believes, on the basis of the wealth of expertise within AMRIE members, are the key issues which need to be addressed as a result of the *Prestige* disaster (following also the *Erika* incident).

### 2. General Aspects

2.1 Two aspects of the *Prestige* accident need to be considered:

- (a) the cause, relating to the vessel condition and operation
- (b) the impact, relating to the management of the stricken vessel and the response to the fuel oil spillage

2.2 Both of these issues require careful and considered examination. It is too soon to identify the primary cause of the accident. What is needed is a *considered* response to issues – some tangential – which have come into the spotlight as a result of the *Prestige*. Consultation with technical experts in the maritime field is essential when deciding specific actions, particularly to ensure that a course of action will not have undesired side effects. This was not the path followed by the European Commission. Whatever the pressure on politicians to respond once the event has occurred, it is essential to resist 'rushing to judgement'.

2.3 The decisions that are taken in the aftermath of this disaster should increase the safety of shipping and improve environmental safeguards. The manner of implementation of measures should take account of their effect on the European shipping industry and trade in oil products.

2.4 The recent establishment of EMSA suggests that the Agency should be allowed time to make considered recommendations in the aftermath of the *Prestige* and other accidents. The Commission can then come forward with cogent, well-argued recommendations. It is also necessary that there is established an independent agency to oversee all accident investigations taking place in EU waters.

2.5 Care needs to be taken, in respect of sub-standard shipping, that European action does not result in poor ships being forced to operate in growing numbers in third world regions, where maritime states would be least able to cope with disasters which could harm the environment on a global scale. To avoid this, it is preferable that action should be taken through the IMO with different regions – such as Europe – bringing forward implementation dates of measures where necessary.

2.6 AMRIE recognises, however, that international action through IMO and other UN Agencies may not always be possible or at least not within acceptable time-scales. In such cases, and the *Prestige* may be one, it is imperative that the measures proposed - and to be argued at international level - should be well-founded and grounded on practical industry advice.

### 3. Issues Relating to Vessels

3.1 The assertion that a single hull tanker is unsafe needs to be questioned, as the evidence suggests otherwise. The focus should be on the operation of ships, because a poorly maintained and badly run double hull tanker poses a greater potential danger than a well maintained properly operated single hull tanker, particularly if we disregard the younger age of double-hull vessels. Hence, given that double hull tankers are newer vessels, it remains to be seen whether they will be safer in the long term than single hulled tankers. It is worth noting that the overall hull strength of a double hull vessel is not necessarily greater than that of a single hull vessel and that the double hull concept is intended purely to provide cargo tank protection in low energy impacts and groundings.

3.2 Tankers are not the only type of vessel to suffer accidents. The number of deaths from accidents involving bulk carriers is extremely worrying. For instance, on February 17th the *Tor1*, a cargo carrier loaded with timber sank off the coast of Sicily with the probable loss of the 8-man crew. This serious accident does not seem to have prompted the same concern as the *Prestige*. There are also problems posed by rogue containers lost overboard, which AMRIE has reported on before. Hence, we believe that there should be a more general focus on the enhancement of safety and improvement of the design, and particularly the operation, of all ship types.

3.3 In relation to all vessels it is imperative that additional resources are provided in all EU Member States so that Port State control inspectors can carry out the full and complete inspections as required by Paris MOU. There is also scope for reviewing the present inspection policy which mandates inspection of at least 25% of visiting foreign ships. Application of this crude target tends to result in too many repetitive inspections of good ships with too few inspections of the real culprits. A really poor ship takes a longer time to inspect and results in the overall number of inspections being reduced. Hence there is inevitable pressure on inspectors to concentrate on good ships which can be inspected very quickly. It would be preferable to refine the targeting approach. This could be achieved by crediting a Port State with, say, 5 inspections, in every case where a ship is detained for substantive reasons. This would shift the emphasis on to ships which warrant detention and away from good ships.

3.4 Finally, the treatment of the Master in the case of the *Prestige* has been little short of disgraceful. To be imprisoned, for 84 days, because of the faults of others is intolerable. Parliament and the Commission should look seriously at the treatment of Masters in these situations. While there may be cases of culpability it should not be matter of course that the Master is presumed to be guilty and imprisoned. The issue of the detention in prison of Masters should perhaps be examined in the light of Human Rights legislation.

#### Summary of Proposed Measures

- The phasing out of single-hull tankers is not the answer to accidental oil spillages
- Other vessel types, particularly cargo carriers, present serious safety problems
- Port State control inspection regimes need to be reviewed to ensure their effectiveness in identifying sub-standard ships
- The imprisonment of masters in the absence of prima facie evidence culpability should not occur

#### **4. Issues Relating to the Management of Environmental Accidents**

4.1 The initiative to develop a network of 'places of refuge' round European shores needs to be progressed. On this issue there is complete agreement. Moreover, it is clear that the impacts of the *Prestige* would have been far less had the mandatory places of refuge policy been in place and adhered to by the Spanish authorities. At one point, after the initial damage was discovered the Master of the *Prestige* sailed to within 4.5 nautical miles of the Spanish coast. Nonetheless, there needs to be flexibility in addressing this issue to allow for responses at different levels, dependent on the needs of a vessel which may find itself in distress, through the designation of primary and secondary places of refuge.

4.2 It is essential that every Member State should have a Disaster/Contingency Plan to deal with a maritime emergency, including a major oil spillage, and that there should be an interface between the plans of contiguous states. Currently many EU countries do have such plans. For instance, France, Portugal, and Spain have adopted the Lisbon Agreement to co-operate in cases of major spills at sea. Exercises to test the effectiveness of the plans and to provide training for key personnel should be conducted periodically. The Disaster/Contingency Plans should be co-ordinated at EU level.

4.3 Further research is required to deal with the containment/neutralisation of heavy fuel oils, such as that involved in the *Prestige* disaster, and chemical spills about which little is known.

4.4 It has been suggested that oil recovery vessels which can operate in heavy seas, away from the shore, should be commissioned. This is not only impracticable - oil recovery from stricken vessels in heavy seas is extremely difficult and dangerous - but runs counter to traditional seamanship practice of sailing towards appropriate sheltered shores and to the whole notion of places of refuge.

#### **Summary of Proposed Measures**

- It is imperative that further discussions and the rapid implementation of the 'places of refuge' Directive should be initiated
- Contingency /Disaster plans, covering, inter alia, oil spills, should be in place in all EU countries and to be co-ordinated at EU level
- Further research should be commissioned into heavy fuel oil spills and their treatment and into chemical spills about which little is currently known
- Oil recovery vessels should not be expected to operate in heavy seas

#### **5. Issues Relating to the Carriage of Oil**

5.1 The Commission suggestion that small vessels under 5,000 dwt should be double skinned, particularly in the light of the impact such a measure would have on Europe's shipping and bunkering industry, is impracticable. The potential problems created by this category of tanker should be dealt with by improved maintenance and operation and by their gradual elimination.

5.2 The operators of all tankers trading in European waters could be asked to belong to an organisation which will provide an immediate response in the case of a Tier 3 oil spill, thereby ensuring a rapid response in the critical few hours after a major accident.

5.3 Rules should be put in place to govern the manner in which bunkers are delivered, following, for example, the Bunkering Code of Practice of Singapore which has been used by other administrations as a basis for their own codes of practice.

5.4 Suggestions that UNCLOS should be re-negotiated and environmental considerations perhaps be allowed to compromise 'innocent passage' should be far more carefully considered before any proposals are made. The implications of a change in the concept of "innocent passage" - which as a concept predates UNCLOS by centuries - are immense. The unilateral 200-mile exclusion zones for single-hull tankers declared by France, Spain, and

Portugal were inadvisable and almost certainly illegal under international law. While accepting that a balance may need to be struck between the environmental considerations relating to the carriage of hazardous cargoes and freedom of the seas, it is not self-evident that the *Prestige* incident leads to some of the conclusions drawn by the Commission. The carriage of hazardous materials by sea does need to be examined and regulated, but it is principally a matter of ensuring that there are safe vessels operated competently that will secure this objective. There is a need to examine the human factors involved in this context. This implies the need for properly trained, proficient, and experienced personnel at all levels of maritime operations and covering shipboard, shore-based, salvage, and all other relevant personnel

5.5 It is also important to recognise that the two key players who have the major responsibility for the safe carriage of all types of cargo, and particularly hazardous cargo, are the shipper/charterer and the ship-owner/ship-operator. These parties have a duty of care. There should be transparency in the transactions and rewards and penalties to ensure compliance with current regulations. Further regulatory measures are not required. Charterers have a cargo and need to select a ship which is suitable in size, equipment and availability. They must have a quick and (relatively) easy way of assuring themselves that the ship they have chosen for commercial reasons is safe, legal, properly manned etc. Existing sets of information and procedures can go a long way to achieve this objective. The best practice of the major oil companies should be mandatory for all vessels sailing in EU waters. In relation to sources of information the EQUASIS system, to which Classification Societies contribute data, should be further developed and EMSA take over its running. The EU might consider the possibility of a Directive on the transparency of the ownership/chartering of vessels and/or pressure on IMO for such a transparency regulation.

#### **Summary of Proposed Measures**

- Potential problems of oil tankers under 5000grt should be dealt with by improving their maintenance and operation not by banning single hull vessels
- All oil tankers should sign up to an organisation providing immediate response to Tier 3 oil spills
- Rules should be put in place to govern the manner in which bunkers are delivered, following, for example, the Bunkering Code of Practice of Singapore
- Extreme care should be taken in formulating any EU proposals to re-negotiate UNCLOS, however desirable it may be to provide potential protection of the marine environment
- The main duty of care in relation to marine accidents belongs to the shippers/charterers and the ship-owners/ship operators, and the former should be provided with, and to use, effective mechanisms to achieve the highest standards of care and to demonstrate transparency

#### **6. The Role of AMRIE**

6.1 AMRIE is ready and willing, through its membership and range of expertise - and its objective representation of the wide range of maritime sector interests - to offer specific, more detailed advice to The European Parliament, and to EMSA and the Commission on all matters arising from proposed measures to enhance safety and environmental care, stemming from the *Prestige* disaster. In offering this advice AMRIE is attempting to ensure that the package of appropriate measures following the *Prestige* incident will only come after careful thought and planning, involving independent and objective representations from the maritime sector.

6.2 Given its strong links with the European Parliament over the past 10 years, AMRIE believes that it is well-placed to fulfil this advisory role.

ANSWER TO QUESTION 2343  
 SCHEDULE TO QUESTION 2343



## AMRIE ANNUAL REPORT YEAR 2003

|                                                                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>1 – Outstanding facts in 2003</b> .....                                                                        | 3  |
| 1.1 – AMRIE 10 <sup>th</sup> Anniversary and Office Move .....                                                    | 3  |
| 1.2 – New Specialist Working Groups .....                                                                         | 3  |
| 1.3 – New AMRIE orientations .....                                                                                | 3  |
| 1.4 – The main activities of AMRIE in 2003 .....                                                                  | 4  |
| <b>2. Maritime Regional Economic Development</b> .....                                                            | 4  |
| 2.1 – The Specialist Working Group MARED .....                                                                    | 4  |
| 2.2 – The MARED Conference .....                                                                                  | 5  |
| 2.3 – The MAREDFlow Project .....                                                                                 | 5  |
| 2.4 – The Trans-European Transport Networks (TENs-T) .....                                                        | 6  |
| 2.5 – Other AMRIE activities related to MARED .....                                                               | 7  |
| <b>3 – Short Sea Shipping and Intermodality</b> .....                                                             | 7  |
| 3.1 – The Specialist Working Group on Short Sea Shipping and Intermodality .....                                  | 7  |
| 3.2 – The REALISE Thematic Network .....                                                                          | 7  |
| 3.3 – The Marco Polo Programme .....                                                                              | 8  |
| 3.4 – The effect of Enlargement and the potential development of ports in the new Member States .....             | 8  |
| 3.5 – European Proposal for a Directive to standardise new Intermodal Loading Unit (ILU) .....                    | 9  |
| 3.6 – The EC Freight Integrator Action Plan .....                                                                 | 9  |
| 3.7 – Other AMRIE activities related to Short Sea Shipping and Intermodality .....                                | 9  |
| <b>4 – Shipping Quality - Safety and security</b> .....                                                           | 10 |
| 4.1 – The Specialist Working Group on Shipping Quality .....                                                      | 10 |
| 4.2 – AMRIE Position Paper on the Prestige incident .....                                                         | 10 |
| 4.3 – AMRIE Position Paper on Classification Societies .....                                                      | 11 |
| 4.4 – AMRIE Position Paper on the European Commission Proposal on enhancing ship and port facility security ..... | 11 |
| 4.5 – AMRIE comments to the Consultation Paper on Freight Transport Security .....                                | 12 |
| 4.6 – Other AMRIE activities in the field of security .....                                                       | 12 |
| <b>5 – Environmental issues</b> .....                                                                             | 13 |
| 5.1 – The Specialist Working Group on Marine Environmental Care .....                                             | 13 |
| 5.2 – The i-MARO Project .....                                                                                    | 13 |
| 5.3 – The SEAM Project .....                                                                                      | 14 |
| 5.4 – The EUROSION Project .....                                                                                  | 14 |
| 5.5 – Comparative Environmental Impacts of all Transport Modes (the WP 3 of REALISE) .....                        | 15 |
| 5.6 – AMRIE Position Paper on Commission Proposal on Sanctions on Ship Source Pollution .....                     | 15 |
| 5.7 – Draft Directive on sulphur content of marine fuels .....                                                    | 15 |
| 5.8 – The DG Environment “Marine Strategy” .....                                                                  | 16 |
| 5.9 – Other AMRIE activities dealing with Environmental Protection .....                                          | 16 |
| <b>6 – Research and Training</b> .....                                                                            | 17 |
| 6.1 – The Specialist Working Group on Centres of Excellence .....                                                 | 17 |
| 6.2 – The METNET Thematic Network .....                                                                           | 17 |
| 6.3 – Bids and projects launched by or in which AMRIE is involved .....                                           | 18 |
| 6.3.1 – Ongoing Projects .....                                                                                    | 18 |

|                                                                                    |    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 6.3.2 – Projects which have been accepted but will be signed and started in 2004 . | 18 |
| 6.3.3 – Projects which were achieved in 2003.....                                  | 19 |
| 6.3.4 – Bids registered but not yet evaluated .....                                | 19 |
| 7 – Information and communication.....                                             | 19 |
| 7.1 –The AMRIE High Level Conference .....                                         | 20 |
| 7.2 – The AMRIE web site .....                                                     | 20 |
| 7.3 – The AMRIE NewsFlash .....                                                    | 20 |
| 8 – Membership .....                                                               | 20 |
| 8.1 – Members of AMRIE in 2003.....                                                | 20 |
| 8.2 – Efforts to recruit new members in 2003.....                                  | 21 |
| 9 – General organisation .....                                                     | 21 |
| 9.1 – The sponsoring MEPs .....                                                    | 21 |
| 9.2 – The organisation of AMRIE.....                                               | 22 |

## 1 – OUTSTANDING FACTS IN 2003

### 1.1 – AMRIE 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary and Office Move

On 1<sup>st</sup> June 2003, AMRIE left its 63 m2 offices at the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of 68 avenue Michel-Ange to move to **20-22 rue du Commerce**, at the corner of rue de Luxembourg, one minute from metro and bus station "Trone" and five minutes from the European Parliament. AMRIE has now 290m2, including a large meeting room. The new office will provide a more congenial and professional meeting space for AMRIE Members when in Brussels for Working Group meetings or on other business. It will also provide a more professional working environment for the Secretariat.

AMRIE organised a **reception on 14 October 2003 at 18:00**, in this new office, which served both as an **official opening** of the office and as a celebration of the **tenth anniversary of AMRIE**. Both events were marked by a short address by Mrs Brigitte Langenhagen, the remaining founder MEP of AMRIE.

### 1.2 – New Specialist Working Groups

1.2.1 - Because there were some overlaps between the former Working Groups on "Short Sea Shipping" and "Ports and European Regional Interests", they have been merged in a new SWG on "**Short Sea Shipping and Intermodality**". The intermodal aspects of port activities will now be covered by this merged WG. (see [point 3.1](#))

1.2.2 – A new Working Group has been created on "**Maritime Regional Economic Development (MARED)**", which will deal with regional and maritime economy. It will also cover the regional developments of ports activities and development (see [point 2.1](#))

### 1.3 – New AMRIE orientations

At the beginning of 2004 the Steering Group agreed a Secretariat proposal – following a General Assembly agreement in 2001 in Brussels – to confirm and formalise the twin aspects of AMRIE activities. These are: *first*, as a traditional membership organisation role, seeking to represent a wide range of maritime regional and maritime transport interests, reflected in the membership, at the level of European Union policy development; and *second*, as a European level 'think tank'/policy research institute, seeking to influence European policy development more directly via its increasing participation in EU projects and studies.

This second role will now be pursued via the AMRIE Policy Research Institute (APRI), which will be established as a division of the existing AMRIE asbl, but with a separate web-site. APRI will set up a database of the expertise of all its members and the Secretariat, to be maintained directly by the AMRIE members who will themselves update, when necessary, the definition of their expertise on the APRI web site. All AMRIE members will soon be invited to complete a template to be placed on the separate APRI web-site, but also linked to the main AMRIE web-site.



## **1.4 – The main activities of AMRIE in 2003**

AMRIE has

- issued **Position Papers** on maritime safety (see *point 4.2*), maritime security (*point 4.4*), the Trans-European Transport Networks (*point 2.4*), the Classification Societies (*point 4.3*), marine environmental protection (*point 5.6*)
- participated in **European projects** (*point 6.3*), co-ordinated some of them and launched some new ones.
- organised **conferences**, such as the annual High Level Conference (*point 7.1*) and the MARED Conference (*point 2.2*) and represented its members in a number of events
- spread **information** through its web site (*point 7.2*) and its NewsFlash (*point 7.3*)
- intensified its **contacts** with the European Commission, the European Parliament and other European institutions.

The present annual Report is structured around a **thematic approach**, in accordance with the agreement at the General Assembly at Lisbon in November 2002 to follow such a thematic approach for the AMRIE work Programme.

## **2. MARITIME REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

### **2.1.- The Specialist Working Group MARED :**

This new working Group was created in 2003 and met for the first time on 20<sup>th</sup> February. The Chairman is Marco Rolandi (Region of Liguria) and the vice-chair is Aude Leblanc (MEF Cherbourg).

The role of this SWG is to encourage discussion and exchange of ideas, leading to proposals to improve maritime regional economic development, involving the input of the regional and local Authorities in the development of port cities and their hinterlands.. The work of the Group will enable more detailed analysis of, on one hand, the profound impact of maritime activities (e.g. port development, short sea shipping) on regional economic and social development and, on the other hand, the obverse impact on maritime sectors of the development of port cities and urban areas and of tourism and land transport strategies.

During the three meetings held in 2003, the MARED SWG has

- adopted its work programme, which focuses on three main priorities:
  - discussion of the TEN-T corridors and the implications for maritime regional economic development;
  - sustainability and socio-economic issues relating to maritime regional infrastructure development and ports and their hinterland, and
  - integrated coastal zone management.
- started work on all three above topics, and some others,
- had first discussions on the revision of Trans-European Transport Networks, TENs-T (see *point 2.4*),
- sponsored MAREDFlow, a European project under the "Regions of Knowledge, Pilot Action" initiative (*point 2.3*),
- organised a "MARED Conference" (*point 2.2*)

## **2.2 – The MARED Conference**

The Conference was organised for the representatives from the Maritime Regions of the EU and pre-Accession countries, including their Brussels offices. It took place in the European Parliament on 15 October 2003 and addressed maritime regional development issues from different perspectives, and how EU maritime regions can benefit from improved economic development, competitiveness and jobs creation through participation in AMRIE and its links with the European Parliament and the European Institutions

Participants (including other interested organisations, and AMRIE members) attended the four sessions covering the following themes:

- the **role of AMRIE** - seen from a European Parliament perspective, given by *Brigitte Langenhagen*, MEP, and from a maritime regions' perspective, by *Jacques Mazières*.
- the **regional policy** in the light of enlargement - chaired by *Barbara O'Toole*, MEP and introduced by a presentation of *Graham Meadows*, Director of Regional Policy in DG REGIO
- the **Trans-European Transport Networks** - chaired by *Michael Frendo*, Maltese MP observer to the EP, with a preliminary presentation by *Alfonso Gonzalez-Finat*, Director of Trans-European Energy & Transport Networks in DG TREN and followed by a report by *Michael Lloyd* on the REALISE Thematic Network on Short Sea Shipping
- the **European Environmental Marine Strategy** - chaired by *Brigitte Langenhagen*, MEP, introduced by *Olle Hagström*, DG ENV and followed by a presentation by *Sue Lewey* on the EUROSION and i-MARQ projects

Each session was followed by very lively discussions with panels including the chairs and vice-chairs of 3 AMRIE Working Groups. A cocktail, offered by our sponsoring MEPs, allowed friendly contacts and continuation of discussions after the end of the Conference.

A press communiqué and the programme are available at [www.amrie.org/docs/Mared\\_Conf.htm](http://www.amrie.org/docs/Mared_Conf.htm)

## **2.3 – The MAREDFlow Project**

AMRIE prepared and submitted on 17<sup>th</sup> September 2003 a proposal called "MAREDFlow" to be funded under the **Regions of Knowledge Pilot Action** of DG Research.

The objective is to enhance the competitiveness of the five maritime regions involved by improving the flow of knowledge and technical "know-how" from "knowledge creators" to "knowledge users" in the transport logistics sector. This will be achieved by using the AMRIE concept of "**knowledge development maps**" devised by Michael Lloyd, who will act as the Coordinator.

In November 2003, the bid was accepted by the Commission and the project will start on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 for a duration of 24 months. **AMRIE is the co-ordinator** and the **partners are all AMRIE members**: the Asturias (Port of Gijon), Bremen (ISL), Mecklemburg (MIZ), Flanders (AWZ) and City of Pori.

## **2.4 – The Trans-European Transport Networks (TENs-T)**

2.4.1 - In August 2003, AMRIE made **comments on the Report of the High Level Group, chaired by former Commissioner Karel van Miert on the TENs-T revision**, which was issued on 27 June 2003. The main conclusions of AMRIE are as follows (*the whole comments are available at <http://www.amrie.org/docs/TEN-T-%20%20Van%20Miert%20Report.pdf>*):

- the Van Miert report represents a positive endorsement for an active policy for developing trans-European transport networks (related to the need for enhanced and balanced trade and regional development within the enlarged European Union) and its emphasis on the sustainability of trans-European transport networks and their proven meeting of economic, social, and environmental objectives and conditions.
- On general aspects: AMRIE supports strongly:
  - the need for the EU Member States and the European Institutions to provide substantial advance financing
  - an increase in Community funding of cross-border projects from 10% to 20%;
  - the establishment of a European Transport Fund (suggested by the European Parliament); the creation of the EIBs TENs Investment Facility (TIF), the use, but with care, of public-private partnerships, and the establishment of the 'Coordination Entity' to enable the Commission and the Member States to manage the delivery of the TEN-T projects in a timely and efficient manner.
  - The need for the TEN-T, including the priority projects, to be established along main trans-European axes/corridors with prioritisation also to achieve a shift in modal balance.
- On maritime transport issues: AMRIE strongly supports:
  - the priority given to the creation of four 'motorways of the sea' and urges that Member States submit proposals to establish all four of these motorways of the sea before 2007
  - the importance placed on improving the efficiency of the complete corridor logistics chain if the motorways of the sea are to become a reality
  - the necessity of providing operating aid for the establishment of the motorways of the sea and their land-side links for a pre-determined period
- However, AMRIE regrets that ports are not yet delineated and asks that the selection of this ports be made by the Members States on the basis of published criteria and methodology based on a cost/benefit analysis.

2.4.2 - AMRIE also participated in other activities related to TENs-T:

- AMRIE was a **co-signatory of a Common Declaration on the van Miert Report**, which is available on the **EIA web site**
- In fact, the concept of "**Motorways of the Sea**" had been launched already in the "White Paper on European Transport Policy for 2010" and DG TREN has organised on **24 January 2003** (hence before the Van Miert Report included them in the TENs-T) a **workshop** with the objective of clarifying the definition and components of this concept. The meeting was open by Mr *Karamitsos*, Director of Maritime Transport and chaired by Mr *S. Totsmann* (for the session on industry's role), Mr *E. Thielmann* (for the session on the role of the TEN-T) and Mr *W. Elsner* (for the session to define motorways of the seas). About 100 participants, from Members States and industry, heard presentations and had very fruitful discussions. A final definition of the motorways of the seas was not reached, but *Jacques Mazières*, who attended, stressed that they look very much like Short Sea Shipping in its wide sense, that is including the full logistic chain and delivery door-to-door.

## **2.5- Other AMRIE activities related to MARED**

2.5.1 – **Interreg IIIB North West Europe:** *Jacques Mazières* attended a workshop on « First Project Ideas for Interreg IIIB NWE » on 15 January 2003 in Paris. After a presentation of the Interreg IIIB Programme, several parallel sessions discussed possible topics to be included in the fields of transport, trans-maritime co-operation, cultural heritage, networks of cities and regions, politics for water, information society.

Following this event, and in particular, contacts made at the MARED Conference (see *point 2.2 above*), AMRIE has been invited to participate in 2004 in an Interreg **project bid for an "Arc Manche Development Initiative"**

## **3 - SHORT SEA SHIPPING AND INTERMODALITY**

### **3.1 - The Specialist Working Group on Short Sea Shipping and Intermodality.**

This new Working Group is the result of merging the former SWGs on "Short Sea Shipping" and on "Ports and European Regional Interests". This eliminated the overlaps which had developed between the two SWGs and avoid any potential overlap with ESPO and FEPOR activities. In the new SWG, the discussions on port issues are limited to those which can be covered by the term "intermodality". The mission of this SWG is to discuss, exchange ideas and make proposals for the development of Short Sea Shipping; its inclusion in the whole logistics transport chain, and the improvement of intermodality

This new Working Group met for the first time on 20<sup>th</sup> February 2003 and elected *Kari Hannus* (City of Pori, for Satakunta Council) as chair and *Harry Heijveld* (University of Plymouth) as vice chair.

During the three meetings held in 2003, the SWG has

- worked on the Marco Polo Programme and prepared a potential bid (see *point 3.3*). On 16<sup>th</sup> October, a presentation on this programme was made by *Mr Hervé Arki*, from DG TREN (however, the bid has been postponed to the second call for proposals, because of the possibility that AMRIE may be ineligible as it is not registered for VAT (see *3.3.1* below).
- monitored the work of the REALISE Thematic Network (see *point 3.2*)
- heard reports on various projects
- commissioned a sub-group of 5 members to examine the effect of enlargement and the potential development of ports in the new Member States (see *point 3.4*)
- discussed the European Commission Programme for the promotion of Short Sea Shipping and proposal for a Directive to standardise new Intermodal Loading Units (see *point 3.5*)

### **3.2 - The REALISE Thematic Network**

REALISE (**R**egional **A**ction for **L**ogistical **I**ntegration of **S**hipping across **E**urope) is an FP5 Thematic Network, funded by DG Transport and Energy.

The overall objective of REALISE is to develop technological strategies, methodologies, and tools for the European business community and policy-makers in the context of the development of short sea shipping, via its integration in the complete logistics supply chain. In the context of the work programme of REALISE these aims are mainly delivered by three key integrative studies dealing with Statistics, Environment impact, Multi-modal transport pricing comparisons.

The duration of REALISE is 36 months, from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2002 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2005. **AMRIE is the co-ordinator**, the principal contractors are Grimaldi, Erasmus, Mettle, Intermed, and the Land of Bremen, and there are 20 other members, many of which are AMRIE members.

During year 2003, the work done by REALISE was in accordance with the Work Plan and the Gantt Chart. The three Inception Reports of the three Integrative studies (Statistics, Environment and Multi-modal Costing and Pricing) were delivered in time to the Commission. The first European Workshop was successfully held in Bremen on 22 and 23 September and the first Regional Workshop was held in Athens on 1<sup>st</sup> December. More information on REALISE is available at [www.realise-sss.org](http://www.realise-sss.org).

### **3.3 – The Marco Polo Programme**

3.3.1 - The Marco Polo Programme - aiming at granting Community financial assistance to reduce road congestion, to improve the environmental performance of the freight transport system and to enhance intermodality - was adopted on 22 July 2003 (Official Journal of 2 August). The first call for proposals was published on 11 October 2003 with a deadline for submission fixed at 10 December 2003.

AMRIE decided in February 2003 to prepare two potential bids under the first type of intervention, that is "common learning action"

- one on "Joint awareness-raising and promotion" (to prolong the activities of REALISE),
- the other on "European-level training capability"

Unfortunately, this project was abandoned when it became evident in the call for proposal that **AMRIE could not be a partner or even a sub-contractor** in a Marco Polo project because we are not registered for VAT

3.3.2 – On 28 October, *Michael Lloyd* made a presentation on the Marco Polo Programme at a **seminar organised by the Flemish Community in Brussels**

### **3.4 – The effect of Enlargement and the potential development of ports in the new Member States**

AMRIE intends to develop a **study**, based on the experience and expertise of its members, reflecting a summary overview of the likely developments over the next five years and to promote the notion of EU funded co-operation between EU regional ports and new Member States ports.

A sub-Group has started first investigations, using studies already made in Turku, Rostock, Malta and Flanders. Funding mechanisms will also be investigated.

### **3.5. – European Proposal for a Directive to standardise new Intermodal Loading Unit (ILU)**

This proposal was criticised by all maritime stakeholders in a meeting of the **Transport section of the MIF (Maritime Industries Forum)** on 21 October 2003, where *Jacques Mazières* presented the criticisms of the AMRIE members, namely:

- the proposed ILU is higher than a maritime container and could not go under the river bridges across Europe
- the ILU will increase costs in ships and in ports. In particular, the coexistence of several types of loading units, e.g. containers and swap bodies, will complicate the storage
- the feedering, which is used mostly in combination with an intercontinental sea leg and the ports outside Europe will not be equipped to handle the new ILU. Furthermore, the new regulation does not integrate the US regulation on containers safety
- for inland navigation, it would lead to a loss of capacity since the barges could only transport a load of 3 units instead of presently 4 containers barges

### **3.6. – The EC Freight Integrator Action Plan**

In October 2003, the AMRIE Secretariat made **comments on a European Commission Discussion Paper** on the "Freight Integrator Action Plan": AMRIE is broadly supportive of the objective of this Plan, but is not convinced that such a broad European Community initiative towards identifying and supporting the "freight integrators" is either necessary or desirable. AMRIE commented also on some specific issues such as the role of SMEs, the implications of "just in time", the potential congestion around ports, the changes now occurring in distribution, the need for an analysis looking at different goods being transported, etc...

The comments have not yet been posted on the web site but are available on request to [info@amrie.org](mailto:info@amrie.org)

### **3.7 – Other AMRIE activities related to Short Sea Shipping and Intermodality**

**3.7.1 – Short Sea Shipping Day (Barcelona, 5 March 2003):** this event was organised by the Directorate General of Ports and Transport of the Autonomous Government of Catalunya, jointly with the Centre of Logistic and Maritime Services of the University of Catalunya. *Jacques Mazières* gave two presentations (one on the aims and activities of AMRIE, the other on REALISE and the AMRIE position on Short Sea Shipping). Other reports were made by Spanish ports and organisations and by the Spanish SSS Promotions centre. All were followed by lively discussions.

**3.7.2 – 4<sup>th</sup> Intermodal Award for Best Practices,** organised by EIA, the European Intermodal Association: AMRIE, represented by *Michael Lloyd*, was a member of the Jury. The awards were attributed to those companies which have the best concrete solutions (service or product) to promote intermodality in a specific area and were distributed during the "Intermodal & Logistics" (ITL) conference and exhibition in Rotterdam on 4-6 November 2003.

**3.7.3 – Galileo Maritime Applications International Conference (Ferrol, Spain, 6-7 November 2003):** *Fernando Pardo* gave the AMRIE position on navigation, environmental issues and short sea shipping

## 4 – SHIPPING QUALITY - SAFETY AND SECURITY

### 4.1 – The Specialist Working Group on Shipping Quality

The role of this Working Group is to discuss, exchange experiences and make proposals for the improvement of safety at sea and the elimination of substandard ships and to monitor related EU policy developments. The Chairman is *Des Howell* (Isle of Man Maritime Administration) and the Vice chairman is *Allan Graveson* (NUMAST).

During the three meetings held in 2003, this Working Group has

- discussed the consequences of the Prestige and Tricolor accidents and adopted an AMRIE Position Paper (see *point 4.2*)
- finalised a position paper on classification societies (*point 4.3*)
- created contacts with the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) and tried to reinforce the links between AMRIE and this body
- discussed the proposed EC Directive on ship source pollution and the introduction of sanctions and adopted an AMRIE Position Paper (see *point 5.6*)
- prepared a position paper on maritime security (*point 4.4*)
- discussed other issues such as a paper from Gauss on an incentive scheme for quality shipping, the extension of the Stockholm agreement, the transfer of register of passenger ships within the EU, the proposals for a reform of the Liner Conferences

### 4.2 – AMRIE Position Paper on the Prestige incident

In October 2003, AMRIE issued a Position Paper which does not comment directly on the Communication produced in December 2002 by the Commission as a response to the Prestige disaster. It rather focused on what AMRIE believes are the key issues which need to be addressed under four aspects

- **General aspects:** in case of severe accident, it is preferable not to hurry and to give a totally appropriate answer after consultation with industrial and technical experts. An independent agency should be established to oversee all maritime accident investigations.
- **Vessels issues:** the phasing out of single-hull tankers is not the total answer (a badly maintained double hull tanker is a greater danger than a properly operated single hull). Other vessel types may be dangerous (bulk carriers, containers lost overboard). Port State Control needs to be reviewed (rule of 25% encourages control of good ships...). Imprisonment of Masters should not occur, without genuine due cause.
- **Management of accidents:** Places of refuge should be rapidly implemented. Contingency/Disaster Plans to deal with maritime emergency should be set up in all EU countries and coordinated at EU level. Further research for neutralisation of heavy fuel oils and chemical spills to be undertaken. The suggestion that oil recovery vessels should operate in heavy seas is impracticable.
- **Carriage of oil in general :** Small tankers under 5.000 dwt should not be double-hull but better maintained and operated. Operators of all tankers should belong to an organisation providing immediate response to Tier 3 Oil Spills. Rules to govern the manner in which bunkers are delivered (code of practice of Singapore) should be created. Importance of human factors and properly trained and experienced personnel at all levels. The main duty of care belongs to the shipowners and the shippers (who must be provided with a mechanism to choose safe ships)

The AMRIE Position Paper on the Prestige Incident is available on the AMRIE web site at <http://www.amrie.org/docs/Prestige.pdf>

It was also presented by *Jacques Mazières* at a Round Table on "Safety in Maritime Transport", organised in Brussels on 7 May by **ETF (The European Transport Forum)**. *Brigitte Langenhagen*, sponsoring MEP also introduced the point of view of the European Parliament on improving safety at sea.

#### **4.3 – AMRIE Position Paper on Classification Societies**

In October 2003, AMRIE issued a Position Paper on the « Role of Ship Classification in improving and maintaining Shipping Quality ».

This paper deals with the role of classification societies and their interrelations with the shipbuilders (in the construction phase) and the shipowners (in the exploitation phase). The AMRIE position is that

- The role of Class is not and should not be that of a Regulator
- Common standards for the construction of ships should be produced not only at the European level (as announced by the LAN group) but at international level, i.e. the IACS level
- Flag states and port states should not recognise any Classification Society not adhering to the IMO guidelines
- Consideration should be given to a legislation imposing disclosure mandates on classification societies and shipowners
- Interested parties, e.g. shipowners, should not be in a position to have a controlling majority on the governing committees of classification societies.

The AMRIE Position Paper on Classification Societies is available on the AMRIE web site at [http://www.amrie.org/docs/Classification\\_Societies.pdf](http://www.amrie.org/docs/Classification_Societies.pdf)

#### **4.4 – AMRIE Position Paper on the European Commission Proposal on enhancing ship and port facility security**

AMRIE issued a Position Paper on the EC Proposal – COM(2003)229 Final of 2/05/2003 – on enhancing ship and port facility security.

AMRIE stresses that

- the security concerns of the USA and the EU will be best addressed by reciprocal co-operation rather than by unilateral actions (such as the USA Container Safety Initiative) which can impact on trade and cause competitive distortions
- third country ships wishing to call at EU ports should operate to adequate security standards, although such compliance will not guarantee the safety of all containers and "sample" inspections at ports will be required
- the complete maritime transport chain, from supplier to customer, needs to be made secure
- the extension of security measures to short sea shipping is appropriate under the conditions that the measures are proportionate
- the development of the use of ICT and of training programmes must be encouraged.
- the issue of piracy should be included.
- Member States should accept to take in charge one part of the costs associated with combating terrorism.



The complete AMRIE position paper is available on the AMRIE web site at [http://www.amrie.org/docs/Maritime\\_Security\\_Sept\\_03.pdf](http://www.amrie.org/docs/Maritime_Security_Sept_03.pdf).

#### **4.5 – AMRIE comments to the Consultation Paper on Freight Transport Security**

On 23 December 2003, AMRIE sent to the European Commission comments on its consultation paper on "Freight Transport Security"

AMRIE stresses that

- in relation to security of goods, as for security of citizens, it is important to ensure that any measures taken are proportionate to the risks involved, which entails an accurate assessment of relative risks to reduce the negative impact on costs
- it is difficult to correctly react to this paper, because of the absence of a comprehensive risk assessment analysis of the various types of risks
- special attention should be paid to the control of containers transferred between different modes, because it is at the intermodal interface that the risk is the greatest

The full AMRIE comments on the EC Consultation Paper on Freight Transport Security is available on our web site at [http://www.amrie.org/docs/Freight\\_Transport\\_Security.pdf](http://www.amrie.org/docs/Freight_Transport_Security.pdf)

#### **4.6. – Other AMRIE activities in the field of security**

**4.6.1** - A paper was presented at the Centres of Excellence WG on the **role of human factors** in maritime security and piracy.

**4.6.2** – An internal paper was produced on **the USA, IMO, and European Commission initiatives on the issue of security**. This covered, inter alia, the amendments to SOLAS (Safety of Life at Sea Convention) Convention and the ISPS Code (International Ship and Port Facility Security Code), adopted at a Diplomatic Conference in IMO in December 2002 and the Commission Communication on the issue.

**4.6.3** - In the **Centres of Excellence WG**, the following points were raised:

- the need for training and certification of security officers was stressed: it is estimated that it will be necessary to train more than 200 000 ship security officers before July 2004.
- though much of the amendments to the SOLAS Convention and ISPS Code are to be welcomed - whether practical results can be achieved is extremely doubtful. Furthermore the issue of the additional workload on existing officers must be considered : on larger passenger ferries/cruise ships there would be a need for an additional officer. On other ships these security duties will fall as an increased duty for an existing officer, on top of an already high workload. This could well increase fatigue and thus the risk of accidents as 80 to 90% of these are due to human factors.
- the "Container Security Initiative" (CSI) adopted by the U.S. Customs Services on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 2003 was discussed and it was stressed that measures at EU level must be taken in order to 'counteract' the unilateral measures adopted by the USA, which can negatively affect the entire global trading environment. It was noted that the measures proposed, and particularly the CSI will have impacts on trade and on competition between ports. Furthermore it seems illogical and economically not justifiable to place undue pressure on vessels and ports, instead

of focussing the attention on making secure the complete maritime transport logistics chain.

## 5 – ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

### 5.1 – The Specialist Working Group on Marine Environmental Care

The role of this Working Group is to discuss, exchange experiences, make proposals and launch common projects for a better protection of the marine environment and the coastal management. The Chairman is *Tom Reincke* (GAUSS/Land of Bremen) and the Vice chairman is *Manfred Grigo* (MIZ in Germany).

During the three meetings held in 2003, this Working Group has

- heard a presentation by *Tim Marking* on the position of European shipowners on the NOx and SOx emissions from seagoing vessels
- discussed draft bids dealing with environment
- received periodic reports on
  - the EUROSION, I-MARQ, and SEAM project (see *points 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4*)
  - the work of the **HECOM Commission, in which AMRIE has a status of observer** and is represented by the Port of Turku (Finland)
  - the work of REALISE in its Workpackage on "Comparative Environmental Impacts of Transport Modes (*point 5.5*)
  - the DG Environment "Marine Strategy", in which AMRIE has several experts (*point 5.8*)
- prepared (in parallel with the SWG on Shipping Quality) a position paper on a draft Directive on ship-source pollution and the introduction of sanctions, including criminal sanctions (*point 5.6*)
- discussed the EC Draft Directive lowering sulphur levels in marine fuels and heard a presentation, followed by discussion, by *Ms Nicola Robinson*, from DG Environment (*point 5.7*).

### 5.2 – The i-MARQ Project

i-MARQ is a Research Project, led by Marinetech South (UK) and is partly funded by DG Information Society – IST. The objective of I-MARQ is to develop and validate a prototype GIS-based system which can deliver information on environmental **quality of coastal waters** to local authorities, ports, tourism agencies and companies. The system will integrate data collected from sensors and from satellites. The project started on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2002 for a duration of 36 months.

AMRIE is one of the partners and is involved in the structuring of End-User Group activity (AMRIE is leader of this work-package), in the technical evaluation, in dissemination and exploitation, and in GIS and Server Implementation.

i-MARQ uses data fusion technology capable of integrating very diverse data streams of varying data quality to improve forecasting. There are three use cases (metocean water quality forecasting; microbiological risk forecasting, and eutrophication risk forecasting) and two geographical study areas (Côte d'Azur in France and The Solent in UK)

In 2003, the system architecture further developed and AMRIE was able to intensify the end-user work by looking at the system/user interface and at the development of a demonstration system to be shown to potential users.. The User Forum was developed and a first Newsletter was produced and circulated.

To know more on i-MARQ, visit their web site at <http://www.imarq.info/>

### **5.3 – The SEAM Project**

SEAM is a Research Project, partly funded by DG Tren (Sustainable Growth - Land Transport and marine technologies). Led by METTLE, its objective is to formulate safety and environmental measures and procedures to **mitigate the impact of three key elements of shipping operations on the marine environment**: ballast water management, anti-fouling paints, and air pollution, including quality of fuel and emissions. It started on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2001 and will finish on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2004 (36 months)

AMRIE is one of the partners and is involved in dissemination of results (AMRIE is Workpackage leader) and, through *Sue Lewey*, in ballast water and anti-fouling.

In 2003, two environmental models have been produced, one by BMT (measuring the quantities of contaminants in the marine environment, with two case areas in the German Bight and the Bay of Naples), the other by Bremen (measuring the quantities of contaminants from the total number of ships over a time period on given routes in the two geographical case study areas).

One of the main work-packages has been completed with reports on information regarding technical and operational measures that can be used to reduce the impact on the marine environment of antifouling compounds, air emissions, and ballast water discharges. The needs and preferences of all major stakeholders have been assessed and presented. The work is now concentrating on case studies and full scale evaluation and on the cost benefit analysis of best solutions.

To know more on SEAM, visit their web site at <http://seam.mettle.org/>

### **5.4 – The EUROSION Project**

This project was launched mid-2001 by DG Environment to assess the status, trends and **impacts of coastal erosion process** throughout Europe and to elaborate policy recommendations on how to manage such processes at the European, national and local levels in the most sustainable way.

AMRIE is not a partner in EuroSION, but has been invited to be a member of the **Advisory Group**, which, in particular, has to review the interim reports and trends in coastal erosion in Europe.

In 2003, *Sue Lewey* represented AMRIE at a workshop on "policy recommendations for coastal erosion management", organised on 10 January in The Hague.

To know more on EUROSION, visit their web site at <http://www.eurosion.org/>

### **5.5 – Comparative Environmental Impacts of all Transport Modes (the WP 3 of REALISE)**

The objective of this WP is to assess the environmental impact of short sea shipping, in comparison with other transport modes and to produce a comprehensive, comparative methodology to enable the internalisation of the associated externalities – principally environmental - in multi-modal transport chain contexts, and to enable the selection of policy options.

Work has been carried on so far to examine the various environmental impacts related to surface transport and how the distinct modes “perform” in relation to the environmental threats that can be distinguished. The preliminary outline of the methodological framework for comparison has been developed and work will continue for the evaluation and conversion into monetary terms of the various externalities.

To know more, visit the REALISE web site at <http://www.realise-sss.org/default.aspx>

### **5.6- AMRIE Position Paper on Commission Proposal on Sanctions on Ship Source Pollution.**

In December 2003, AMRIE issued a Position Paper on the Commission Proposal for a Directive on ship source pollution and the introduction of sanctions (COM 52003) 92)

AMRIE welcomes the Commission proposal, but stresses that – unless attention is paid to the need for enforcement to be adequate and uniform throughout the EU, and adequate mechanisms are established for the gathering of evidence, and the protection of the chain of evidence to be presented in a court of law – then the impact of any legislation will be minimal.

AMRIE also welcomes the inclusion of “operational”, i.e. deliberate and/or negligent discharges; stresses the importance of inclusion of all types of ship source pollution (not only oil), and considers that criminal sanctions should apply to all those who are responsible (ship operating Company, flag state, but also public ports and maritime authorities when culpable).

The AMRIE Position Paper is available on the AMRIE web site at <http://www.amrie.org/docs/Ship%20Source%20Pollution.pdf>

### **5.7 – Draft Directive on sulphur content of marine fuels**

The European Commission has published a proposal (COM 2002 595 final) ) for a Directive lowering sulphur levels in marine fuels as a means of reducing air pollution (specifically SOx) from ships, particularly in the vicinity of ports.

A Workshop was held in the European Parliament, chaired by Heidi Hautala, a Finnish MEP of the Environment Committee and was attended by *Michael Lloyd*. The discussions showed some discrepancy between the data provided from the oil industry and those from environmental organisations.

Another obvious point, which emerged from discussion, was the oil companies’ reluctance to provide low sulphur fuel at reasonable cost. Their preference was to continue to supply their current ‘residual’ product and to promote the use of ‘scrubbing’ on board individual vessels.

Though both the shipping industry and the oil companies welcome the proposal lowering sulphur levels in marine fuels, the solution to the problem seems difficult to reach, mainly because the oil companies state that they can supply low sulphur oil, but at a price reflecting a 50% premium required for the extra production costs, while Environmental Groups estimate the real cost premium to be around 15% only.

The issue, as usual in environmental matters, being to know who finally bears the cost of reducing pollution. Studies into the scrubbing approach and market-based solutions, emissions trading, fiscal measures, etc are being initiated to provide a full overview of the potential solutions. Meanwhile, the Directive will proceed through the normal EU procedure.

AMRIE considers that the approach of the proposed Directive, aimed at reducing the sulphur content of marine fuel oils, is substantially correct, as were the main suggested amendments by the European Parliament Environment Committee. However, some flexibility to provide for alternative approaches should be provided within the Directive.

### **5.8 – The DG Environment “Marine Strategy”**

The European Commission published in 2002 a communication “towards a Strategy to protect and conserve the marine environment” and organised at Koge (Denmark) in December 2002 a conference to develop this strategy in close co-operation with Member States, the European Parliament and candidate countries. Further to this conference, to which AMRIE was invited, DG Environment has created **four working groups and invited AMRIE to nominate experts** in each of them:

- Ecosystem Approach to management of human activities (EAM): *Sue Lewey* is the AMRIE expert. This group met in December 2003. It clarified its role (to develop guidelines for an ecosystem approach to human activities and make proposals for its implementation in the marine environment) and had first discussions on the impact of major European initiatives
- European Maritime monitoring and assessment (EMMA): *Sue Lewey* is the AMRIE expert. This Group will meet in February 2004. Its role will be to establish a baseline to monitor the marine environment without getting absorbed in the technical and scientific difficulties.
- Hazardous substances (HS): *Sue Lewey* is the AMRIE expert. A first meeting took place in November and decided that a document will be prepared to select and prioritise hazardous substances; regional conventions such as Helcom will be contacted. Discussions will continue on measures to control hazardous substances and improve reporting systems
- Strategic Goals and Objectives: *Michael Lloyd* is the AMRIE expert. This group has not yet met.

### **5.9. – Other AMRIE activities dealing with Environmental Protection**

**5.9.1 – Seminar on Ports and Habitat (Brussels, 20 March 2003):** *Sue Lewey* represented AMRIE at this seminar, organised by PIANC, EUDA and IMI to address the implications of the Habitats and Birds Directives for port development in estuaries, deltas and other coastal habitats protected under Natura 2000.

**5.9.2 – Workshop on ICZM organised by DG Environment on 9 December 2003 in Brussels:** *Jacques Mazières* and *Sue Lewey* participated in this workshop which made a review of the compatibility of EU policies and legislation with ICZM and discussed possible

action/communications to enhance awareness and understanding of ICZM and to support the implementation of the ICZM Recommendation and Agenda 21 process in coastal zones.

5.9.3 – **Conference on anti-fouling systems (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 17 December 2003):** *Sue Lewey* made a presentation on "Responding to the AFS Convention: the EU initiatives"

## 6 – RESEARCH AND TRAINING

### **6.1 – The Specialist Working Group on Centres of Excellence**

The role of this Working Group is to discuss, exchange experiences, make proposals and launch common projects in the fields of Research and Development and of Education and Training; and to monitor EU policy developments. The Chairman is *Richard Garcia* (Gibraltar Government) and the Vice chairman is *James Veiga* (FRETI in Portugal).

During the three meetings held in 2003, this Working Group has

- examined all European projects in which AMRIE was or may be involved (see *point 6.3*)
- discussed education, training and recruitment of seafarers
- monitored the work of AMRIE in the METNET Thematic Network (*point 6.2*)
- discussed the maritime security issues, mainly from a human point of view
- heard on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2003 a presentation, followed by discussion, by *Michael Kyriakopoulos*, from DG Research, on the present status of FP6, the results of the 1<sup>st</sup> Call for Proposal, and the next steps

### **6.2 – The METNET Thematic Network**

METNET was a 3-year Thematic Network launched by DG Transport and Energy to improve the quality, to harmonise the contents; to extend the applicability of maritime education and training for ship officers in the EU, and to cluster and exploit the results of completed and ongoing RTD projects. It finished on 31 March 2003.

AMRIE was one partners and was involved in several work-packages. All tasks have been achieved, more than 30 deliverables and seven CDs with courses have been produced. METNET Days have been organised in all European countries to spread the achieved results and envisage future activities derived from the project. A final event was organised in Brussels on 20 March 2003, where over 60 participants discussed the results of METNET and the ways to implement its recommendations.

Due to the lack of ship officers in the EU, the efforts to attract more young people for a maritime career and to retain ship officers on board have been analysed and evaluated. An initiative was launched to propose upgrading and enrichment to maritime education and training to promote maritime studies and to offer quality training.

The METNET web site is still alive at <http://www.metnet.info/>

### **6.3 – Bids and projects launched by or in which AMRIE is involved**

AMRIE is involved, sometimes as Coordinator, in several European Projects, some of which finished during the year 2003. Some other Projects will only start in 2004. Finally, some bids have not yet been evaluated while some others were rejected

#### **6.3.1 – Ongoing Projects**

- **REALISE**, a Thematic Network on short sea shipping, **co-ordinated by AMRIE** (see point 3.2)
- **I-MARQ**, a project dealing with quality of coastal waters (see point 5.2)
- **SEAM**, a project to mitigate the impact on marine environment of ballast water management, anti-fouling paints and air pollution (see point 5.3)
- **MISTIC**, a Thematic Network on Maritime Intelligent Transport systems. The main objectives of MISTIC are: dissemination of state of the art concerning intelligent systems for transport; assessment of research projects; collection of end-users requirements; development of a suggested methodology to involve users and stakeholders more intensively in the development of maritime intelligent systems, particularly in relation to socio-economic aspects. In 2003, the deliverables were close to being finalised. The project will be completed on 30 April 2004. To know more, visit the web site at <http://www.ist-mistic.org/>
- **TOHPIC** is a project aiming at improving the interface between ports and High Speed Crafts. It will finish on 28 February 2004 and deliver operational tools and a handbook on the establishment of HSC operations. On 1<sup>st</sup> December 2003, AMRIE, in charge of dissemination, organised in Brussels an "information and discussion workshop" which allowed discussion, with stakeholders, of the results of the project. To know more, visit the web site at <http://www.amrie.org/tohpic/index.htm>

#### **6.3.2 – Projects which have been accepted but will be signed and started in 2004**

- **MTCP** – Maritime Transport Co-ordination Platform (a co-ordination action led by BMT and funded by DG Tren). to study issues arising in most sectors of maritime transport (excluding short sea shipping, already covered by REALISE). The subject areas will include safety, education and training, shipping quality, social economic issues. The duration is 36 months and AMRIE will be involved in WP3 (Maritime Transport Sector Observatory) and in WP4 (Expert Reviews, Forecasting and Recommendations). Participation in specific studies is also envisaged.
- **FASTER** – Fostering Alliances For Sustainable Transport in European Research, a SSA to provide a platform of high added value services to European SMEs from the transport sector and related business areas.
- **MAREDFlow**, a Project **co-ordinated by AMRIE** under the "Regions of Knowledge" Pilot action (see point 2.3)

### **6.3.3 – Projects which were completed in 2003**

- **E-MARCON** is a project which *finished on 31 December 2003*. It has created tools to allow museums around Europe to create virtual exhibitions. AMRIE was in charge of dissemination and has produced the final CD Rom, which contains a copies of the web site and of a virtual exhibition on "Ships of wood – ships of steel" and diaporamas how to create a virtual exhibition and how to use the e-shop. To know more, visit the web site at <http://www.emarcon.net/>
- **TELESHIPPING** (1 December 2001 – 30 September 2003) made a pilot market validation of telematics applications to maritime transport operators (shipping companies operating cruise and ferry ships) and the affected community (travel agencies, passengers, ports, cities, etc.).
- **E-MAR** (1st July 2001 - 30th June 2003) was a Thematic Network launched by DG Information Society (IST) for developing maritime e-work and e-business, mainly in SMEs. To know more, visit the web site at <http://emar.mettle.org/>
- **METNET** (1st April 2000 - 31st March 2003) was a Thematic Network launched by DG Transport and Energy on Maritime Education and Training.(see *point 6.2*)
- **ADVANCES** (1<sup>st</sup> April 2000 - 31st March 2003) was a Thematic Network launched by DG Transport and Energy to improve quality shipping and safety at sea. AMRIE was in charge of dissemination

### **6.3.4 – Bids not yet decided**

- EI-SECURE - 2003 (a Project led by BMT on an Integrated System using Evolutionary Computing for Unified Risks Evaluation)
- MARSECAT - 2004 - (a Specific Support Action, **led by AMRIE**, on Maritime Security Assessment and Training),
- MARINERS - 2004 (a STREP, **led by AMRIE**, on Market-based instruments for emission reduction from ships)

There were also bids which were **rejected** by the evaluators, such as

- CHEMPOL - 2003 (an AMRIE project on chemical pollution at sea and management of chemical and hazardous spills from ships) but it will be presented again in a future call for proposals
- MARMO - 2003 (an Integrated project for GMES, Global Monitoring for Environment and Security, to promote the use of Earth Observation satellites to monitor maritime traffic, fisheries, pollution, etc.)

## **7 – INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION**

AMRIE has continued to inform its members and - for items which are not reserved only to members - the whole European Maritime Community, through a large e-mailing list with over 1.500 addressees. Besides the **MARED Conference**, already mentioned (*point 2.2*) and the great number of **events in which AMRIE represented its members**, also mentioned, the main activities were the following.



### **7.1 – The AMRIE High Level Conference**

Every year, at the occasion of its Annual General Assembly, AMRIE organises a High Level Conference hosted by one of its members, the country and theme changing every year.

In 2003, there was no High Level Conference because the General Assembly which took place on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2002 at Lisbon decided, for several practical reasons, that these conferences should take place **in Spring and no more in Autumn**.

Hence, the last High Level Conference was the **Eleventh** and took place in **Lisbon on 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> November 2002** on the theme of "**Maritime Safety and Coastal Management Issues**". The programme and papers are available on our web site at <http://www.amrie.org/docs/HLC11/index.htm>

The **Twelfth High Level Conference** will take place on 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> May, 2004 in Genoa (Italy) on the theme of "The Trans-European Transport Networks (TENs-T)

### **7.2 – The AMRIE web site**

The AMRIE web site at <http://www.amrie.org/index.htm> has been **totally re-designed** in 2003: new background colours, no more frames, a retractable, always visible, menu bar, etc. A search engine has been included and a **password protected area for members only** has been created.

### **7.3 – The AMRIE NewsFlash**

The AMRIE NewsFlash is e-mailed about once a month to about 1200 addressees. It gives to the maritime community summary information on the AMRIE activities, the European Institutions activities in maritime fields (including publications in the Official Journal), the progresses of European projects in which AMRIE is involved, next conferences and meetings, etc.

To be registered on the mailing list, please ask to [info@amrie.org](mailto:info@amrie.org). The last issues of the NewsFlash are available on the web site at [http://www.amrie.org/news\\_flash.htm](http://www.amrie.org/news_flash.htm)

## **8 – MEMBERSHIP**

### **8.1 – Members of AMRIE in 2003**

At the end of 2003, AMRIE had **41 members** (the list is available on the AMRIE web site at <http://www.amrie.org/members.htm>)

Classified by **countries**, 12 were from Italy, 7 from UK, 4 from Finland, 3 from Germany and Spain, 2 from European organisations, France and Portugal, 1 from Belgium,

Denmark and the Netherlands, 2 from Accession Countries (Malta and Slovenia) and 1 from Isle of Man.

Classified by **categories**, 9 were Regional Authorities, 3 local Authorities, 5 ports authorities, 5 universities, 8 research/training/engineering organisations, 5 industries (yard, shipowner, software, equipment, simulation), 2 trade unions, 1 classification society, 1 chamber of commerce, 2 individual members

The AMRIE membership covers most of the European Maritime counties and **all categories of actors in the maritime regions, which give AMRIE a wide range of expertise** on every maritime issues and facilitates networking and the launch of common projects

## **8.2 – Efforts to recruit new members in 2003**

Because of the upcoming enlargement of the EU, AMRIE started efforts to mainstream **accession countries** members into the organisation. Potential members in all maritime regions have been contacted. Priority has been given to those maritime actors with whom we have an existing contact or leads to individual organisations. Further meetings have been undertaken with Brussels representatives offices where they exist. All those contacted were, invited to the MARED Conference (see *point 2.2*).

Strong contacts have been built in particularly with Tallin (Estonia), Gdansk (Poland), the port of Klaipėda (Lithuania), the Latvian Academy, and in Slovenia, and membership is anticipated after accession

A first success was reached with the **Faculty of Maritime & Transport Studies of the University of Ljubljana, based in Portoroz (Slovenia)** that became member in July 2003.

Of course, AMRIE has also prospected for new members in the **current EU15 countries**.

While converting potential members into new ones always remain a slow process, the Secretariat is optimistic because AMRIE has **benefits** to offer its membership:

- by allowing participation in projects and studies
- by giving the opportunity to influence the policy making process
- by giving access to information and key people

The best way to enable prospective members to perceive the benefits of membership is for them to be recruited directly by existing members in the same area of activity. This will be encouraged in 2004

## **9 – GENERAL ORGANISATION**

### **9.1 – The sponsoring MEPs**

The AMRIE sponsoring MEPs are now 22 and the list is available at <http://www.amrie.org/sponsors.htm>.

*Karla Peijs*, who was appointed Minister for Transport in the Netherlands was replaced by *Peter Pex* as a sponsoring MEP from the Netherlands.

However, because the European Parliament will be totally renewed by **new elections to take place in June 2004**, in the EU15 countries, and also in the accession countries, AMRIE has already started in 2003 to look for possible new sponsoring MEPs. In particular, contacts have been taken with the National Parliament observers from the Accession countries who have taken their seat in the European Parliament.

The Secretariat regularly follows the **meetings of relevant Committees**, including in 2003 the Temporary Committee which started an inquiry into the Prestige disaster.

The AMRIE sponsoring MEPs and the Secretariat (Michael Lloyd) have **met Vice-President Ms Loyola de Palacio** during the plenary session of the EP in Strasbourg on **two occasions in 2003**. The MEPs had thus the opportunity to exchange views on all topical maritime issues, to raise questions, and to make suggestions or comments on the activities of DG Tren.

## **9.2 - The organisation of AMRIE**

**9.2.1** - The **Secretariat** is based at Brussels, 20-22 rue du Commerce, 1000 Brussels. The phone number is +32.2.736.17.55, the fax is +32.2.735.22.98, the e-mail address is [info@amrie.org](mailto:info@amrie.org).

The Secretariat is made of

- Jacques Mazières, Director
- Michael Lloyd, Deputy Director
- Milena Noviero, Office Administrator
- Walter Vassallo (Shipping, Transport and Intermodality)
- Fernando Pardo (Training and Maritime Pollution)
- Sue Lewey (Environmental Issues)
- Bob Beck (European Parliament and Accession countries)

**9.2.2** - The **five Specialist working Groups** (see points 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1 and 6.1) meet three times a year, in February, June and October. They help the Secretariat to prepare position papers, new European Projects, and all other documents to be presented to the Steering Group.

**9.2.3** - The **Steering Group** is made of 14 persons, from which at least 70% are representatives of Regional and local governments. *The list of present members is available on the web site at [http://www.amrie.org/Steering\\_Group.htm](http://www.amrie.org/Steering_Group.htm).*

The Steering Group is effectively the Board of AMRIE and meets four times a year, in February, June and October (generally in the European Parliament) and just before the annual General Assembly. It represents AMRIE between General Assemblies and is responsible for the approval and implementation of AMRIE policies.

**9.2.4** - The **General Assembly of Members** meets at least once a year, generally the day before the opening of the annual High Level Conference. It determines AMRIE policy, adopts the work programme, approves income and expenditure accounts, votes the budget, and fixes the annual membership fees.

It also votes on the **Resolutions** prepared by the Specialist working Groups.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2336 TO 2343 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Representative in all the forums not just in the Specialised Working Group, is that right?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes. Each of the regions is represented by one person and it is normally officials although MEPs are sometimes brought in for discussions or whatever, but it is officials and it is Richard Garcia who sits representing Gibraltar.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There are a number of questions which the Minister has answered together so I will endeavour to go through them to see whether any supplementaries arise. In relation to Question No. 2336 the Minister said that we are represented as a maritime region, is that as a region of the United Kingdom or as a maritime region of Europe? Is there a difference?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, we are a maritime region of Europe. However, if one looks at the membership category list, obviously when it comes under the country the Member State is UK, but we are actually there in our own right and we argue from our own position and not the UK's position. The UK has actually other maritime areas within the UK which are represented there. Remember it is not a one person per Member State, there are a number of maritime regions within one Member State and so therefore it is there by regions and not by Member States.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say how Gibraltar came to be involved with these organisations? How did this come about? Was it the United Kingdom who directed us in that direction or was it an initiative of his Department?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, we had contacts in Brussels which we were in contact with. Let me say that AMRIE is a fairly new body which was born from within the European Union to try and communicate amongst different regions for dictating maritime policy generally, and we were asked if we wanted to form part of it and we felt that it was of benefit to Gibraltar for us to be there.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 2337 which related to the cost of the conference, the Minister said that there was no cost because there was already somebody there to attend a meeting of the Working Group, that is how I have understood it from my notes. What was the cost of that, going there for the Working Group and going to this at the same time?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I have not got that information in front of me but let me say that obviously the cost is the cost for the flights and accommodation for our representative to attend, and he was already attending there for one of the main AMRIE meetings so the cost of actually attending the APRI meeting was not anything extra because it fitted in to the schedule of the meeting and it was done to coincide in order to bring the different participants together and being able to participate in this extra forum.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Given that the Minister does not have the cost of that with him, could he write to me perhaps in relation to that cost?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.

ORAL

NO. 2344 OF 2004

THE HON L A RANDALL

**PORT AUTHORITY**

Can Government provide an update on the on-going discussions with the Port Department staff regarding their possible transfer to a statutory Port Authority?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS

Discussions continue and are on the point of concluding in a manner satisfactory to all concerned.

ORAL

**NO. 2345 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Port Advisory Council met since 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2320, 2355, 2376 and 2377 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2346 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – NUMBER OF SHIP VISITS**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar since October 2004 inclusive for:

- (a) cargo;
- (b) repairs?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 2348 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2347 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

Have any new applications for a bunkering licence been made since October 2004 and have any new licences been issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

ORAL

**NO. 2348 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar for bunkering since August 2004 inclusive, on a monthly basis and how many tonnes of bunker fuel were sold each month?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought in this Question is set out in the Schedule which I hand the hon Member.

### **Schedule to Question 2348**

Ships which called at Gibraltar, August-November 2004.

(a) **Bunkering**

|           |     |       |
|-----------|-----|-------|
| August    | 367 | ships |
| September | 397 | ships |
| October   | 431 | ships |
| November  | 453 | ships |

Ships which called at Gibraltar, October-November 2004.

(b) **Cargo**

|          |   |       |
|----------|---|-------|
| October  | 0 | ships |
| November | 1 | ship  |

(c) **Repairs**

|          |    |       |
|----------|----|-------|
| October  | 11 | ships |
| November | 6  | ships |

Bunkers supplied, August-October 2004.

| <b><u>Month</u></b> | <b><u>Tonnes</u></b> |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| August              | 259,888              |
| September           | 304,705              |
| October             | 322,285              |

The figures for November 2004 are not yet available.

**NO. 2349 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – YACHT REPORTING BERTH**

Can Government confirm that there are no plans to close down the Yacht Reporting Berth?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

No, I cannot confirm that.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2349 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister tell the House whether the future of the Yacht Reporting Berth is under consideration by the Government?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If the future of the Yacht Reporting Berth is under consideration by the Government, is it because there is an intention to close it down?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the Government are actively considering a more modern yacht reporting approach in Gibraltar in line with marinas in the area and indeed in most of the Western Mediterranean, and therefore that will mean the ceasing of the Yacht Reporting Berth in its present format.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I remember we debated the question of yachts and yacht reporting during the time of the increase in security or the stage of security alerts in Gibraltar, and we discussed the roles of the yacht reporting berth. When the Minister refers to a more modern approach to yacht reporting is that what we discussed at the time, which I believe was that they would report in by fax or by radio or whatever instead of actually physically reporting?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The new system that is currently being considered is that yachts would actually not report to any yacht reporting berth but would actually call directly into the marinas into which they intend to stop at, and those marinas would actually have a type of yacht reporting berth which would enable marinas to comply with the relevant requirements in terms of customs, immigration and relevant security and documentation, and then these would be processed through a system which would enable the different law enforcement agencies to consider whether they wish to make themselves appear on site at the time and consider whether they need to take any further action in respect of any yacht calling at Gibraltar. The whole idea is to try and make it far more user-friendly than we have at the moment and in fact, legislation will be brought to the House in early 2005 which actually creates the new system to be put in place which will apply to all marinas and not like the system that we have at the moment where only yachts going in to Marina Bay and Sheppards Marina actually call at the Yacht Reporting Berth, but those at Queensway do not. The system will apply to all marinas and the legislation will actually put in place a certain amount of sort of responsibility on the marinas themselves. This is something that I have discussed with them and they are willing to play their part in this.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Will the cost of the new developments that the Minister has described be borne by the marinas or by the Government? Will the persons who will be there administering the legislation be Government officials or employees of the marinas?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the system will be run by the marinas themselves at their expense.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the new arrangements, would the Government be satisfied that the security, which is obviously an important consideration in the times in which we live, the security of Gibraltar would be fully covered and fully protected with the new measures that they intend to put into place, and that they would be better protected in fact than with the present system?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, at least the new system will be a system that will apply to all marinas and not just like at the moment where it applies to some not the other. Obviously there will be adequate facilities in place to ensure adequate security is in place at all times.

**NO. 2350 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – UPPER ROCK**

Do Government have any plans to increase the entrance charges for visitors to the Upper Rock?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Yes, the industry has been formally notified that the entrance charge will increase by £1.00 from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2350 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I recall correctly, there is a charge per vehicle and also per passenger, is that £1.00 per person, if there are four people in the car for example or is it £1.00 per vehicle, what is it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The entrance fee for private adults will be increased by £1.00, when I say private it is when they turn up privately or on tour through a tour operator, by £1.00 the walkers who are adults will go up by £1.00, for a child as well. Walkers only will actually only be increased by 50p but there the numbers are very, very small. Private vehicles will go up by £1.00 and those that actually turn up to visit only the 100 Ton Gun, which again the numbers are very low, will go up by 50p. So most will go up by the £1.00.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Minister says private adults would go up by £1.00 and private vehicles would go up by £1.00 does that mean that four private adults in a vehicle will go up by £5.00?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I do not understand the question.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has, as I have understood it, said that private adults will pay an extra £1.00, and also said private vehicles would pay an extra £1.00. If the four adults are in one car do they pay an extra £1.00 each plus an extra £1.00 for the car?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes they do. That is right.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Minister take into account something that is happening at present, I am sure he must have seen it as I have, which is that when people get up to the toll booth they suddenly realise how much they have to pay and then they turn the cars round and come back again which causes some traffic congestion in that narrow road, has the Minister taken into account the possibility that that might now increase as a result of the increase in charges, and if so what plans do the Government have to deal with it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe that part of that problem has been addressed already by allowing access for coaches and taxis through Lathbury Barracks. So there are now two entrances into the Upper Rock. Obviously there will always be those that wish to turn round at the last minute and decide not to enter, however, we intend to try and publicise the rates or the new charges as early on as possible on the approach to the Upper Rock, but that unfortunately does not always work. People still continue to go right up to the ticket office and then decide that they may want to turn round. We have tried to diminish that practice as much as possible but it will always be difficult to eradicate.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What I do not think I have heard the Minister say, it is not in the question but, is the reason behind this increase, is it as a general revenue raising measure or is it anything specific related to improvements to the Upper Rock or to the environment, because I believe this was an environmental levy originally?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, we are the victims of our own success and unfortunately the level of investment that has to be contributed towards the maintenance and upkeep and improvement in fact of the Upper Rock is an ever increasing demand, and so therefore much of the increase we hope is obviously general revenue but we hope to be able to increase our maintenance and improvement of the tourist site in the forthcoming years. In fact I am working at the moment on a three to four year programme in order to upgrade and improve the Upper Rock experience, which I believe needs to be attended to as a result of the fact that wear and tear due to numbers that actually visit the Upper Rock now warrant at this stage in our development.



**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Obviously in relation to the last answer, I do not have the latest figures yet, but I do recall that we have had this discussion before in relation to other issues to do with the Upper Rock. In terms of being the victims of our own success we know that the number of visitors to the Upper Rock has actually gone down and not up over the last few years for whatever reason, but can I ask the Minister whether, well he has already said that it will go into the general revenue of the Government but is there any percentage of it which will be allocated directly to the Upper Rock for the purposes which he has just described, or will it just be into the general fund?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I have already said that this will be general revenue. However, there is a commitment to invest in the Upper Rock like we do every year. If one looks at the I&D Fund every year, there is a budget that is attributed to the Upper Rock and I would hope that this would be enhanced but obviously that remains to be seen at Budget time when the Government have to prioritise the different submissions that are made in order to be able to improve and carry out the programme which I would like to see happening in the next three to four years.

ORAL

**NO. 2351 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – COACH FEES**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from October 2004 inclusive:

- (a) by charging coaches that use the coach park;
- (b) in admission fees to the Upper Rock?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 2352 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2352 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – GIBRALTAR MUSEUM**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from September 2004 inclusive in admissions to the Gibraltar Museum?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

## **SCHEDULE TO Q2353**

### **Q2351**

Revenue from Upper Rock Admission Fees

|      |          |          |
|------|----------|----------|
| 2004 | October  | £249,635 |
|      | November | £124,445 |

Revenue from Coach Park Fees

|      |          |         |
|------|----------|---------|
| 2004 | October  | £11,810 |
|      | November | £ 6,057 |

### **Q2352**

Revenue from Museum Admission Fees

|      |           |        |
|------|-----------|--------|
| 2004 | September | £2,481 |
|      | October   | £1,774 |
|      | November  | £3,352 |

**NO. 2353 OF 2004****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****GTB – HOTEL ASSISTANCE SCHEME**

Can Government say what amounts are due to Government in respect of loans and grants under the Hotel Assistance Scheme, listing the hotels in question and the amounts repaid as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

No monies are due to Government in respect of grants made under the Hotel Assistance Scheme.

The following are the amounts outstanding on loans made under the Scheme as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004:

| <u>Hotel</u> | <u>Amount Repaid</u> | <u>Amount Outstanding</u> |
|--------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Caleta       | £181,250.00          | £1,268,750.00             |
| Eliott       | £200,000.00          | £ 800,000.00              |
| Rock         | £249,513.25          | £1,176,276.40             |

ORAL

**NO. 2354 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – LICENSED GUIDE PASSES**

How many Licensed Guide Passes have been issued as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004 and how many are renewals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

All 380 Licensed Guide Passes issued as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004 were renewals.

ORAL

**NO. 2355 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Tourism Advisory Council met since 24<sup>th</sup> September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2320, 2345, 2376 and 2377 of 2004.

**NO. 2356 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MINISTERIAL VISITS**

Can the Minister with responsibility for Tourism give the dates when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business from 15<sup>th</sup> September 2004 to date, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 2357 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2357 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How much of the 2004/2005 £980,000 Tourism budget for Marketing, Promotions and Conferences has been spent as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004 giving a breakdown of the expenditure in question?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The information sought by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

## **SCHEDULE TO Q2357**

### **Q2356**

#### **Overseas Engagements of Minister for Trade, Industry and Communications**

8 November 2004  
World Travel Market, Excel, London

12 November 2004  
UKGTA and other meetings in London

8-9 December 2004  
Meetings and Press Launch of 2005 Gibraltar Tourism Brochure, RAC,  
London

### **Q2357**

The amount spent on marketing, promotions and conferences to 30 November 2004 was £618,296, broken down as follows:

|                                                                                                   | £       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Literature                                                                                        | 72,142  |
| Brochure distribution, fair trips and trade activity                                              | 12,666  |
| Press trips and media activity                                                                    | 15,382  |
| Promotional materials                                                                             | 2,687   |
| Advertising                                                                                       | 130,057 |
| Trade fairs                                                                                       | 51,122  |
| Events                                                                                            | 203,609 |
| Website maintenance                                                                               | 5,707   |
| UKGTA expenses, sales manager expenses, travel, PR and advertising agency fees, subscriptions etc | 119,025 |
| Contingency                                                                                       | 5,899   |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2356 AND 2357 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Looking at the expenditure on marketing, out of £980,000, £618,000 has been spent already, do the Government forecast for this year being within the budget set?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes.

**NO. 2358 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MISS GIBRALTAR 2005**

How many tenders have been received for the organisation, production and staging of the Miss Gibraltar contest 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Three.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2358 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The closing date for this was 10<sup>th</sup> December, can the Minister say whether they have actually selected the tender already or are they in the process of doing that?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the selection has not been done. The Tender Board is due to meet in early January and then after that an announcement will be made once a decision has been reached.

ORAL

**NO. 2359 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TURISPORT 2004**

How many persons made up the Gibraltar delegation at Turisport 2004 and what offices do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2360 and 2361 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2360 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – EXHIBITIONS IN SPAIN**

When did Government take the policy decision to participate in smaller, specialised tourism exhibitions in Spain and what have been the results to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2359 and 2361 of 2004.

**NO. 2361 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TURISPORT 2004**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of Gibraltar's participation in Turisport 2004 Tourist Fair from 14-17 October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The decision to participate in smaller, specialised tourist exhibitions in Spain was taken when deciding the strategy for the 2004/2005 promotional campaign in the Spring of 2004.

It is not possible to speak of the "results" of attendance at an exhibition as the GTB does not sell any specific product at a specific price: that is the role of tour operators. The GTB is, nevertheless, satisfied at the degree of interest shown by attendees at those specialised shows where there has been a Gibraltar stand. Gibraltar's profile has therefore been raised.

With regard to Turisport 2004, the two persons who made up the Gibraltar delegation were Denise Devincenzi, Marketing Co-ordinator, GTB Madrid Office, and Gillaine de los Santos, Office Administrator, GTB Madrid Office.

The cost of attendance at Turisport was £1,972, made up as follows:-

|                                        |      |
|----------------------------------------|------|
| Cost of Stand                          | £585 |
| Flights                                | £426 |
| Hotel accommodation                    | £250 |
| Subsistence and out of pocket expenses | £711 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2359 TO 2361 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The flights for £426 I take it was an internal Spanish flight, from Madrid to Santiago, is that right?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I presume that is correct.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the policy decision taken to participate in smaller specialised fairs and exhibitions in Spain, can the Minister say where that came from, was it industry-led or was it made by a particular sector of the Tourism in Gibraltar or was it his own Department that came up with that idea?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, in the case of the UK it is slightly different because we tend to take a lot of the decisions based on discussions at the United Kingdom/Gibraltar Tourism Association. In the case of Spain it was basically thoughts that were presented for consideration following input from the staff in Madrid, who obviously have contact with the industry in Spain and they felt that it was a good thing to be able to have a presence in smaller exhibitions in Spain, in places like Valencia, Santiago de Compostela, where these shows are actually open to the public as well. So therefore there is an element of increasing our public awareness as a destination rather than targeting the industry like for example, would be the case in FITUR, even though FITUR is open to the public at the weekend. I think that for the level of expenditure involved, it is actually quite a worthwhile exercise.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister mentioned FITUR, is the policy decision taken to participate in the smaller fairs, does that mean that they will no longer be participation in the larger trade fairs like FITUR or will they go to both?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Not at all. In the case of FITUR we will be there again this year, subsequent years will obviously be reviewed but we will be there in January again.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In the relation to the question I asked about results, obviously by results what the question means is whether this will be reflected in an increase in tourism activity to Gibraltar, which is what we all want. Is the Minister in a position to say whether that can be monitored to see whether this new policy will actually work in terms of producing dividends at the end of the line?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It is very difficult for us to, unless I stand at the border and ask everybody that comes in to Gibraltar, which is well over 7 million people, whether they have come to Gibraltar because we have exhibited in Turisport, that is the only way that I could actually attribute whether anybody would come to Gibraltar as a result of that. I think what we need to gauge is our results over our overall strategy and that will involve attending fairs, advertising, promotions, public relations, media, advertising, media familiarisation trips et cetera, et cetera, it is a long list. Therefore we need to assess what we are doing and assess our results and numbers of people coming in through



the border have actually been increasing year on year, at least since 1996 so therefore, we must be doing something right. Nevertheless, even though we may have increased numbers coming in we still review our strategy every year. We spend a lot of time reviewing in detail what we do and try to come up with new initiatives and leave those initiatives which we feel have worked well for us. Therefore that is how we can gauge whether attendance at these small shows will be of benefit to Gibraltar or not.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The number of people coming through the border may indeed have gone up but if I am not mistaken I think the Minister inherited already in the order of 6 million people that were coming through when they came into office. Also, the other point is that expenditure has also gone up and that is what we are trying to measure, the ratio of expenditure on marketing to actual results in terms of visitor numbers, but is it not the case in terms of monitoring what happens that surveys are already conducted on sample numbers of people who come in through the border, come through the airport, or arrive in Gibraltar by sea. Would it not be quite simple to introduce a question into that survey establishing how it was that they had an interest in Gibraltar and how they came to know about Gibraltar and why it is that they are here. That surely could be done, it does not involve the Minister himself standing at the border but it involves people that are already paid to do that job.

ORAL

**NO. 2362 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – VISIT BY SPANISH JOURNALISTS**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the visit to Gibraltar by a group of Spanish journalists at the beginning of October?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2363 to 2365 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2363 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – VISIT BY SPANISH JOURNALISTS**

How many Spanish journalists were invited to Gibraltar at the beginning of October and what media did each of them represent?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2362, 2364 and 2365 of 2004.

**NO. 2364 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SPANISH OPERATORS**

How many Spanish operators is the GTB talking to with a view to developing specific packages including Gibraltar in tandem with the visiting journalists initiative, who are they and what field of expertise do they offer?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2362, 2363 and 2365 of 2004.

**NO. 2365 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – VISIT BY SPANISH JOURNALISTS**

Can Government say how and by whom the “selected travel journalists from Spain” who visited Gibraltar at the beginning of October were chosen?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The cost of the Spanish press trip was £3,989, broken down as follows:

|                                |        |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| Rail tickets, Madrid-Algeciras | £ 790  |
| Hotel Accommodation            | £1,204 |
| Lunches and dinners            | £1,029 |
| Dolphin tour                   | £ 200  |
| Transfers                      | £ 766  |

Seven Spanish journalists were invited to visit Gibraltar in October, as follows:

Ester Muñoz Murillo (Nexotur)  
Javier Carrion (Europa Press)  
Jesus Navarro Blanco (Turismo Rural and Deportes de Aventura/A Filo De)  
David Santiago Garcia (Turismo y Aventura)  
Ana Vara (Hoteles de España y del Mundo)  
Silvia Barrufet (journalist Turismo y Ocio International Magazine)  
Juan Carlos Viera (photographer, Turismo y Ocio International Magazine)

The operator that the GTB is in discussions with is Iberrail, with a view to developing rail packages to Gibraltar.

The selected travel journalists were chosen by the GTB public relations agency in Madrid, in close consultation with the Gibraltar Tourist Board.

**NO. 2366 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – CAMP BAY AND LITTLE BAY**

Can Government explain why toilet facilities and cleaning for Camp Bay and Little Bay did not continue to be provided automatically for the winter months once the official bathing season had ended?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Toilet facilities and cleaning of Camp Bay and Little Bay did in fact continue to be provided after the conclusion of the bathing season without a break, in the same way that this was done in 2003. They will continue throughout the winter months. The question is therefore not understood.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2366 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

It is true to say that they are provided at present and that these are the winter months, but I think the key word in the question is “automatically”. The Opposition receive representations from people who use the beach who were told that the cleaning of the beach would not continue during the winter months, that the changing room and toilet facilities would not be available also, and we issued a statement to that effect I am sure the Minister will recall. It was subsequent to that statement that the Government published a notice saying that the cleaning of the beaches would continue as normal, but certainly the information that we have is that there was an interruption in that service however short it might be and that that is what led to the question being placed. The key word then is “automatically” is the Minister not aware of that?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I am not aware of any gap or break in the service provided. The service, as far as I understand, was continued and I do recall the Opposition actually issuing a press release on the matter and as a result of that I issued a Government Notice to ensure that the public were informed about the fact that the service would be continued. Prior to that I did not feel that the need was there for an Official Notice because the service was being continued.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The position of the Minister then is that the service did not cease at any particular moment in time.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Not as far as I am aware of.

**NO. 2367 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say of the number of persons who have been interviewed since August 2004 inclusive, who said that they had not stayed at a hotel, how many were interviewed at the airport, how many were interviewed at the land frontier, and how many were interviewed elsewhere, and in each case what was the average length of stay in hotels?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 2368 of 2004.



**NO. 2368 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB –PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews have been carried out with persons who said that they had not stayed at a hotel since August 2004 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested in both questions is identical, as they both relate to persons who do not stay at hotels.

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand to him.

**Schedule to Question 2368**

**Persons interviewed who said they did not stay at a Hotel**

| Month     | Number of Persons Interviewed | Place of Interview |      |          |           |        |            |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------|------|----------|-----------|--------|------------|
|           |                               | Airport            | Port | Frontier | Waterport | Marina | Coach park |
| August    | 2083                          | 73                 | 131  | 1672     | 1         | 13     | 193        |
| September | 2091                          | 20                 | 96   | 1704     | -         | 12     | 259        |
| October   | 2079                          | 36                 | 60   | 1788     | -         | 16     | 179        |

The information in respect of November 2004 is not yet available.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2367 AND 2368 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I think there is a question which asks, in relation to those who stay at hotels, which is the one that I normally table but it does not seem to be included. Perhaps I can write to the Minister and get that information from him.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I know that last time there was a confusion as to whether they related to things so when I saw this again it was pointed out to me by the official that it was actually asking the same information in a different format, so I read it again and again and I thought that they were actually asking for the same information. If there is any other information which the hon Member wishes to seek, please write to me and I will be very happy to give the information needed.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

What it is would be really the same question as Question No. 2367 in relation to those who had stayed at a hotel, because then the average length of stay which is the difference between the two questions, would be the information that would be given.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, I would be very happy to write to the hon Member and send him the information for those who had stayed in hotels.

**NO. 2369 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ST MICHAEL’S CAVE**

Can Government say whether a service agreement has now been signed with the company that provided the sound and light system for St Michael’s Cave?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2369 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Who is maintaining the sound and light system at present?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Electrosonic who are maintaining the equipment since 1<sup>st</sup> September 2004 but the contract has not been signed yet. It is a matter of logistics the fact that there is not an agreement.

ORAL

**NO. 2370 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – WORLD TRAVEL MARKET**

Can Government say on what date they were advised by the UKGTA that they were dissatisfied with the return on the investment offered by having a dedicated Gibraltar stand at the World Travel Market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 2371 of 2004.

**NO. 2371 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – WORLD TRAVEL MARKET**

What sector of the UKGTA was dissatisfied with the return on investment offered by the World Travel Market?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The UKGTA Exhibitions Sub-Committee met on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2004 and decided to recommend to the UKGTA that Gibraltar should not have a stand at the World Travel Market in November 2004. The Sub-Committee's recommendation was discussed at the UKGTA meeting of 14<sup>th</sup> September 2004, where the UKGTA recommended to me that the Sub-Committee's recommendation should be accepted. I accepted the advice that had been tendered.

There was dissatisfaction with the World Travel Market voiced by all sectors of the UKGTA, namely tour operators, airlines and hotels. In addition, it was reported to the UKGTA that members of ANTOR, the UK Association of National Tourist Office Representatives, were unhappy with World Travel Market and believed it no longer represented value for money. Let me add to this that obviously we will be reviewing whether we go back to World Travel Market or not next year, but I thought that we would be bold and take the decision not to be there this year and see what the results are.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2370 AND 2371 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether this is something the UKGTA has recommended to the Government in the past?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well there have been voices of expression in this respect in the past but something that I have not accepted because I am open to being advised but I do not really need to take the advice. On this occasion I felt that having been to World Travel Market last year, there was an element of numbers were down in people attending, the location as to where it is now as to where it was in the past is at a disadvantage, the transport infrastructure to get there is not adequate at all and I think there was a

general feeling in the industry that the move from the centre of London down to the Excel Exhibition Centre has been a mistake. Therefore, it remains to be seen whether the World Travel Market will continue to be there next year. I thought it was a good time to test the decision this year and so we did it and we will see what the results are as a result of this.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Do I detect from the Minister's reply and from the statement he made on GBC that this is not a decision that he has taken lightly, that he is doing this somewhat reluctantly?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think the hon Member is probably judging right. I am a personal believer that we should be there but that does not mean that I am right, and if I am advised by those that are in the industry full-time and are in the UK themselves, and have their best interests at heart, at the end of the day if tour operators in the UK are telling me 'look, we should be doing something else instead of this. We do not feel that we are getting the benefits that we should be', then obviously I am willing to give them the benefit of the doubt and go down that route. Therefore, probably, that is why I have said that we should not rule out that we will be back next year because I still want to review this decision when we conclude our strategy for the next year.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

As the Minister knows well, in the House we have raised in the past the expense involved in relation to attending this particular event, but the Government's comments at the time indicated that what there will not be is a specific Gibraltar stand at the World Travel Market, which is the bulk of the expense, was there any other presence which did not involve having a stand there?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No there was not any specific stand but we did have our own industry there. I attended World Travel Market on one particular day and we had our industry players on some other stands where they participated and used for their own point of contact. So Gibraltar was represented in an indirect way but nothing direct and nothing official.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

As a matter of curiosity, are those industry players the same ones who recommended to the Government that they should not be present and have a stand?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Indeed, they were. Let us put it into perspective, I think that they all feel that attending World Travel Market and being there is of benefit to Gibraltar. I think what

we need to put it is against the backdrop of the cost of doing that. Attending World Travel Market last year cost in the region of about £70,000. That figure will probably be higher this year because the rates at which they hire the space et cetera has actually been increased by something like 25 per cent. So therefore we are looking at big numbers and therefore a good number of national tourist boards actually pulled out. We felt we did not want to be the only ones to pull out because otherwise the industry may perceive that as if we are going into second division and why is Gibraltar not there but the fact that a number of national tourist boards decided that they were not going to take it and be there, we thought we would do the same and take the decision if at any time the best time was probably this year and that is why we took it.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I may question the Government on the UKGTA's decision? There was a statement or a comment made at the time which suggested that half of the UKGTA members were dissatisfied with the World Travel Market, which implies that the other half were perfectly content in continuing, was this decision a unanimous one or was this division reflected in the position that they took?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Sub-Committee of the UKGTA which takes care of all exhibitions and actually consider, made a unanimous recommendation. When it was put to the full forum of the UKGTA there were still those that felt that we should be there, but after a long discussion on the issue we decided that we would pull out this year and review the situation.



ORAL

**NO. 2372 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SECURITY GUARD SERVICE**

Can Government say whether the tender for the provision of a Security Guard Service at various tourist sites, which was awarded in the sum of £56,308.98p and an ad hoc rate of £6.25p an hour was the lowest tender submitted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 2373 of 2004.

**NO. 2373 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SECURITY GUARD SERVICE**

Can Government say which tourist sites were covered by the tender for the provision of a Security Guard Service, and during what hours this service is provided at each site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The tourist sites and the hours covered by the tender are as follows:

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| St Michael's Cave   | 10.30 am to 7.00 pm |
| Great Siege Tunnels | 12 noon to 7.00 pm  |
| Moorish Castle      | 10.00 pm to 7.00 am |
| Jew's Gate          | 10.30 am to 7.00 pm |
| Coach Park          | 10.00 am to 4.00 pm |

The tender was awarded to the lowest bidder.

**NO. 2374 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – CONFERENCES**

Can Government list the conferences that they have assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored since 29<sup>th</sup> September 2004 inclusive, showing the dates of the conferences in question?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The GTB has not assisted, sponsored or co-sponsored any conference since 28<sup>th</sup> September 2004.

The Finance Centre participated in one conference, on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2004, on insurance.

**NO. 2375 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HOTEL GRADINGS**

Can Government say into which star category the hotel at 11/15 Turnbull's Lane is expected to fall?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

It is for the hotelier to determine into which category of hotel he wishes the property to go. There are specific grading criteria against which the hotel will be judged once it is operational to determine its star rating.

It is not for the Government to determine the star rating of the intended hotel, nor to indicate to the hotel what grading it should aspire to.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2375 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it not the case that when the Government have considered hotels as part of development projects, I recall the one at Rosia Bay there was a discussion once about that one, there was a discussion about the ones on the East Side, that the Government themselves have a preference for a particular star grading of hotels?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, but in this case this is a very small hotel with only a handful of rooms so therefore it is really up to them as to what they decide. I have met the developers and I know the Gibraltar Tourist Board has given them the criteria they need to meet in order to meet various star ratings under the RAC scheme. It is up to them now to come up with whatever product they want to sell.

ORAL

**NO. 2376 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Business Advisory Council met since 1<sup>st</sup> October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2320, 2345, 2355 and 2377 of 2004.

**NO. 2377 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – E-BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the e-Business Advisory Council met since 9<sup>th</sup> July 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The E-Business Advisory Council met twice, on 28<sup>th</sup> October and 6<sup>th</sup> December 2004.

The Business and Commerce Advisory Council met once on 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2004.

The Development and Planning Commission met four times, on 14<sup>th</sup> October, 16<sup>th</sup> November, 7<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> December 2004.

The Tourism Advisory Council met once on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2004.

The Port Advisory Council met twice on 29<sup>th</sup> October and 16<sup>th</sup> December 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2378 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties who have applied for EU funding since the last Question Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purpose for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2379 to 2381 of 2004.

**NO. 2379 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties who have applied for Gibraltar Government funding since the last Question Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purposes for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful, and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2378, 2380 and 2381 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2380 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Have the projects shown as “under consideration” in answer to Question No. 1794 of 2004 been successful in their application for EU funding or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2378, 2379 and 2381 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2381 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT FUNDING**

Have the projects submitted and given in answer to Question No. 1793 of 2004 been successful in their application for Gibraltar Government funding or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the attached schedule.

## **SCHEDULE TO Q2381**

### **Q2378**

Five applications for EU funding were received as follows:

#### **ERDF PROJECTS**

| <b>Applicant</b>              | <b>Status</b> | <b>ERDF Funding</b> | <b>Purpose of Grant</b>                                                              |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Technical Services Department | Approved      | £180,050            | Beautification works at Catalan Bay                                                  |
| Technical Services Department | Approved      | £178,362            | Works association with City Centre Beautification phase VI                           |
| H&S Property                  | Approved      | £4,174              | Purchase of equipment, fitting-out premises, advertising, Rent-Subsidy Scheme        |
| Barrow Hills Ltd              | Approved      | £4,424              | Purchase of equipment, payment of import duty, installation works                    |
| Department Transport          | Approved      | £1,155,000          | Purchase of bus fleet, purchase and installation of ticketing system and CCTV system |

There were no unsuccessful applications, and there are none pending.

### **Q2379**

One application for Gibraltar Government funding was received, but it was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant. No applications are pending.

### **Q2380**

The two projects which were under consideration for EU funding, as notified in answer to Question No. 1794 of 2004, have yet to submit further information requested of them and are still pending.

Contd.....

**Contd Answer to Schedule to Q2381**

**Q2381**

Of the two projects referred to in Question No. 1793 of 2004, one (Dorcas Fashion Designs) has been successful in its application; the other (Risso Bakery Ltd) is still pending, as further information needs to be supplied by the applicant.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2378 TO 2381 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I have a number of queries in relation to some of the answers given. In answer to Question No. 2378 there is a grant approved for £4,174, that includes a rent subsidy scheme, is that something new or something which businesses can now apply for whether the landlord is the Government or whether it is a private landlord?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, this is part of a package in the application where the Government or the European Union is asked to participate in part of the funding, composed of a variety of expenditure issued which total up a total bid. Therefore, that included the purchase of equipment, the fitting-out of the premises, the advertising and the rent subsidy scheme which has nothing to do with, maybe it appears there and it looks as if it is a scheme that has been developed, but it is part of the overall expenditure proposal which is then partly funded by the European Union, and partly funded by the actual applicant himself.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My other query is in relation to the grant of £4,424 where one of the items listed is the payment of import duty. That is something that I do not recall seeing there before, is that new or can people now legitimately apply for relief from import duty?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I think possibly the purpose of the grant issued there, I have been of the view that I wanted to give as much explanation as possible, possibly in the past they have never been mentioned and never been discovered. It may be that in the case of say the £4,424 maybe the purpose of the grant would have been for the purchase of equipment and said nothing else, or upgrading of equipment and said nothing else. What I have done is specify the actual purpose of the grant as appears in the application form, because I have requested that there should be more information when making applications for EU funding than there have been in the past.

ORAL

NO. 2382 OF 2004

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EU FUNDING**

How many entities have submitted a tender for the art, design, printing and supply of an EU funding newsletter and who was successful?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS

Four tenders were submitted and Gibraltar Chronicle Limited was the successful tenderer.

ORAL

**NO. 2383 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY NEW YEAR'S EVE CELEBRATIONS**

Who was the successful tenderer in respect of the organisation, production and staging of the Tercentenary New Year's Eve Celebrations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Answered together with Question No. 2384 of 2004.

**NO. 2384 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY NEW YEAR'S EVE CELEBRATIONS**

How many entities have submitted tenders for the organisation, production and staging of the Tercentenary New Year's Eve Celebrations?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

Four entities submitted tenders. The successful tenderer was The Studio.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2383 AND 2384 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister able to say in what amount and whether it was the lowest tender?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, the amount was awarded to The Studio in the sum of £59,650 and they were not the lowest bidder. Let me say that the Government are not liable to accept the lowest tenderer and in this case especially the financial aspect is just one aspect of the submission. The quality of the programme that they actually propose et cetera is something that is very much borne in mind in the adjudicating.



**NO. 2385 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**SALE OF BANK NOTES**

Can Government state whether they no longer intend to proceed with a system for the sale of banknotes via the Internet?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government do intend to have a system in place for the sale of banknotes via the internet.

Arrangements are in hand for Gibraltar currency notes to be offered for sale to collectors through the Gibraltar Philatelic Bureau Ltd website.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2385 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is there a target date for the software to be ready for the sale to proceed via the internet?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not aware that there is a target date, I think that this is something that both sides want to do so I suppose it will be done as quickly as they can agree. That website will give access to about 15,000 collectors of Gibraltar stamps, the Philatelic Bureau website, so it will provide a useful outlet but I cannot give a target date.

**NO. 2386 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**LAND PROPERTY SERVICES**

Can Government state whether they have now concluded a new contract with Land Property Services, and if so, on what terms?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Heads of Terms of the revised contractual arrangements have now been agreed by the Government, in principle, and a formal document is now being drafted for final approval and execution by the two parties. This is expected to take place early in the new year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2386 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether the agreement fulfils the goal which they set up, which if I remember correctly, was to give the Government a more equitable share of the revenues derived?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I am not sure that that is how I would put it, but the Government wanted a form of contract which (a) did not give them more revenue for no more substantial amount of effort, in other words, if the Government grows a particular source of revenue it is not equitable in our view that they should get an automatic share increase in their revenue without a commensurate increase in effort. The other thing that we wanted to do was to have a system that was measurable in terms of value for money and productivity, so whereas I think it would be inappropriate at this stage to give the hon Member details of the basis of the contract, I can tell him that it is based on cost plus principles. In other words, the operating cost base has been agreed with the Government, they are then allowed a percentage mark-up over their cost not as a percentage of the Government revenues that they are collecting, and then in addition to that they are allowed bonuses linked to passing certain gateways and targets and reaching certain targets. So they do not get a fixed percentage of any growth but what they get is a bonus if they achieve things that in turn increase the level of revenue for Government through their efforts.

**NO. 2387 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – THE SANDS PROJECT**

Can Government state how many tenders have been received for the Housing Project on the site known as 'The Sands' by North Mole Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The closing date for the return of tender bids has been extended to the 14<sup>th</sup> January 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2387 OF 2004**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether any tenders have been received, even though the date has been extended to January?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe the answer is no, but in any event the system does not work like that, these tenders get deposited in a box and I think the box is opened on the day, so theoretically one should not know whether any tenders have already been deposited in the box. That said, I believe that it will not have been because all interested parties sought an extension.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could I also ask the Chief Minister if the completion date as stated in the Official Notice on 28<sup>th</sup> May this year is still the 31<sup>st</sup> December 2006, or is that also being extended?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

My understanding is that it is a two year construction period.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So effectively then the condition that was published is being altered in the sense that instead of them having to undertake to finish by a given date, they have to undertake to finish within two years of starting, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. A completion period has been specified and then they have been invited to tender, if they want to, for different periods so that the Government can then judge the relationship between completion date and cost, but their primary obligation is to tender for a specified period and then they are free to submit tenders for different periods. In addition not instead of. They have to submit a bid for the period of two years and if they want to they can submit bids for other periods as well.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Right, but my question in relation to the two years is that if the commencement, which I think is the question my hon Friend was asking, if the commencement of the two year period is now different from originally envisaged, since the original invitation to tender required people to submit a bid on the premise that they would complete by the end of 2006, is that now altered in terms of the language being that the basic bid that everybody that has to come up with, irrespective of what other options they may offer, is a bid for December 2006 or a bid for two years from the date of commencement?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The latter because we do not know when the contract will be adjudicated.

ORAL

**NO. 2388 OF 2004**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government state if there has been any further response to the current offer for sale of Government 50 per cent share of the co-ownership homes with a 5 per cent uplift, giving the same breakdown as was given in answer to Question No. 1912 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member schedules detailing the information requested.

**Answer to Question 2388 of 2004**

**Completions as per Question 1912 of 2004**

| <b><u>Estate</u></b>      | <b><u>No. of completions</u></b> | <b><u>Funds Received</u></b> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Brympton                  | 8                                | £213,176.81                  |
| Harbour Views             | 22                               | £420,990.16                  |
| Montagu Crescent          | 10                               | £292,216.32                  |
| Montagu Gardens           | 8                                | £237,233.07                  |
| Sir William Jackson Grove | 5                                | £83,742.15                   |
| Westview Park             | 5                                | £106,579.82                  |
|                           | <u>58</u>                        | <u>£1,353,938.33</u>         |

**Completions to date**

| <b><u>Estate</u></b>      | <b><u>No. of completions</u></b> | <b><u>Funds Received</u></b> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Brympton                  | 8                                | £213,176.81                  |
| Harbour Views             | 35                               | £657,924.47                  |
| Montagu Crescent          | 15                               | £422,740.91                  |
| Montagu Gardens           | 16                               | £452,919.38                  |
| Sir William Jackson Grove | 14                               | £339,605.64                  |
| Westview Park             | 12                               | £262,866.93                  |
|                           | <u>100</u>                       | <u>£2,349,234.14</u>         |

Contd.....

### **Contd Answer to Question 2388 of 2004**

|                           | <b>Total Letters Sent</b> | <b>Total sum of Government share</b> | <b>Replies received "Yes"</b> | <b>Total sum of Government share</b> | <b>Replies received "No"</b> | <b>Total sum of Government share</b> | <b>No reply received</b> | <b>Total sum of Government share</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Brympton                  | 36                        | £1,014,815.46                        | 9                             | £241,976.81                          | 2                            | £51,840.00                           | 25                       | £720,998.65                          |
| Harbour Views             | 400                       | £8,264,069.26                        | 49                            | £979,208.45                          | 53                           | £1,095,090.58                        | 298                      | £6,189,770.23                        |
| Montagu Crescent          | 152                       | £4,022,567.45                        | 20                            | £532,446.34                          | 11                           | £287,798.53                          | 121                      | £3,202,322.58                        |
| Montagu Gardens           | 307                       | £8,995,500.59                        | 28                            | £820,190.49                          | 31                           | £900,595.75                          | 248                      | £7,274,714.35                        |
| Sir William Jackson Grove | 167                       | £3,206,488.17                        | 17                            | £287,871.27                          | 13                           | £240,943.43                          | 137                      | £2,677,673.47                        |
| Westview Park             | 82                        | £1,848,982.94                        | 16                            | £349,166.97                          | 8                            | £181,570.32                          | 58                       | £1,318,245.65                        |
|                           | <b>1144</b>               | <b>£27,352,423.87</b>                | <b>139</b>                    | <b>£3,210,860.33</b>                 | <b>118</b>                   | <b>£2,757,838.61</b>                 | <b>887</b>               | <b>£21,383,724.93</b>                |

**NO. 2389 OF 2004**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CIVIL SERVICE – MATERNITY LEAVE**

Can Government state whether there is any disparity in the Civil Service with regard to maternity leave entitlement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Maternity leave entitlement currently stands at twenty six weeks for all Government employees. Teachers, however, are entitled to 14 weeks exclusive of school holidays. This is as a result of the application of the teacher's UK conditions of service relating to maternity leave. The manner in which maternity leave is calculated in the UK has since changed and discussions are on-going with the GTA as to their application or otherwise in Gibraltar.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2389 OF 2004**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just to make the Chief Minister aware since he did mention the teachers, that yes, teachers do get the 14 weeks and the maximum a teacher would get because the system works that the school holidays are not counted as part of the maternity leave, therefore the maximum are sort of added on to the teacher. Therefore, for example, the maximum now a teacher would get would be 20 weeks, because if we take for example that a teacher starts the maternity leave in June, has four weeks maternity leave before the school ends, then the six weeks of holiday is added on which is not counted, that would be ten weeks of de facto maternity leave and then they would have another ten weeks to a maximum of twenty. Just to say that I appreciate that the Chief Minister has mentioned the teachers and that there is on-going discussions with the GTA.



**NO. 2390 OF 2004**

**THE HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO**

**GHA – CAR PARKING SPACES**

Can Government now state how many car parking spaces will be available at the Europort Hospital and who will have access to them, since the answer to this question was not given in reply to Question No. 1888 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Assuming that the question by saying “at the Europort Hospital” means in the Europort Hospital building, the answer is 50 car parking spaces and 50 motorbike spaces will be provided. This will be available to on-call staff, staff who are mobile between differing GHA sites, a percentage will be available for disabled persons and some may be made available for other visitors. They are talking about the spaces in the basement of the hospital building.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2390 OF 2004**

**HON MISS M I MONTEGRIFFO:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether the staff, likewise, will be available to the car parking spaces which they have purchased from the adjacent building?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That decision has not yet been made but the answer is probably not because those spaces are intended for visitors to the hospital.

**NO. 2391 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FAMILY EXPENDITURE SURVEY**

When do Government expect to undertake the next Family Expenditure Survey?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In answer to Question No. 1325 of 2004, I explained that a Family Expenditure Survey is undertaken at times when there have been significant changes in the pattern of consumers' expenditure. The last such Survey was carried out in 1995/1996 after a period of 17 years since the previous one, and gave rise to the current Index of Retail Prices that commenced in April 1998. Since then, the Statistics Office updates and revises the range of goods and services that are priced as part of the Index. It is not intended to carry out a new Survey in the immediate future.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2391 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not the case that in fact when the Government brought the Bill to provide for a minimum increase of two per cent to Government Civil Service pensions, the Government said that this was being done on the basis that they believed that the Index was under-reflecting price rises and that it was being done as an interim measure until the information needed to review the Index was done? Then at a subsequent meeting when I asked about what exactly was being done, I was told that what was being done was that a new Expenditure Survey was going to be carried out.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it is intended that at some point there will be a new Family Expenditure Survey. I did emphasise in my reading out of the answer the word "immediate", I did not want the hon Members to think that it was imminent but it is in the pipeline at some stage when they are ready to do it, I suppose. I cannot tell the hon Members that it is imminent or immediate in the sense that it is round the corner, but yes, the Government do recognise the need to do this Survey again and though there is no policy decision here, they ought to do it whenever they have the resources and are ready to do it, as far as Government are concerned.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Government are not saying that there should be one or that there should not be one, we are just trying to find out if there is going to be one.

**NO. 2392 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCE CENTRE DIRECTOR**

What is the annual remuneration package of the Finance Centre Director?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Finance Centre Director is on a three-year fixed term contract. His gross annual salary (which is not subject to annual increases) is currently £97,728. This salary does not accrue pension rights.

The question refers to an annual remuneration package. The Finance Centre Director will also receive a gratuity of £51,436 at the end of his three-year contract which expires on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2005. In addition, the Finance Centre Director receives a housing allowance of £30,000 per annum.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2392 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that salary also treated like the salary of the new Chief Executive of the GHA as a Category 3 salary or Category 3 Individual with that tax applied to that salary?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is correct.

ORAL

**NO. 2393 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown by month of the number of individuals taking up Category 2 status in the months of October and November 2004, under the Qualifying (Category 2) Individuals Rules 2004 made under the Income Tax Ordinance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2394 to 2400 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2394 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the number of individuals taking up Category 3 status under the rules made pursuant to the Income Tax Ordinance as at the end of each financial year since the introduction of that status, giving a breakdown by industry, sex and nationality until the month of June 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2393 and 2395 to 2400 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2395 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown by month of the number of individuals taking up Category 3 status in the months from July to November 2004, under the Qualifying (Category 2) Individuals Rules 2004 made under the Income Tax Ordinance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2393, 2394 and 2396 to 2400 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2396 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 4 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown by month of the number of individuals taking up Category 4 status in the months from July to November 2004, under the Qualifying (Category 2) Individuals Rules 2004 made under the Income Tax Ordinance?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2393 to 2395 and 2397 to 2400 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2397 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown by month of the number of individuals who have renewed their Category 3 status made under the Income Tax Ordinance in the months from July to November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2393 to 2396 and 2398 to 2400 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2398 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 4 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown by month of the number of individuals who have renewed their Category 4 status made under the Income Tax Ordinance in the months from July to November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2393 to 2397 and 2399 to 2400 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2399 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 4 STATUS**

Can Government provide a breakdown of the number of individuals taking up Category 4 status under the rules made pursuant to the Income Tax Ordinance as at the end of each financial year since the introduction of that status, giving a breakdown by industry, sex and nationality until the month of June 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2393 to 2398 and 2400 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2400 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals who were registered with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of the month of July 2004 have since surrendered or not renewed the same?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing all the statistical information which is requested.

## **ANSWER TO QUESTION 2400**

### **Answer to Question 2393/2004**

In the months from October to November 2004 the following number of individuals took up Category 2 status:-

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| October  | 4 |
| November | 1 |

### **Answer to Question 2394/2004**

During the following financial years:-

#### **1998 – 1999**

5 individuals took up Category 3 status, 2 were in the Financial Services Commission, 1 GDC, 1 gaming and 1 ship repair, all 5 are male, 4 are British and one is Irish.

#### **1999 – 2000**

5 individuals took up Category 3 status, 3 were in financial services, 1 in property and 1 in gaming, all 5 are male, 3 are British, 1 is Swiss and 1 is Greek.

#### **2000 – 2001**

19 individuals took up Category 3 status, 11 were in the gaming industry, 3 in financial services, 2 in beverage, 1 in the Financial Services Commission, 1 in security and 1 in IT, of which 18 are male and 1 female. 15 are British, 1 is Brazilian, 1 is Italian, 1 is Irish and 1 is Swedish.

#### **2001 – 2002**

18 individuals took up Category 3 status, 11 were in the gaming industry, 4 in the financial services, 1 in the oil industry, 1 automotive and 1 in shipping, all 18 being male of which 14 are British, 2 are Italian, 1 is Indian and 1 is Swedish.

#### **2002 – 2003**

34 individuals took up Category 3 status, 24 were in financial services and 10 in the gaming industry, 32 are male and 2 female. 21 are British, 3 are American, 3 are Australian, 3 are South African, 1 is Italian, 1 is Danish, 1 is Irish and 1 is French.

Contd.....

## **CONTD ANSWER TO QUESTION 2400**

### **2003 – 2004**

40 individuals took up Category 3 status, 20 were in the gaming industry, 19 in financial service and 1 in the Financial Services Commission, 38 are male and 2 female, 23 are British, 8 are Israeli, 3 are American, 2 are Australian, 1 is South African, 1 is French, 1 is Indian and 1 is Swedish.

### **2004 – June 2004**

9 individuals took up Category 3 status, 5 are in financial services and 4 in the gaming industry, all 9 are male, 6 are British, 1 is Indian, 1 is Polish and 1 is Swedish.

### **Answer to Question 2395/2004**

In the months from July to November 2004 the following number of individuals took up Category 3 status:-

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| July      | 2 |
| August    | 2 |
| September | 8 |
| October   | 1 |
| November  | 2 |

NB Individuals taking up Category 3 status do so under the Qualifying (Category 3) Individuals Rules 1998.

### **Answer to Question 2396/2004**

In the months from July to November 2004 the following number of individuals took up Category 4 status:-

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| July      | Nil |
| August    | Nil |
| September | 3   |
| October   | 1   |
| November  | Nil |

NB Individuals taking up Category 4 status do so under the Qualifying (Category 4) Individuals Rules 1999.

Contd.....

## **Contd ANSWER TO QUESTION 2400**

### **Answer to Question 2397/2004**

In the months from July to November 2004 the number of individuals renewing their Category 3 status was 2.

### **Answer to Question 2398/2004**

No individuals have renewed their Category 4 status in the months from July to November 2004.

### **Answer to Question 2399/2004**

During the following financial years:-

#### **1999 – 2000**

2 individuals took up category 4 status, both were in the betting industry, both are male and are British.

#### **2000 – 2001**

9 individuals took up category 4 status, all were in the betting industry, 7 are male and 2 are female, 6 are British, 1 is South African, 1 is French and 1 is Italian.

#### **2001 – 2002**

13 individuals took up category 4 status, 11 of which were in the betting industry and 2 in the shipping industry, all are male, 9 of which are British, 3 are Swedish and 1 is Malaysian.

#### **2002 – 2003**

4 individuals took up category 4 status, 2 of which were in the betting industry, 1 in trusteeship and 1 in the medial specialist industry, 3 are male, 1 is female. 3 are British and 1 is Belgian.

#### **2003 – 2004**

10 individuals took up category 4 status, 9 of which were in the betting industry and 1 in the insurance industry, 9 are male and 1 is female, of which 5 are Israeli, 3 are British, 1 is Swedish and 1 is German.

Contd.....

**Contd ANSWER TO QUESTION 2400**

**2004 – June 2004**

5 individuals took up category 4 status, all of which are in the betting industry, 4 are male and 1 is female, 4 are Indian and 1 is Italian.

**Answer to Question 2400/2004**

No individuals with Category 2 status as at the end of the month of July 2004 have since surrendered their status.

NB Category 2 status does not need to be renewed as it is granted indefinitely subject to compliance with the rules.



**NO. 2401 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES – CONFERENCES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attending all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the months of October and November 2004, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Mr James Tipping, the Finance Centre Director, was invited by Willis to give a presentation at their insurance seminar in London on 16<sup>th</sup> November 2004.

The breakdown of the costs were:-

|                          |                |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Flight and Accommodation | £290.50        |
| Travel Expenses          | <u>£156.45</u> |
| Total                    | £446.95        |

ORAL

**NO. 2402 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANY**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the months of October and November 2004 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2403 of 2004.

**NO. 2403 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANY**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies are registered in Gibraltar in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No applications to form a Protected Cell Company which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected in the months of October and November 2004. In other words, there have been none and none remain pending basically.

In the months of October and November 2004, one Protected Cell Company appears as registered. No new Protected Cell Companies have been registered in this period.

ORAL

**NO. 2404 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

How many qualifying companies have discontinued their qualifying status in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2405 to 2407 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2405 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2404 and 2406 to 2407 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2406 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many of the qualifying companies which remained in the months of October and November 2004 are considered by it to be active or trading?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2404, 2405 and 2407 of 2004.

**NO. 2407 OF 2004****THE HON F R PICARDO****TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates were issued in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In the months of October and November 2004 the following number of qualifying companies discontinued their qualifying status.

|          |     |
|----------|-----|
| October  | Nil |
| November | 19  |

In the months of October and November 2004 the following number of tax exempt companies terminated their tax exemption certificate.

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| October  | 72 |
| November | 82 |

“Terminated their tax exemption” is interpreted by the Finance Centre Department as companies which have returned their certificate and no longer require their tax exempt status.

In the months of October and November 2004, the following numbers of qualifying companies were considered as active or trading.

|                 | <b>Active</b> | <b>Trading</b> |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>October</b>  | 102           | 65             |
| <b>November</b> | 83            | 59             |

During the months of October and November 2004 the following exempt company certificates were issued:-

|          |    |
|----------|----|
| October  | 94 |
| November | 93 |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2404 TO 2407 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Chief Minister aware whether any of the 19 that discontinued their qualifying status in November have actually taken up exempt status thereafter?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is not an issue on which I would like to give chapter and verse in public. I should say this to the hon Member and perhaps this will suffice for his purposes at the moment, that during the last few months each qualifying status company has been addressed individually, discussions have taken place and the result has been that each have opted for different status. In other words, they have each been dealt with differently. There are three possibilities, just leave Gibraltar, they stay in Gibraltar as an ordinary tax paying company or they stay in Gibraltar as an exempt company. Those are the three options. There have been examples of all three. No sorry, let me say that again. To date none has left Gibraltar or signified its intention, so either the Government have agreed to issue them with an exemption certificate or they have been happy to become ordinary tax paying companies subject to the normal provisions of the Income Tax Ordinance.



ORAL

**NO. 2408 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2409 of 2004.

**NO. 2409 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As follows:

**Answer to Question 2408/2004**

The following companies were removed from the Companies Register in the months of October and November 2004.

|          |     |
|----------|-----|
| October  | 261 |
| November | 227 |

**Answer to Question 2409/2004**

The following companies were formed in the months of October and November 2004.

|          |     |
|----------|-----|
| October  | 260 |
| November | 263 |

**NO. 2410 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAXATION OF SAVINGS ORDINANCE**

Can Government now confirm that the Taxation of Savings Ordinance 2004 will come into effect in January 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It would be ultra vires for the Government to commence the Taxation of Savings Ordinance in January 2005. Pursuant to section 2(2) of that Ordinance as passed by this House, the Government do not have the power to commence this Ordinance prior to 1 July 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2410 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister told us in answer to questions recently in relation to this Ordinance that there was a possibility that it might be necessary to bring it into effect in January I believe, and that is why I am pressing him further in relation to that. I know that both of us agree that the longer that we can avoid bringing this legislation into effect the better, and I think that we both agree that is why I am pressing him. But if that is the position I am quite happy to see that it has been kicked into the future in July.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have to say I have no recollection of saying anything of the kind. It may be that I said something else and the hon Member has misunderstood me. I remember that the hon Member asked me what was the commencement date, whether it was January because there was then a story in the press, I suppose that might have prompted his question that the Commission was delaying the commencement. It had been scheduled to start in January, there was a decision taken at the European Community to defer the commencement until July. Since that date we have debated the Bill itself in this House, and we have legislated it with a commencement provision that the usual commencement clause says "to be commenced on a date by Government not before 1<sup>st</sup> July", that is the chronology. I am not aware that I have said anything to the hon Member since then that puts the January/July date back in the balance. In any case it is not in the balance.

ORAL

**NO. 2411 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**LEGAL COSTS – MR JOHN GOMEZ**

Are Government now in a position to state what were the legal costs of defending the case of unfair dismissal brought by John Gomez?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The legal costs of defending the case to which the Question refers are £13,895 plus £172.75p disbursements.

ORAL

**NO. 2412 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**AGE OF CONSENT**

Is it Government's intention to take any action in relation to the age of consent as a result of the ruling of the European Court of Human Rights in L & V –v- Austria?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government will take such action as they are compelled to take on a proper and authoritative interpretation of the meaning and effect of that ruling and its actual extent. The Government will not do more than is strictly obligatory.

ORAL

**NO. 2413 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SALE OF S/Y PERKEO**

Has a decision now been taken in respect of the allocation of the proceeds of sale of the S/Y "Perkeo" sold by auction on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2004 and have any such proceeds been earmarked or ring fenced exclusively for investment in respect of law enforcement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am advised to answer that the Government have still not yet made a decision as to the use of the funds. I think the matter remains as it was in the last House.

**NO. 2414 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TEP'S**

Will the Government agree to assist investors in TEP Plans that have themselves or through their solicitors written to him, as far back as July 2004, by agreeing to fund a group litigation in respect of the losses that have arisen from that financial product?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am considering what help the Government can give and indeed how it should be given since persons affected are not all of the same financial disposition.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2414 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I hear what the Chief Minister says but the fact is that he will have received the request as far back as July 2004 for some assistance, and as I understand it he has not yet replied to that letter. Can the Chief Minister tell us when he expects to be in a position to communicate his decision, such as it may be, to these individuals?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The people who are affected by the problems that arise as a result of the collapse of these products are all of a different financial disposition, I appreciate that, that means that there are some of them who are in dire need of some financial assistance and in that respect the Government are being looked to for the funding, for action that they may take to obtain some financial support. Can I not persuade the Chief Minister to reply to that letter outstanding from the members of the TEP Plan Association very quickly, and if possible before the end of January next year at the very latest?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No the Government will reply to the letter when they are in a position to decide what the reply should be, and that is the position and the hon Member's involvement in this matter, which I suppose he should have added, is of a professional nature.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order. There is absolutely no basis whatsoever for the Chief Minister to suggest that I am involved in this professionally, I am not. All my contact with members of the TEP Plan Association and all parties related to the TEP Plan debacle, if I may call it that, has been purely political not at all professional. I have had to endure the Chief Minister referring to my involvement in this matter as being quasi professional and political before, I have made the point before, I think there was a ruling in that respect before, he should, I would be grateful, be directed to ensure that he does not make that type of reference again.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I see, so if e-mails are sent to Picardo and Co we should assume that that is a political lobby firm, should we?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I should not have to answer to the Chief Minister for what e-mail address I use, and I certainly do not have to answer to him if I take political correspondence at a professional address, that is not to address the issue of whether or not I am professionally involved or politically involved in a matter, or is it that he expects me only to receive correspondence of a political nature at a political address, as if that were to change the nature of the correspondence. The Chief Minister's remark, although this is the season of goodwill and good cheer, I have to say are absolutely ridiculous, and I would ask Mr Speaker directly to ensure that in relation to this matter he accepts that my involvement is purely political and that he stops making jibes of that sort, which I consider very damaging to him because it shows that he does not understand the nature of my involvement.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I have no way of knowing whether his involvement is professional or political. I hear that he says that it is only political but I am certainly not prepared to vouch for it simply because he asserts it. I hear what he says. It is not for me to underwrite the accuracy of his remark or not to underwrite the accuracy of his remark. I am not responsible for the accuracy of it, he is. In any event the answer remains the same. The answer remains as given.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the hon Gentleman accusing me of lying?



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He can choose whatever words he likes. He has said that he is not acting professionally and he has required me to accept that he is not acting professionally. I cannot accept whether he is acting professionally or not, I can accept that he asserts in this House that he is only acting politically, and that is his statement of fact it is not for me to agree with it politically. I have to accept what the hon Member says until or if I could prove to the contrary, which is of no interest to me one way or the other frankly.

**MR SPEAKER:**

But the Chief Minister will accept that until such time as he is able to establish that the hon Member is acting professionally he ought not to make such an allegation in this House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is nothing wrong with the hon Member acting professionally in this matter or in any other. I am not suggesting it but I accept Mr Speaker's ruling.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As a result can I therefore ask the Chief Minister whether he can finish his answer to me which related to whether or not he will be in a position to answer before the end of January with the request made of him by the TEP Plan Association?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have answered that question already, I have no intention of repeating it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case, if he is not going to go beyond the answer that the Government will answer when they are in a position to do so, can I leave him with the fact that a lot of the individuals who are suffering as a result of this debacle are actually of a financial capability which requires a result for the problems that they are experiencing. Can I therefore at least ask him to acknowledge receipt of the letter?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The recourse for people affected is in litigation. If there are people of the sort that he is describing, there is a Legal Aid & Assistance Ordinance Scheme which provides for assistance in the conduct of civil litigation. To my knowledge there are people who have already applied for and obtained assistance under the Legal Aid & Assistance Scheme. The request being sought is over and above that and indeed for the benefit of people who may not be entitled to legal aid and assistance because of the threshold provisions and the asset provisions in that Ordinance. So we are necessarily talking of people who are not entitled to legal aid in the context of their

present financial disposition and assets and that is what we are talking about, because people who do qualify have already obtained the assistance that the hon Member thinks everybody should be given by the Government and it has to be looked at carefully, because as I said in my original answer, not everybody affected, some people have been very, very badly affected, and to the extent of almost all that they own except perhaps a roof over their heads, and others are not in that category. There is no reason why the Government should assist them all at tax payers expense in equal measure.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I now just clarify only one issue that arises as a result of the Chief Minister's question. I do not think, and he should not interpret from my questions, that everybody affected should receive the type of assistance that those who are entitled to receive legal aid are receiving, that is not the point I am making. That as I understand it is not the question that has been asked of him in the letter that he has received and has not yet even acknowledged. I just want to put that point on the record and simply press him out of simple good manners to at least acknowledge receipt of the letter.

**NO. 2415 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORM PROPOSALS**

When do the Government expect the EU Commission to take a decision as to the interim measures the Government are seeking (and announced to have been agreed between the Government and the EU Commission DG Competition in June 2004) pending the outcome of the legal proceedings commenced by the Government against the EU Commission in respect of the latter's rejection of the Government's tax reform proposals, and will the said "interim arrangements" last until the outcome of the said legal proceedings or until 2010, whichever is the earlier?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Commission has not approved the arrangements negotiated with DG Competition in June. Since then intense negotiations have been taking place, culminating in new interim arrangements being settled on Monday of last week subject to approval by the College of Commissioners early in the New Year. It is not appropriate to give details until the arrangements have been approved by the Commission in full.

**NO. 2416 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORM PROPOSALS**

What progress has been made since the last Question Time in the House of Assembly in the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission following the latter's rejection of the Government's tax reform proposals?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government have now filed their reply to the Commission's defence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2416 OF 2004**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are we to assume then that pleadings are closed or do the Government expect the Commission will be filing another reply, or is there any provision for that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

My personal understanding of European Court of Justice procedure is, although I am not a lawyer in practice, is that the Commission now has a right of rejoinder.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is what I mean. Does the Chief Minister know, are the Government aware or has there been any indication from the Commission that they will be exercising a right to file a rejoinder? He will remember from the times when he was in practice that sometimes parties file rejoinders, they do not always do even if they have a right to do so.

Can I take it from the silence that the answer to my question is that the Government do not have any such indication one way or another?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Parties do not give indications to their opponents, they either file it within the required time limit or they do not. My understanding is, and I may not be entirely right in this, is that the European procedure is not voluntary, that one has to file a rejoinder. It may not have to be as comprehensive as it would be if one were enthusiastic about it, but my understanding is that all stages of the procedure are compulsory in that Court. That is my understanding but I would not assert it as fact.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case can the Chief Minister tell the House by what date the Commission is required to file its rejoinder, or if that date is not available and I would understand that he might need notice of the question, at least can he tell us on what date the Government's defence was filed so that it might be possible to work out by looking at the procedure when the Commission's rejoinder will have to be filed?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have either dates here.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Would the Chief Minister agree to provide that date outside this House if he does not have it available? Although I must say that I find it surprising that the Chief Minister does not have the date or does not know it, seeing as he has told us before that in all these matters he is involved in the day to day running of cases like he told us he was in the Matthews Case. He told us he checked every document and was very much in the driving seat.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I assume that the fact that he expresses surprise at the fact that I have not got it is not an insinuation that he thinks I have got it and I am misleading this House by suggesting that I have not got it. I cannot imagine what other interpretation one is to give to the phrase "I am surprised that he has not got it". I am telling the hon Member I do not have and I do not have it, of course it is available in a file in the office.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I said I was surprised he did not remember it or did not know it but fair enough. The first part of my question was would he undertake to provide it, perhaps in writing when he gets back to his office.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not give the hon Members undertakings across the floor. This is not a court room. If the hon Member would like me to provide him with the information I will of course be happy to provide it to him.

**NO. 2417 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EUROPEAN ELECTIONS**

Can Government say whether the Spanish Government persists in its legal challenge to the manner in which Gibraltar was enfranchised for European elections?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As far as we are aware the Spanish Government have not withdrawn their legal challenge.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2417 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether the UK Government are as robust in defending this action as they said they would be before it materialised?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know what answer I can give to that question. The United Kingdom has expressed a determination, both publicly and privately, to defend this action which actually raises very challenging issues for the UK itself let alone just for Gibraltar. I have not yet seen any of the pleadings in this matter which may be because the case has not got that far.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible for the Chief Minister to give an indication of at what stage the case actually is at this particular juncture?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, this is not a case to which the Government of Gibraltar are a party. We rely entirely on the information provided to us by the UK, whom I am sure would provide us with and keep us informed of the main steps. I am not aware that we have received or been informed that the UK for example, has received Spain's application

or that the defence has been filed. That may not be the case that may have happened but certainly I am personally not aware of it.



**NO. 2418 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS**

Can Government say whether, and if so when, they met with the Secretariat of the EU Committee of the Regions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am not aware that the Government have met with the Secretariat of the EU's Committee of the Regions.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2418 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the Chief Minister was asked that question on this subject on television, I think it may have been a phone-in, he mentioned that Michael Llamas would shortly be taking this matter forward, and that is the reason why the question was tabled, to establish whether it actually happened or had not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No I think that is something quite different. The hon Member may be referring to a seminar organised by the Committee of the Regions to which I indicated Gibraltar might be represented, but that is not a meeting with the Secretariat of the Committee of the Regions. I think Michael Llamas was scheduled to go to that, whether he actually went or not I would have to check, but it is certainly not a meeting with the Secretariat and nor do I recall saying anything about a meeting with the Secretariat. I have got a vague recollection of alluding to the fact that there was this seminar organised by the Committee of the Regions.

**NO. 2419 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU SINGLE EUROPEAN SKY**

Following the preliminary advice received by the Government on the feasibility of mounting a legal challenge to the exclusion of Gibraltar from the EU Single European Sky, can Government say whether and when they intend to mount such a challenge?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This matter remains under consideration.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2419 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The preliminary advice which the Government have now received, is the Chief Minister in a position to say what the chances of success would be if the Government take this forward according to the advice that has been received?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think it is self-evident that it would not be appropriate for me to say that even if it were possible to say so.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible to say then, to give an idea of the timescale in which the Government intend to consider this matter and then come to a conclusion as to whether to proceed or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No it is not.

**NO. 2420 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NATIONAL DAY**

How much of the £188,000 forecast outturn for 2003/2004 in respect of Head 8 – A 21 National Day was in respect of travel and accommodation for Government guests?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am advised that none of it was.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2420 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Would the travel and accommodation for Government guests come under a different Head in the Estimates?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I do not have that information in front of me but if the Government paid for travel and accommodation and it is not under this Head then it must be under some other.

ORAL

**NO. 2421 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

Who made up the Gibraltar Government/GDC delegation to the Gibraltar Day festivities in London and what posts do they hold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2422 to 2424 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2422 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

How many persons from Gibraltar were invited by the Government to the Gibraltar Day events in London, and who were they?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2421, 2423 and 2424 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2423 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

What was the cost, with a breakdown, of the Gibraltar Day in London?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2421, 2422 and 2424 of 2004.

**NO. 2424 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GIBRALTAR DAY IN LONDON**

Can Government say whether the Corps of Drums of the Royal Gibraltar Regiment provided the music inside the Guildhall during the Gibraltar Day festivities in London?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Gibraltar Government delegation to the Gibraltar Day festivities in London were the Chief Minister, the Minister for Health and the Minister for the Environment, Roads and Utilities, the Government's Press Director, the Chief Minister's Private Secretary (Legal Affairs), and the Director of the London Office.

There were no invited persons from the GDC.

The Government invited the Honorary Colonels and the Commanding Officer of the Royal Gibraltar Regiment, local Trade Union leaders, the Chairperson of the Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses and the President of the Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce.

The Gibraltar Government is as always grateful for the participation of the Royal Gibraltar Regiment at the Gibraltar Day. The band and Corps of Drums were engaged in providing music throughout the evening.

The breakdown of Gibraltar Day expenses are as follows:

|                                     |                  |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| • Food & Wine                       | 23,504.58p       |
| • Lighting, sound & video           | 21,132.38p       |
| • Hire of Guildhall                 | 8,416.25p        |
| • Toastmaster & Performance fees    | 852.40p          |
| • Printing, postage and photography | 3,535.10p        |
| • Military expenses                 | <u>2,088.65p</u> |
|                                     | 59,529.36p       |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2421 TO 2424 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the figures just given by the Chief Minister, I noted down a figure of £2,088.65p in relation to military expenses, can the Chief Minister say what military expenses those were?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot give that information with the degree of accuracy that I would wish. I can tell the hon Member that apart from the Gibraltar Regiment there were colour parties in attendance from all the regiments still in existence that participated in the events of 1704, and there was also bandsmen and the Honorary Artillery Company and I suppose this must have related to their expenses.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I just say that there is nothing here in relation to the travelling and accommodation expenses which normally are supplied to me, not just for this event but also for others, is there a reason for that or could the Chief Minister supply that information if he has it available?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

He has not asked for that information. Those are not expenses of the Gibraltar Day in London. The hon Member has asked for costs in relation to the event itself not to the cost of people from Gibraltar attending at it.



**NO. 2425 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**RECAPTURE OF GIBRALTAR – 1705**

What events are planned for the commemoration and celebration of the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the failure of the first Spanish siege to recapture Gibraltar in April 1705?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

None.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2425 OF 2004**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the position of the Government that the failure of the first Spanish siege to recapture Gibraltar since the Anglo-Dutch conquest is not an event worthy of commemorating?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct, it is the Government's view that it is not an event worth commemorating. Gibraltar has been resisting Spanish ambitions to recover its sovereignty on a 24 hour a day, 365 day year, 300 year basis. On the basis of the hon Member's logic every day would have to be a tercentenary or centenary or something.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Well, I am sure he would not mind celebrating that event every day, I am sure many people do, but given that this was an attempt at a military conquest, in the same way as we celebrated the liberation of Spain from the Bourbons in 1704 in August, is it not also worth celebrating the fact that they did not take it over from a military point of view in April 1705? I think that is a distinction, there are several key historical events and this was one of them. Earlier on in this House we heard from the Minister for Heritage that we will be celebrating the 200<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Battle of Trafalgar which is obviously something that we welcome and we certainly would equally welcome if the Government found it in their hearts to celebrate this anniversary as

well. Firstly because it is 300 years and secondly because it is an important historical event.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I hear what the hon Member says that he thinks that during this year he has been celebrating the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the liberation of Spain from the Bourbons, he can speak for himself. I have been celebrating nothing of the sort but if that is what he has been celebrating let me tell him that he has been celebrating under a false premise, because the Bourbons indeed ascended to the throne of Spain.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Indeed they did but they did not do so with Gibraltar as part of their realm.

ORAL

**NO. 2426 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TERCENTENARY EVENT**

Can Government provide a breakdown (showing the cost per person) of the sum spent in respect of "Accommodation" in respect of the Chief Minister's travel on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2004 with others to the FCO/Tercentenary Event, and as stated in answer to Question No. 1859 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2427 and 2428 of 2004.

**NO. 2427 OF 2004**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JEWISH MUSEUM EXHIBITION IN LONDON**

Can Government provide a breakdown (showing the cost per person) of the sums spent in respect of "Air Fares & Travel (£2,511.57p) and "Accommodation" (£1,858.18p) (showing the name of the hotel and the rate per room) in respect of the Chief Minister's travel to the Museum Exhibition in London on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2004 and as stated in answer to Question No. 1859 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2426 and 2428 of 2004.

**NO. 2428 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**JEWISH MUSEUM EXHIBITION IN LONDON**

Can Government provide a full breakdown of the expenditure under head "Others" set out in the table provided in answer to Question No. 1859 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The schedule submitted in answer to Question No. 1859 of 2004 contained a typographical error in respect of the date of the Jewish Museum Exhibition. What read as 5<sup>th</sup> June 2004 should have read 5<sup>th</sup> July 2004 as suggested by the chronological order of events.

The Chief Minister's travel on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2004 related to the Committee of 24 trip to New York and not the Jewish Museum Exhibition as stated in Question No. 2427.

I hand the hon Member schedules setting out the information he has requested in Question Nos. 2426 and 2428. Goodness, even the names of the hotels are given, this really is transparency.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 2428**

**Answer to Q 2426**

|                                           |                          |               |              | £                       |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Media Director & Private Secretary to CM  | The Howard Hotel, London | £175/night    | 29/2 to 2/3  | 1,452.32                |
| Chief Secretary / Private Secretary to CM | Le Meridien, Gatwick     | £125/night    | 26/2 to 27/2 | 594.97                  |
| CM                                        | Le Meridien, Gatwick     | £125/night    | 26-Feb       | 125.00                  |
| CM                                        | Savoy, London            | £312.55/night | 27/2 to 3/3  | 1,562.75                |
| Miscellaneous                             |                          |               |              | 108.38                  |
|                                           |                          |               |              | <b><u>£3,843.42</u></b> |

**Answer to Q2428**

|                                                                                                                            |                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <u>19/10/2003</u>                                                                                                          | <b>£</b>         |
| Chief Secretary subsistence                                                                                                | 299.40           |
| Media Director subsistence                                                                                                 | 299.40           |
| Chief Secretary subsistence                                                                                                | 102.43           |
| Media Director subsistence                                                                                                 | 102.43           |
| Private Secretary to CM (Legal) subsistence                                                                                | 102.43           |
|                                                                                                                            | <hr/>            |
|                                                                                                                            | <b>£906.09</b>   |
|                                                                                                                            | <hr/>            |
| <u>27/02/2004</u>                                                                                                          | <b>£</b>         |
| CM Driver allowance                                                                                                        | 25.00            |
| Chief Secretary subsistence                                                                                                | 102.43           |
| Private Secretary to CM (Projects) subsistence                                                                             | 153.65           |
| Private Secretary to CM (Legal) subsistence                                                                                | 102.43           |
| Media Director subsistence                                                                                                 | 153.65           |
| Chief Secretary expenses charged to credit card (rail & other exps)                                                        | 160.35           |
| Media Director expenses charged to credit card (taxi)                                                                      | 15.00            |
|                                                                                                                            | <hr/>            |
|                                                                                                                            | <b>£712.51</b>   |
|                                                                                                                            | <hr/>            |
| <u>18/05/2004</u>                                                                                                          | <b>£373.60</b>   |
| Hire of Conference Room + refreshments on 7/6/04<br><i>(NB Included in 18/5/04 costs in error in answer to Q1859/2004)</i> |                  |
| <b>Total</b>                                                                                                               | <hr/>            |
|                                                                                                                            | <b>£1,992.20</b> |
|                                                                                                                            | <hr/>            |

ORAL

**NO. 2429 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state the date on which Gibraltar Investment (Holdings) Limited acquired 3,700,000 £1 shares of the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2430 of 2004.



**NO. 2430 OF 2004**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY LIMITED**

Can Government state the date on which the Authorised Share Capital of the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited was increased from £1,000 to £4,000,000?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Gibraltar Investment (Holdings) Limited acquired 3,700,000 £1 shares in the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited on the following dates:

|                                |   |                                                        |
|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 16 <sup>th</sup> March 2004    | - | 2 fully paid up ordinary shares of £1.00 each          |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> September 2004 | - | 3,699,998 fully paid up ordinary shares of £1.00 each. |

The Authorised Share Capital of the Gibraltar Bus Company Limited was increased by Ordinary Resolution on the 1<sup>st</sup> September 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2429 AND 2430 OF 2004**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can Government state the £1,825,000 above the cost of acquiring the buses, was this in respect of working capital for the company or in settlement of other things such as the licence acquired?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The latter.

**NO. 2431 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**I & D FUND**

Can Government say how much has been received to date by the Improvement and Development Fund under Head 103 – Grants?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY & COMMUNICATIONS**

The sum of £2,025.23p. These are expenses incurred to facilitate a number of projects being driven under the Interreg III A Programme namely:

- Gib MA Natur - (Barbary Apes)
- Gib Mo Col - (Trade project – training for people involved in business)
- DDP and SME Project - (Distance learning and development project for senior managers of small and medium size enterprises)

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2431 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Nothing has been received then in respect of the Konver Projects which I understand was money that was pending approval but had already been spent, is that the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is the case. The Konver Projects are currently in what they call the completion programme stage and we are hopeful that the balance that is outstanding to us will be forthcoming during the first quarter of 2005.

**NO. 2432 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INTERNATIONAL DIALLING CODE**

Can Government provide a copy of the Report on the technical problems and economic costs of the possible utilisation of the 0044 international dialling code for Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government do not consider it appropriate to provide details at this stage of the technical assessment of the utilisation of 0044 international dialling code for Gibraltar. I think it is also fair to comment that there is not a bound report as such, it is a series of assessments.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2342 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When he offered to provide a copy of the Report to Mr Peter Isola in the Viewpoint programme which I was there with him, was he referring to this or was he referring to something else?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can he remind me what it was that I said?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

When we were in that debate and Mr Isola was saying the Chamber supported the use of the 0044, the Chief Minister in reply said that in fact it was not as straightforward as people thought, that there were economic and technical problems and that he would be happy to provide Mr Isola with a report if he wanted it. That is the report I am asking for. I am assuming I am not going to get inferior treatment to Mr Isola even though I am not President of the Chamber.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I will write to the hon Member setting out the relevant arguments, the relevant aspects of the issues. There is nothing confidential about the issues themselves but I am not sure that the report itself is in a form that can just be handed over. It is not a sort of bound report but I mean the technical aspects themselves he can be aware of but I would like him to deal with them on a confidential basis, given several factors. First of all, that this proposal is not presently on the agenda, it is not under consideration and secondly, that we hope to revisit the whole issue of telephones in the context of the new spirit of dialogue and cooperation which has broken out.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Let me make clear that we are not supportive of the 0044 it is just that since there are apparently arguments against it which we are not aware of, we would like to know what they are and I am happy to receive it on a confidential basis because I do not want to do anything that may hamper the Government's negotiating position, but given that we did not even know such arguments existed, now that we know that they do we would like to know what they are.

**NO. 2433 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 255 female full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 7 of the October 1998 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2434 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2434 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 236 female full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 7 of the October 1999 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 and 2435 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2435 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 229 female full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 7 of the October 2000 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433, 2434 and 2436 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2436 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 240 female full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 7 of the October 2001 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2435 and 2437 to 2450 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2437 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 108 female full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 7 of the October 2002 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2436 and 2438 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2438 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 114 female full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 7 of the October 2003 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2437 and 2439 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2439 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 875 male full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 6 of the October 1998 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2438 and 2440 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2440 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 782 male full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 6 of the October 1999 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2439 and 2441 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2441 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 768 male full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 6 of the October 2000 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2440 and 2442 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2442 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 764 male full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 6 of the October 2001 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2441 and 2443 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2443 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 368 male full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 6 of the October 2002 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2442 and 2444 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2444 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 352 male full-time weekly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 6 of the October 2003 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2443 and 2445 to 2450 of 2004.



**NO. 2445 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 1497 male and 929 female full-time monthly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 8 of the October 1998 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2444 and 2446 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2446 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 1433 male and 998 female full-time monthly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 8 of the October 1999 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2445 and 2447 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2447 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 1473 male and 1077 female full-time monthly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 8 of the October 2000 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2446 and 2448 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2448 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 1443 male and 1065 female full-time monthly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 8 of the October 2001 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2447 and 2449 to 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2449 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 1887 male and 1172 female full-time monthly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 8 of the October 2002 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2433 to 2448 and 2450 of 2004.

**NO. 2450 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government provide a breakdown by nationality and industry of the average earnings of the 1937 male and 1257 female full-time monthly-paid employees in the Official Sector shown in Table 8 of the October 2003 Employment Survey, showing separately the employees of

- (a) Gibraltar Government; and
- (b) MOD?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information requested by the hon Member goes back to 1998. It is not possible in the time available since notice of his Questions to compile all the relevant data. However, I am handing over to the hon Member a schedule containing details of average earnings for the different categories of employees by sex and nationality shown separately by the Gibraltar Government and the MOD for the periods 1998 to 2003.

The hon Member, whilst he digests that, may also be interested to know that in fact it is not possible to provide the additional desegregation of the data that he has required by industry without re-writing virtually the whole of the survey programme, and in respect of 1998 it cannot be given at all because the programme used for that survey is not in use any more. The programme was revamped in 1999 and onwards and it is therefore no longer possible to re-run the obsolete programme to obtain the desegregated data the hon Member seeks, which is why he only has it there from 1999 onwards not 1998.

Question 2434 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 125    | 49.5           | 243.68            | 11.1          | 54.17            |
|             | UK           | 1      | *              | *                 | *             | *                |
|             | Moroccan     | 2      | 58.8           | 278.89            | 19.8          | 93.89            |
|             | Spanish      | 1      | *              | *                 | *             | *                |
|             | Other EU     | 1      | *              | *                 | *             | *                |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2435 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 112    | 49.9           | 235.49            | 10.9          | 52.75            |
|             | UK           | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Moroccan     | 2      | 44.7           | 211.87            | 5.7           | 26.87            |
|             | Spanish      | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other EU     | 1      | *              | *                 | *             | *                |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2436 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 109    | 48.5           | 254.06            | 11.8          | 58.11            |
|             | UK           | 3      | 54.0           | 266.50            | 15.0          | 73.52            |
|             | Moroccan     | 3      | 52.2           | 259.75            | 15.8          | 77.83            |
|             | Spanish      | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other EU     | 1      | *              | *                 | *             | *                |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

1

Question 2437 of 2004

Note:

With effect from this Survey, the M.O.D. no longer has any weekly-paid workers.

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 102    | 47.9           | 254.73            | 13.2          | 55.70            |
|             | UK           | 3      | 48.6           | 248.54            | 9.6           | 49.20            |
|             | Moroccan     | 2      | 57.0           | 293.24            | 18.0          | 92.01            |
|             | Spanish      | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other EU     | 1      | 94.5           | 510.74            | 55.5          | 297.02           |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2438 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 102    | 47.2           | 316.15            | 14.3          | 70.55            |
|             | UK           | 7      | 46.1           | 285.28            | 10.2          | 65.08            |
|             | Moroccan     | 1      | *              | *                 | *             | *                |
|             | Spanish      | 2      | **             | **                | **            | **               |
|             | Other EU     | 2      | 48.1           | 312.26            | 11.1          | 71.33            |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |



Question 2440 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |           | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|-----------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 329    | 52.8           | 337.39            | 14.1          | 74.08            |
|             | UK        | 11     | 58.2           | 313.83            | 18.5          | 92.12            |
|             | Moroccan  | 41     | 57.4           | 348.37            | 17.8          | 90.12            |
|             | Spanish   | 4      | 73.9           | 384.95            | 34.9          | 180.67           |
|             | Other EU  | 8      | 48.2           | 262.98            | 9.2           | 50.67            |
|             | Other     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2441 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |           | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|-----------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 332    | 50.4           | 284.36            | 12.5          | 66.45            |
|             | UK        | 7      | 52.0           | 323.75            | 14.2          | 74.08            |
|             | Moroccan  | 40     | 52.5           | 286.09            | 13.3          | 67.20            |
|             | Spanish   | 3      | 61.7           | 332.69            | 22.7          | 119.70           |
|             | Other EU  | 6      | 45.4           | 249.91            | 7.0           | 38.99            |
|             | Other     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2442 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |           | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|-----------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 313    | 53.0           | 385.12            | 13.9          | 77.11            |
|             | UK        | 13     | 62.9           | 374.27            | 23.2          | 120.43           |
|             | Moroccan  | 43     | 65.0           | 431.45            | 25.4          | 137.32           |
|             | Spanish   | 3      | 67.0           | 300.76            | 28.0          | 242.22           |
|             | Other EU  | 7      | 79.5           | 446.01            | 40.5          | 223.99           |
|             | Other     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2443 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |           | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|-----------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 305    | 53.8           | 378.90            | 15.8          | 83.37            |
|             | UK        | 14     | 72.1           | 473.22            | 32.5          | 183.16           |
|             | Moroccan  | 40     | 62.6           | 446.79            | 23.0          | 128.14           |
|             | Spanish   | 4      | 69.0           | 408.85            | 30.0          | 136.55           |
|             | Other EU  | 5      | 85.0           | 486.14            | 46.0          | 264.97           |
|             | Other     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2444 of 2004

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT**

|             |           | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|-----------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 292    | 47.3           | 490.30            | 10.5          | 66.70            |
|             | UK        | 6      | 69.9           | 532.98            | 31.0          | 201.50           |
|             | Moroccan  | 45     | 52.9           | 418.01            | 15.3          | 106.51           |
|             | Spanish   | 2      | 72.0           | 406.01            | 16.5          | 118.73           |
|             | Other EU  | 7      | 46.4           | 490.27            | 9.4           | 81.35            |
|             | Other     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

4

Question 2434 of 2004

M.O.D.

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 92     | 41.1           | 214.85            | 2.9           | 14.86            |
|             | UK           | 8      | 43.3           | 226.17            | 4.5           | 23.91            |
|             | Moroccan     | 3      | 48.8           | 235.70            | 12.5          | 51.04            |
|             | Spanish      | 3      | 47.0           | 251.71            | 8.0           | 40.58            |
|             | Other EU     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2435 of 2004

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 92     | 40.8           | 214.55            | 1.8           | 12.93            |
|             | UK           | 11     | 45.5           | 254.07            | 2.5           | 16.89            |
|             | Moroccan     | 5      | 42.1           | 229.21            | 3.1           | 20.23            |
|             | Spanish      | 6      | 40.9           | 230.79            | 1.8           | 12.51            |
|             | Other EU     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2436 of 2004

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 116    | 41.5           | 227.69            | 2.5           | 19.33            |
|             | UK           | 2      | 39.0           | 200.71            | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Moroccan     | 2      | 43.3           | 235.70            | 4.3           | 31.25            |
|             | Spanish      | 4      | 42.0           | 233.93            | 2.8           | 20.76            |
|             | Other EU     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2440 of 2004

Question 2440 of 2004

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 282    | 46.2           | 296.26            | 8.0           | 55.06            |
|             | UK           | 44     | 47.1           | 291.33            | 8.5           | 65.72            |
|             | Moroccan     | 58     | 47.4           | 261.50            | 8.6           | 54.56            |
|             | Spanish      | 5      | 45.0           | 233.66            | 6.5           | 44.40            |
|             | Other EU     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2441 of 2004

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 259    | 44.6           | 281.26            | 5.6           | 46.02            |
|             | UK           | 47     | 47.6           | 300.42            | 8.6           | 73.10            |
|             | Moroccan     | 64     | 44.2           | 257.21            | 5.2           | 39.66            |
|             | Spanish      | 10     | 50.2           | 282.75            | 3.4           | 22.09            |
|             | Other EU     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

Question 2442 of 2004

|             |              | Number | Av. Wkly Hours | Av. Wkly Ergs (£) | Av. O/T Hours | Av. O/T Ergs (£) |
|-------------|--------------|--------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 312    | 44.9           | 293.16            | 5.9           | 49.47            |
|             | UK           | 3      | 41.7           | 236.56            | 2.7           | 20.13            |
|             | Moroccan     | 63     | 43.9           | 267.52            | 4.9           | 40.42            |
|             | Spanish      | 7      | 40.7           | 241.60            | 1.7           | 12.32            |
|             | Other EU     | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0      | 0.0            | 0.00              | 0.0           | 0.00             |

6

Question 2446 of 2004

GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT

|             |           | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |           | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 1,068           | 2,138.28         | 798               | 1,599.71         |
|             | UK        | 73              | 2,861.24         | 67                | 2,173.80         |
|             | Moroccan  | 1               | *                | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Spanish   | 1               | *                | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other EU  | 2               | 4,431.50         | 1                 | *                |
|             | Other     | 9               | 4,180.04         | 2                 | 3,585.63         |

Question 2447 of 2004

|             |           | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |           | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 1,058           | 2,216.68         | 855               | 1,599.51         |
|             | UK        | 69              | 2,911.35         | 68                | 2,219.33         |
|             | Moroccan  | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Spanish   | 1               | *                | 1                 | *                |
|             | Other EU  | 1               | *                | 2                 | 2,497.62         |
|             | Other     | 13              | 4,093.82         | 1                 | *                |

Question 2248 of 2004

|             |           | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |           | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 1,055           | 2,393.78         | 830               | 1,748.18         |
|             | UK        | 74              | 3,143.95         | 79                | 2,335.48         |
|             | Moroccan  | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Spanish   | 2               | 4,061.89         | 1                 | *                |
|             | Other EU  | 2               | 6,531.99         | 4                 | 1,996.82         |
|             | Other     | 10              | 4,372.11         | 1                 | *                |

Question 2449 of 2004

|             |           | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |           | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 1,097           | 2,558.75         | 816               | 1,864.90         |
|             | UK        | 54              | 3,522.00         | 75                | 2,437.69         |
|             | Moroccan  | 1               | *                | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Spanish   | 6               | 3,469.00         | 5                 | 1,903.88         |
|             | Other EU  | 4               | 4,986.21         | 5                 | 1,992.43         |
|             | Other     | 8               | 4,819.62         | 1                 | *                |

Question 2450 of 2004

|             |           | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |           | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltar | 1,116           | 2,704.95         | 865               | 1,970.97         |
|             | UK        | 50              | 4,285.68         | 79                | 2,571.68         |
|             | Moroccan  | 2               | 3,328.86         | 1                 | *                |
|             | Spanish   | 10              | 4,204.54         | 5                 | 2,972.15         |
|             | Other EU  | 3               | 5,138.01         | 4                 | 2,077.57         |
|             | Other     | 10              | 5,738.04         | 1                 | *                |

Question 2446 of 2004

M.O.D.

|             |              | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |              | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 270             | 1,995.27         | 126               | 1,168.95         |
|             | UK           | 9               | 1,822.32         | 4                 | 933.61           |
|             | Moroccan     | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Spanish      | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other EU     | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |

Question 2447 of 2004

|             |              | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |              | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 328             | 2,143.80         | 144               | 1,198.24         |
|             | UK           | 3               | 1,728.53         | 6                 | 1,102.82         |
|             | Moroccan     | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Spanish      | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other EU     | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |

Question 2248 of 2004

|             |              | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |              | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 296             | 2,278.09         | 138               | 1,335.49         |
|             | UK           | 4               | 1,967.39         | 12                | 1,268.52         |
|             | Moroccan     | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Spanish      | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other EU     | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |

Question 2449 of 2004

|             |              | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |              | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 657             | 1,854.37         | 259               | 1,177.48         |
|             | UK           | 1               | *                | 1                 | *                |
|             | Moroccan     | 50              | 1,280.83         | 3                 | 1,809.71         |
|             | Spanish      | 3               | 1,213.68         | 3                 | 801.31           |
|             | Other EU     | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 6               | 1,270.14         | 4                 | 1,226.41         |

\* Publication is not allowed under the Statistics Ordinance.

Question 2450 of 2004

|             |              | ADULT MALE JOBS |                  | ADULT FEMALE JOBS |                  |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
|             |              | Number          | Av. Earnings (£) | Number            | Av. Earnings (£) |
| Nationality | Gibraltarian | 681             | 1,958.18         | 295               | 1,230.11         |
|             | UK           | 0               | 0.00             | 0                 | 0                |
|             | Moroccan     | 10              | 1,726.16         | 4                 | 1,906.86         |
|             | Spanish      | 2               | 1,313.32         | 2                 | 1,161.77         |
|             | Other EU     | 2               | 1,374.84         | 0                 | 0.00             |
|             | Other        | 1               | *                | 1                 | *                |



**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2433 TO 2450 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to the first one which is Question No. 2434 I understand what the Chief Minister has just said that the answer cannot be provided for Question No. 2433 because that is in respect of 1998, but the first one is Question No. 2434 which is in respect of 1999 and of course I have asked from 1998 onwards because he has told me previously that it was not possible to do it before 1998 because that was when the survey was compiled from information collected by the Tax Office and that it was only possible to do this kind of exercise after 1998 when it was the results of survey results. Question No. 2434 quotes the figures that I have taken from Table 7. In fact the answer provides a breakdown by nationality and not by industry but the numbers of the breakdown by nationality do not seem to tally with the 236 in Table 7.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the hon Member may not have noticed that they are provided separately for the Government and for the MOD. On page 10 it is the Government of Gibraltar and then four pages further on it is the same table because this is the only way the computer can produce the information, and indeed that is the reason why we cannot do it for 1998 because the computer can no longer be run, so in page 5 he has to add the two together.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, the figures tally, yes. In fact what he is saying is that the distribution by industry which is given in Table 7 cannot be given with the programme as it stands.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Not with the programme, the information is there but it cannot be retrieved.

ORAL

**NO. 2451 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2452 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2452 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of October and November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member requests is in the schedule which I hand to him.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 2452**

**Answer to Question 2451/2004**

Persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by nationality.

| Month       | No. of Employers | No. of Employees | Gib | Other British | Spanish | Moroccan | Other EEC | Other Non-EEC |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|-----|---------------|---------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| October-04  | 33               | 229              | 132 | 77            | 15      | 0        | 3         | 2             |
| November-04 | 33               | 232              | 135 | 76            | 16      | 0        | 3         | 2             |
|             |                  |                  |     |               |         |          |           |               |

**Answer to Question 2452/2004**

Persons employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by nationality.

| Month       | No. of Employers | No. of Employees | Gib | Other British | Spanish | Moroccan | Other EEC | Other Non-EEC |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|-----|---------------|---------|----------|-----------|---------------|
| October-04  | 15               | 669              | 477 | 106           | 34      | 2        | 49        | 1             |
| November-04 | 15               | 665              | 476 | 106           | 33      | 2        | 47        | 1             |
|             |                  |                  |     |               |         |          |           |               |

ORAL

**NO. 2453 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY**

Based on expenditure to date do Government anticipate any changes to the estimated expenditure for the current financial year by the Gibraltar Electricity Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2454 and 2455 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2454 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR HEALTH AUTHORITY**

Based on expenditure to date do Government anticipate any changes to the estimated expenditure for the current financial year by the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2453 and 2455 of 2004.

**NO. 2455 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELDERLY CARE AGENCY**

Based on expenditure to date do Government anticipate any changes to the estimated expenditure for the current financial year by the Elderly Care Agency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government anticipate expenditure higher than budgeted by the Gibraltar Electricity Authority, the Elderly Care Agency and the Gibraltar Health Authority.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2453 TO 2455 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the case of the Electricity Authority, which is the only one really that has got a product to sell, is this something that the Government also expect to be reflected in revenue from electricity sales? Is it driven by higher outputs or driven by higher costs?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is some higher output but it is not the substantial part, or a significant part even, of the reason. The reason is a combination of errors in the calculation of the estimate in the context of the transfer between Government and the Authority, as well as the sort of fluctuating fuel costs during the year. There is an element of increased output but it would not explain anywhere like the overspend. It is not actually overspend, the higher fuel bills is overspend the other is not so much overspend as understated estimates included in the budget, a mistake was made in effect in the departmental tender bid.

**NO. 2456 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Based on the 2003/2004 Employers Annual Statement Declaration and Certificate submitted to date what was the PAYE payable by area of employment and the number of employees as follows:

- (a) MOD;
- (b) Gibraltar Government;
- (c) Government Owned/Joint Venture Companies; and
- (d) Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Based on the 2003/2004 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 13<sup>th</sup> December 2004 the information sought is as follows:

|                                                  | £m          |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| (a) MOD                                          | 4.7         |
| (b) Gibraltar Government                         | 11.0        |
| (c) Government owned and joint venture companies | 2.6         |
| (d) Private Sector employment                    | 33.1        |
|                                                  | <u>51.4</u> |

The above does not include estimates of PAYE tax payable in respect of employers that have not returned the Employers' Annual Statement.

Also the PAYE Deduction Cards for the year 2003/2004 are currently being processed and it is not possible at this time to provide details of the number of Deduction Cards returned.



**NO. 2457 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – CAR PARKING SPACES**

Can Government state what is the area in square metres of the land provided by the developers of Europlaza for the provision of car parking spaces to be used for the hospital at Europort?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Approximately 2,600 square metres but it would be wrong for the hon Member to think of it in terms of land rather than floor space. I mean it is in effect a floor of the building, it is one floor of that building that is presently being built.

ORAL

**NO. 2458 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – EUROPORT HOSPITAL**

Can Government confirm that the annual rent payable in respect of the Europort Hospital forms part of the assessable income of the recipient for tax purposes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2459 of 2004.

**NO. 2459 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – EUROPORT HOSPITAL**

Can Government state whether the annual rent payment in respect of the Europort Hospital is payable to the Royal Bank of Scotland (International) in Gibraltar, or to another branch of the parent bank?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Question 2458**

I am advised and therefore believe that the annual rent payable in respect of the Europort Hospital does form part of the assessable income of the recipient for tax purposes.

**Question 2459**

The annual rent payment in respect of the Europort Hospital is payable to The Royal Bank of Scotland (International), Jersey.

ORAL

**NO. 2460 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

What is the surface area of the existing east side reclamation, which is available for development excluding the 11,700 square metres currently occupied by commercial activities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Currently and approximately 50,000 square metres.

**NO. 2461 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD LAND**

What has been the expenditure to date, if any, in the relocation costs connected with the release of MOD land?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Relocation costs to date connected with the release of MOD land has been £360,403.71p, in direct costs as well as in part of expenditure totalling £81,000 on the Mid Harbour reclamation project which has involved assessments and initial design proposals into moving MOD facilities in the area around the No. 4 Dock, the Watermanship Training Centre.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2461 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is this charged to the Improvement and Development Fund?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That very issue is currently under consideration, whether it is going to be booked to the Improvement and Development Fund or to the Government property company, the Accountant-General is currently considering that and I am awaiting his advice on the matter. I think at the moment it is being charged to a suspense account but funded, I think presently it is being defrayed out of the Government property company but that may not be how it is finally accounted for.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In the transfer of land that is involved is it not the case that this land will go to the Government as there is a transfer from one side of the Crown to the other or can it be transferred to the property company? Presumably it has to go through the Government first.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I suppose that the MOD would, if we wanted to, transfer it to a company but in fact our view is that it should be transferred to the Crown and therefore it is being transferred to the Crown and therefore the sale proceeds will be revenue of the Improvement and Development Fund.

ORAL

**NO. 2462 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state in respect of which property sales the Treasury charged a 5 per cent commission as first payment in February?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2463 to 2467 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2463 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state in respect of which property sales the Treasury charged a 5 per cent commission as second payment in February?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2462 and 2464 to 2467 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2464 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state in respect of which property sales the Treasury charged a 5 per cent commission as third payment in February?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2462, 2463 and 2465 to 2467 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2465 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state in respect of which property sales the Treasury charged a 5 per cent commission as fourth payment in February?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2462 to 2464, 2466 and 2467 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2466 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government state whether in the current financial year the Treasury has charged any commission on property sales and if so how much, on what dates and in respect of which sales?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2462 to 2465 and 2467 of 2004.

**NO. 2467 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government confirm, that the charge made by the Treasury as commission on property sales, was payable by wholly owned Government companies, which sold the 50 per cent or lesser share of co-ownership homes and if so can Government identify which companies were charged this commission, how much was charged in each case and on the different dates, in the financial year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question 2462**

The first payment of £62,137.86p in February 2004 was paid by Brympton Co-Ownership Company Ltd in respect of a 5 per cent commission charged on properties sold in Brympton Estate during the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2004.

**Answer to Question 2463**

The second payment of £242,333.97p in February 2004 was paid by Westside Two Co-Ownership Company Ltd in respect of a 5 per cent commission charged on properties sold in Harbour Views Estate during the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2004.

**Answer to Question 2464**

The third payment of £127,602.66p in February 2004 was paid by GRP Investments Company Ltd in respect of a 5 per cent commission charged on properties sold in Sir William Jackson Grove during the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2004.

**Answer to Question 2465**

The fourth payment of £330,797.55p in February 2004 was paid by Gibraltar Co-Ownership Company Ltd in respect of a 5 per cent commission charged on properties sold in Westview Park, Montagu Gardens and Montagu Crescent during the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2002 to 31<sup>st</sup> January 2004.

**Answer to Question 2466**

I confirm that properties sold during the current financial year have been charged 5 per cent commission.

**Answer to Question 2467**

I can confirm that the commission charge of properties sold were and are payable by wholly owned Government companies. I hand the hon Member a schedule detailing the information requested.

**" Answer to Question 2467"**

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 2466**

|        |              | GRP<br>Investments<br>Co Ltd | Brympton<br>Co-Ownership<br>Co Ltd | Westside Two<br>Co-Ownership<br>Co Ltd | Gibraltar<br>Co-Ownership<br>Co Ltd | Totals       |
|--------|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| Apr-04 | Monies Rcvd  | £ 86,099.01                  | £ -                                | £ 111,486.98                           | £ 28,622.24                         | £ 226,208.23 |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ 4,304.95                   | £ -                                | £ 5,574.35                             | £ 1,431.11                          | £ 11,310.41  |
| May-04 | Monies Rcvd  | £ 181,328.51                 | £ 57,600.00                        | £ 154,693.44                           | £ 101,384.58                        | £ 495,006.53 |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ 9,066.43                   | £ 2,880.00                         | £ 7,734.67                             | £ 5,069.23                          | £ 24,750.33  |
| Jun-04 | Monies Rcvd  | £ 187,841.87                 | £ 17,280.00                        | £ 94,363.90                            | £ 226,151.72                        | £ 525,637.49 |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ 9,392.09                   | £ 864.00                           | £ 4,718.20                             | £ 11,307.59                         | £ 26,281.88  |
| Jul-04 | Monies Rcvd  | £ 32,147.50                  | £ 72,040.50                        | £ 93,611.07                            | £ 61,527.94                         | £ 259,327.01 |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ 1,607.38                   | £ 3,602.03                         | £ 4,680.55                             | £ 3,076.40                          | £ 12,966.35  |
| Aug-04 | Monies Rcvd  | £ 11,295.88                  | £ 29,812.50                        | £ 13,409.63                            | £ 69,395.80                         | £ 123,913.81 |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ 564.79                     | £ 1,490.63                         | £ 670.48                               | £ 3,469.79                          | £ 6,195.69   |
| Sep-04 | Monies Rcvd  | £ 9,544.05                   | £ 36,443.81                        | £ 37,228.25                            | £ 101,610.74                        | £ 184,826.85 |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ 477.20                     | £ 1,822.19                         | £ 1,861.41                             | £ 5,080.54                          | £ 9,241.34   |
| Oct-04 | Monies Rcvd  | £ 18,737.40                  | £ -                                | £ -                                    | £ 154,562.40                        | £ 173,299.80 |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ 936.87                     | £ -                                | £ -                                    | £ 7,728.12                          | £ 8,664.99   |
| Nov-04 | Monies Rcvd  |                              |                                    |                                        |                                     | £ -          |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ -                          | £ -                                | £ -                                    | £ -                                 | £ -          |
| Dec-04 | Monies Rcvd  |                              |                                    |                                        |                                     | £ -          |
|        | 5% charge pd | £ -                          | £ -                                | £ -                                    | £ -                                 | £ -          |

**"Answer to Question 2467"**

|         |              | GRP<br>Investments<br>Co Ltd | Brympton<br>Co-Ownership<br>Co Ltd | Westside Two<br>Co-Ownership<br>Co Ltd | Gibraltar<br>Co-Ownership<br>Co Ltd | Totals         |
|---------|--------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| Apr 03- | Monies Rcvd  | £ 1,024,949.39               | £ 395,868.33                       | £ 1,042,510.58                         | £ 2,202,777.12                      | £ 4,666,105.42 |
| Dec-03  | 5% charge pd | £ 51,247.47                  | £ 19,793.42                        | £ 52,125.53                            | £ 110,138.86                        | £ 233,305.27   |
| Jan-04  | Monies Rcvd  | £ 76,777.78                  | £ -                                | £ 15,280.72                            | £ 64,295.45                         | £ 156,353.95   |
|         | 5% charge pd | £ 3,838.89                   | £ -                                | £ 764.04                               | £ 3,214.77                          | £ 7,817.70     |
| Feb-04  | Monies Rcvd  | £ 155,949.61                 | £ -                                | £ 19,465.16                            | £ 7,500.00                          | £ 182,914.77   |
|         | 5% charge pd | £ 7,797.48                   | £ -                                | £ 973.26                               | £ 375.00                            | £ 9,145.74     |
| Mar-04  | Monies Rcvd  | £ 84,001.16                  | £ -                                | £ 15,685.75                            | £ 52,506.41                         | £ 152,193.32   |
|         | 5% charge pd | £ 4,200.06                   | £ -                                | £ 784.29                               | £ 2,625.32                          | £ 7,609.67     |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2462 TO 2467 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the ones in the current financial year, was this estimated in the figure put under Reimbursements in the budget. I can remember this came to light as a result of asking for a breakdown of the figure of the revenue head which showed Reimbursements.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Without sight of it I cannot remember whether an estimate provision was made on the basis perhaps of sales in the pipeline at least. The hon Member can marry this to the information I gave or that was given to the Hon Mr Bruzon in answer to the question of how many flats had been sold to date. What I cannot tell him is whether this revenue was estimated or not estimated in the revenue, perhaps it would be under the Treasury head.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The fact is that in the original estimate in last year's Budget was £100 million and the result was £1,250,000 and a big chunk of the £750,000 was this 5 per cent. Now in this year's estimate the figure put in for Other Reimbursements, which is not exclusively this of course, is £900,000 and therefore that is why I am wondering whether in fact they left this out in the estimate for this year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well the figure that he has just read out of £900,000 odd compared to the previous year's estimate of £500,000 suggests that there may have been some inclusion in respect of this head in this year's estimate.

**NO. 2468 OF 2004**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES**

In relation to financial services, can the Chief Minister give the dates in the months of October and November 2004 when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business relating to Financial Services, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited, the names of any officials or other persons travelling with the Chief Minister and a breakdown of the cost of each visit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I am reminded that between 19<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> October I visited the Foreign Office accompanied by the Chief Secretary and one of my Private Secretaries and the total cost was £3,917.99p, of which £1,052.99p related to accommodation and £2,865.00 related to air fares.



ORAL

**NO. 2469 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY**

Can Government state what was the total number of property transactions and the value of each transaction in respect of which Stamp Duty was collected in the financial year 2002/2003 and the total amount of such duty paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2470 of 2004.

**NO. 2470 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY**

Can Government state what was the total number of property transactions and the value of each transaction in respect of which Stamp Duty was collected in the financial year 2003/2004 and the total amount of such duty paid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As I replied in Question No. 553 of 2004, Government's land agents (Land Property Services Ltd) do not maintain analysed records of transactions in respect of which stamp duty is paid.

The total amount of stamp duty collected in the years 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 was as follows:-

|           |   |                |
|-----------|---|----------------|
| 2002/2003 | - | £1,365,136.68p |
| 2003/2004 | - | £1,486,710.42p |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2469 AND 2470 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer that I was given before was when I asked for the information in respect of residential property and I took that to mean that they could not distinguish between residential and commercial property sales, but is it that they do not even know how many transactions have taken place? That is to say, they know they have collected £1.365 million but they do not know how many transactions that represents.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Surprising as it might sound to the hon Member and perhaps even to me, that is what they are saying to me. I would have thought they could just count the number of entries in the cash book or something, perhaps they just make a day's entry aggregated, they do not analyse them that way. I suppose it must be possible from their records somehow, to count the number of transactions and I suppose they mean that it is too much work. I cannot imagine that this information is not available by any means or over any period of time, it may not be conveniently available.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would it be possible to get them to do it from a current date? Given that the Chief Minister has said in previous answers to questions from me that the Government do not believe in monitoring the movement in property prices, I think he added although it was a non sequitur because they had no intentions of controlling it, I do not think the rest of the Governments in the Western Europe control property prices, although they all monitor them. What I am trying to do is to see if there is some sort of information that would indicate what is happening.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I can certainly ask them whether they can start keeping the information in a way that allows them to say how many transactions it takes to accumulate £1.486 million et cetera, yes. I would have thought a system of numbered receipts would be sufficient.

**NO. 2471 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Do Government still expect to be in a position to publish the estimated value of the GDP for the year 2002/2003 by January 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

We can do better, I can tell him now. The 2002/2003 GDP estimates have now been finalised. GDP stood at £507.17 million and rose therefore by 7.9 per cent in money terms and by 5.1 per cent in real terms compared to 2001/2002. The attached table gives the breakdown of the GDP estimate.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 2471/2004**

| INCOME METHOD                                   | * | 2002/03 |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|---------|
| INCOME FROM EMPLOYMENT                          | B | 289.75  |
| INCOME FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT                     | C | 49.44   |
| GROSS TRADING PROFITS OF COMPANIES              | C | 78.32   |
| GROSS TRADING SURPLUS OF GOVERNMENT ENTERPRISES | A | 5.00    |
| RENT                                            | C | 85.76   |
| TOTAL DOMESTIC INCOME                           | B | 508.27  |
| LESS STOCK APPRECIATION                         | C | -1.10   |
| GDP (FACTOR COST)                               | B | 507.17  |
| NET PROPERTY INCOME FROM ABROAD                 | C | -2.99   |
| NET FACTOR INCOME FROM ABROAD                   | B | -45.24  |
| GNP (FACTOR COST)                               | B | 458.94  |

| EXPENDITURE METHOD              | * | 2002/03 |
|---------------------------------|---|---------|
| CONSUMERS' EXPENDITURE          | B | 229.83  |
| GOVT. FINAL CONSUMPTION         | A | 159.99  |
| GROSS DOMESTIC FIXED CAP. F'MTN | C | 49.68   |
| TOTAL DOMESTIC EXPENDITURE      | C | 439.50  |
| EXPORTS OF GOODS AND SERVICES   | C | 764.15  |
| IMPORTS OF GOODS AND SERVICES   | B | -629.08 |
| RESIDUAL ERROR                  |   | -13.43  |
| GDP (MARKET PRICES)             | B | 561.14  |
| SUBSIDIES                       | C | 5.72    |
| TAXES ON EXPENDITURE            | A | -59.69  |
| GDP (FACTOR COST)               | B | 507.17  |
| NET PROPERTY INCOME FROM ABROAD | C | -2.99   |
| NET FACTOR INCOME FROM ABROAD   | B | -45.24  |
| GNP (FACTOR COST)               | B | 458.94  |

**NO. 2472 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NON-EU PENSIONERS**

Can Government state when the policy was introduced that non-EU pensioners should continue to be provided with annual residence permits, how many such persons currently have such permits and under which provision of the Immigration Control Ordinance have such permits been issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The only non-EU nationals who have reached pensionable age and reside in Gibraltar on the basis of annual residence permits are persons who have continued to work after reaching pensionable age and who are covered by employment permits.

The Employment Ordinance does not prohibit employment after pensionable age and, as a matter of policy, no age restriction has ever been imposed on non-EU nationals so as to prevent them from continuing to work after reaching pensionable age.

There are currently 51 non-EU women over 60 and 51 non-EU men over 65 who continue in employment and who hold employment and annual residence permits issued under the provisions of section 18(f) of the Immigration Control Ordinance.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2472 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact I must have misunderstood the Chief Minister when he said a policy had been taken to allow pensioners to remain here, because in fact they have always been able to remain as long as they were working and had a work permit.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, most of that statement is true and the bit that is not true I still would not disagree with. It is true that there has never been a policy, as far as I am aware, under any administration of not allowing working pensioners to stay in Gibraltar. What the hon Member may be alluding to is to the parallel policy of issuing multiple entry visas to non-working Moroccan pensioners who come and go under the guise of coming to collect their pensions and things, but as far as I am aware Government have never

had a policy of issuing residence permits to retired persons. So if I have said anything that has led him to believe that, it has been a misunderstanding.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It was a misunderstanding, I thought that was what he had said at a previous meeting, so I have got it wrong obviously.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The only other thing that the hon Member might be alluding to is that when we agreed to extend the residence permit that had always been for one year, we extended them to five years for working non-EU nationals on the basis that the Moroccans could not get a visa to visit Spain on the basis of only a one year residence permit. That was not extended to workers over pensionable age who continue to get only a one year residence permit.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was under the impression that at some point it had been decided to allow persons to register as unemployed and therefore get a permit of residence beyond their retirement age, but clearly this is not the case.

-----

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I correct the hon Member on what he said was not the case. Persons of the sort that he has described are issued with monthly residence permits as opposed to annual which is what his question sought. Provided they register with the Unemployment, they are issued with monthly residence permits.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, so non-EU pensioners therefore, was that a policy then? What the Chief Minister is saying is that in Question No. 2472 the answer would have been yes if I would have put monthly instead of annually, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, well can I then ask when that policy was introduced then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Further, there has been an administrative concession whereby if “the unemployed Moroccan looking for work” is actually too old to work and everybody understands that this is just for the purposes of getting his monthly residence permit, I do not think they make them go every month, I think if they register once every six months I think that is the administrative concession that has been made. But it is monthly residence permits and not annual. I think there is in total 35 such people in Gibraltar, of the sort that I have just described of those monthly.



ORAL

**NO. 2473 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5 – 6 OTHER REIMBURSEMENTS**

Can Government explain the nature of the payments of £116,198, £5,279 and £56,225, made by Customs for the financial years 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 respectively, shown under Revenue Subhead – Other Reimbursements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2474 to 2478 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2474 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5 – 6 OTHER REIMBURSEMENTS**

Can Government explain the nature of the Other Treasury Receipts £178,444, £201,531 and £34,544 for the financial years, 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 respectively, shown under Revenue Subhead – Other Reimbursements?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2473 and 2475 to 2478 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2475 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5 – 6 OTHER REIMBURSEMENTS**

Can Government now give the breakdown of the source of receipts of £600,000 estimated under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2473, 2474 and 2476 to 2478 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2476 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5 – 6 OTHER REIMBURSEMENTS**

Can Government now give the breakdown of the source of receipts of £430,000 forecast under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2473 to 2475, 2477 and 2478 of 2004.

**NO. 2477 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5 – 6 OTHER REIMBURSEMENTS**

Can Government now give the breakdown of the source of receipts of £500,000 estimated under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I think the hon Member means the source of receipts of £500,000 estimated for the financial year 2003/2004. I will answer together with Question Nos. 2473 to 2476 and 2478 of 2004.

**NO. 2478 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 5 – 6 OTHER REIMBURSEMENTS**

Can Government now give the breakdown of the source of estimated receipts of £900,000 under Revenue Head 5(6) – Other Reimbursements – for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question 2473 of 2004**

The amounts of £116,198, £5,279 and £56,225 collected by Customs for the financial years 2001/2002, 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 respectively, and credited to Revenue Subhead – Other Reimbursements, are in respect of Landing Certificates, Examination Certificates and Destruction Certificates.

**Answer to Question 2474 of 2004**

I hand the hon Member a statement showing the information requested.

**Answer to Questions 2475 to 2478 of 2004**

Annual estimates of receipts under Revenue Subhead 5(6) are calculated on the basis of actual revenue collected over previous years.

Source of receipts forecast under this Revenue Subhead are calculated using actual collections at the time the Estimates are prepared, and a proportional estimate for the remaining months of the financial year.

## **ANSWER TO QUESTION 2478**

### **Answer to Question 2474 of 2004**

#### **Breakdown of Other Treasury receipts collected under Revenue Subhead – Other Reimbursements**

##### **Financial Year 2001/2002**

|                                                                                                  |                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Settlement of Insurance Claims                                                                   | £71,814.75       |
| Transfer from Deposits of monies held over five years in accordance with Accounting Instructions | £66,092.09       |
| Recovery of salaries overpaid (previous years)                                                   | £26,733.29       |
| Misallocation of amounts written off in previous years                                           | £7,045.00        |
| Dormant Bank Ordinary Accounts transferred to revenue                                            | £1,857.87        |
| Hire of New Mole Warehouse                                                                       | £1,800.00        |
| Recovery of amount overpaid in previous years                                                    | £272.00          |
| Cash Surplus                                                                                     | £177.90          |
| Miscellaneous and sundry credits                                                                 | <u>£2,651.31</u> |

##### **Financial Year 2002/2003**

|                                                                                                  |                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Transfer from Deposits of monies held over five years in accordance with Accounting Instructions | £101,925.42        |
| Recovery of amount overpaid (previous years)                                                     | £38,172.86         |
| Recovery of salaries, wages and pensions overpaid (previous years)                               | £23,745.46         |
| Sundry misallocations (previous years)                                                           | £23,357.36         |
| Recovery of legal costs (previous years)                                                         | £12,500.00         |
| Advances recovered (previous years)                                                              | £1,200.71          |
| Miscellaneous and sundry credits                                                                 | £628.71            |
|                                                                                                  | <u>£201,530.52</u> |

##### **Financial Year 2003/2004**

|                                                                   |                   |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Recovery of Legal costs (previous years)                          | £20,869.11        |
| Transfer from Deposits in accordance with Accounting Instructions | £7,721.78         |
| Recovery of salaries overpaid (previous years)                    | £2,138.63         |
| Recovery of amount overpaid (previous years)                      | £2,446.56         |
| Miscellaneous and sundry credits                                  | £1,368.00         |
|                                                                   | <u>£34,544.08</u> |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2473 TO 2478 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So on the basis of that answer, that would mean that for example in terms of the forecast original estimate of £600,000 for 2002/2003 which is the subject of Question No. 2475, what the Chief Minister is saying is that the Government estimate produced by the Treasury would have been guided, for example in the case of Customs, by the £116,000 that they had received in 2001/2002.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes I assume that that is what it means.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the revenue that is collected by the Customs and then passed on to the Accountant-General, because this is really what we are talking about, I mean the fact is that the Customs collect it from the public but the Head itself makes the receiver of revenue the Accountant-General.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.



ORAL

**NO. 2479 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**CONSOLIDATED FUND REVENUE**

Can Government now state what were the receipts of revenue giving a breakdown by Head of the Consolidated Fund to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2480 of 2004.

**NO. 2480 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****I & D FUND – EXPENDITURE**

Can Government state what is the estimated expenditure from the Improvement and Development Fund to 30<sup>th</sup> September giving a breakdown by Head of Expenditure?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER****Answer to Question 2479 of 2004**

The tentative revenue, by Head, of the Consolidated Fund for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 is as follows:

| <b><u>HEAD</u></b> |                                | <b><u>REVENUE</u></b> |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1                  | Taxes                          | £45,940,965           |
| 2                  | Duties                         | £15,225,661           |
| 3                  | Rates                          | £5,864,461            |
| 4                  | Departmental Fees and Receipts | £5,810,875            |
| 5                  | Government Earnings            | £4,935,606            |
|                    | Total                          | <u>£77,777,568</u>    |

The tentative expenditure of the I&D Fund for the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 is as follows:

**Answer to Question 2480 of 2004**

| <b><u>HEAD</u></b> |                                                   | <b><u>REVENUE</u></b> |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 101                | Housing, Health and Social Affairs                | £1,360,355            |
| 102                | Educational, Sports, Leisure and Youth            | £2,557,415            |
| 103                | Environment, Culture and Heritage                 | £202,655              |
| 104                | Transport Roads, Port and Airport                 | £335,578              |
| 105                | Economic Development, Industry and Infrastructure | £1,587,112            |
| 106                | Public Administration and Essential Services      | £724,649              |
|                    | Total                                             | <u>£6,767,764</u>     |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2479 AND 2480 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In terms of the I & D expenditure, which nearly always eventually finishes up less than budgeted and approved by the House, looking at it in terms of global figures we are talking about something like one third of the expenditure having been incurred in 50 per cent of the year. Is there an indication, for example, in any particular Head that something is not likely to be progressing at the rate that was originally expected when the estimates were approved by the House earlier this year? I mean in terms of the different Heads, I have not obviously analysed each individual one to see which one is, the overall thing seems to be that it is only slightly behind because we have got a third of the expenditure in 50 per cent of the time, but is it to the Government's knowledge a case that any one of these things is not likely to have progressed as fast as originally thought?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I agree for reasons that we have debated in the past that expenditure outturn is always much less than the amount estimated at the beginning of the year. Of course even now, in December, if one asks the Controlling Officers of expenditure they will swear blind that they will all spend the full allocation, which of course they never do and I suspect that they give that answer for fear of losing the money, or somehow they think that the money can be taken away from them if they admit that they are not going to be able to spend it on time. But of course they do not and I think the under-spend this year may even be a higher percentage than it has been in previous years. I think the hon Member will find by the end of the financial year that Heads 101 and 102 will be pretty fully spent, and also Head 106 will be pretty fully spent, and that the shortfall is in Heads 103, Head 104 to a lesser extent obviously it is a smaller Head, and partly in Head 105 but probably Heads 103 and 105 will account for the largest share of the under-spend. If I had a copy of the Estimates here, which I have not I am afraid, I might even be able to give him an indication of which particular Subheads, in case I see any projects there.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

There are Subheads but.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Projects which I can look at at a glance and tell him where, yes, housing will be almost completely spent, I think Social Affairs will certainly be fully spent, Education certainly fully spent, Sports I think that the expenditure on Subhead 7 which is the main item there will more or less come out in full, so that takes us to Head 103. I do not think that environmental projects, depending on the expenditure of this new equipment when it arrives, that that might be fully spent. I think rock safety, coastal protection and retaining walls, storm water drains and sewers probably we will not spend the full amount provided there. I am not sure that £500,000 of road maintenance and resurfacing has been done this year, so those are the sort of areas. Construction of a car parking facility, which is down there as £550,000, I do not think that will have been spent by the end of the year. The Objective II Programmes I

think are fully committed whether the expenditure will be met, I believe so I believe that it will be and that might account for some higher because there are projects that have been approved there recently which are already advanced. I do not think that £1.6 million of tourist beautification projects will necessarily be done, so I think it is in Head 105 and Head 103, and to a much lesser extent in Head 104, which I think the hon Member will find the under-spend comes in.

ORAL

**NO. 2481 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

As at the end of November 2004, what was the value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2482 to 2484 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2482 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

What is the final figure for Government Deposits in the on-call investment account with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2481, 2483 and 2484 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2483 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

Do Government still estimate that non-Government deposits with the Gibraltar Savings Bank will only reach £137.9 million at the end of the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2481, 2482 and 2484 of 2004.

**NO. 2484 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

Do Government still estimate that interest on investments held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank will only reach £8.2 million in the current financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question 2481 of 2004**

The value of the Monthly Income Debentures and the Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004 is as follows:

|                                      |             |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Monthly Income Debentures            | £30,119,800 |
| Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures | £67,012,000 |

**Answer to Question 2482 of 2004**

The total amount of Government deposits held in the On-Call Investment Account with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 was £23,833,456.

**Answer to Question 2483 of 2004**

Non-Government deposits with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 30<sup>th</sup> November 2004 totalled £152,167,274.

Non-Government Deposits at the end of the current financial year, based on current trends, is estimated to reach £157 million.

**Answer to Question 2484 of 2004**

As a result of a number of increases in the Bank of England base rate, it is estimated that interest on investments held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank will reach £10.2 million in the current financial year.



ORAL

**NO. 2485 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – ABANDONED CLAIMS**

Can Government state of the £2,117,018 of abandoned claims in the financial year 2002/2003, relating to tax assessments on individuals and companies, how much was in respect of individuals and how much in respect of companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2486 and 2487 of 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 2486 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – ABANDONED CLAIMS**

Can Government state how many individuals were affected by the abandoned tax assessments claims in the financial year 2002/2003 and what was the highest individual claim?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2485 and 2487 of 2004.

**NO. 2487 OF 2004****THE HON J J BOSSANO****INCOME TAX – ABANDONED CLAIMS**

Can Government state how many companies were affected by the abandoned tax assessments claims in the financial year 2002/2003 and what was the highest company claim?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Write-offs in the financial year 2002/2003 can be summarised as follows:

|             | £                |
|-------------|------------------|
| Individuals | 404,541          |
| Companies   | 1,679,637        |
| PAYE        | 32,840           |
|             | <u>2,117,018</u> |

88 individuals of which the highest write-off was £33,594.

51 Companies of which the highest write-off was £241,554.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2485 TO 2487 OF 2004****HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government say whether the highest amount, he has given a breakdown which shows the PAYE separately, can he say whether in the highest amount of the company PAYE would be included, or is PAYE by people that are self-employed or something like that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, PAYE may relate to monies deducted by employees but it is not company tax. I assume that the hon Member has assumed in receiving the answers that he has had from me, that of course abandoned tax assessments does not necessarily mean failure to collect sums which were due and payable because some of these were assessments raised in the absence of the returns. So the hon Member is familiar

with the system, if one does not submit a return the Commissioner issues an assessment, it may then be abandoned but the tax may never have been due in the first place because it was a raised assessment. So he should not assume, for example in the case of companies, that all the companies made all the profits that would have rendered this amount of tax which was not collected payable.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was making that assumption.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member was making that assumption, well I am glad I have clarified it then.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I am not sure that the Chief Minister has clarified it. To my knowledge, when provisional assessments are made and then they are corrected based on information submitted, it does not require a write-off.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, it becomes a debt in the books of the company the moment that the assessment is raised. Once the assessment is raised, even in the absence of a return, it becomes an amount due, it can become due by two different routes. One submits a return and is assessed and one does not submit a return and one is assessed in the absence of a return. Both are accounted for in the same way, both become tax payable to the Government. If both of those are then written-off they are included in the total written-off even though one is the result of a calculation of actual tax due on the basis of profits actually made, and the other is tax assessed to be due in the absence of no return. Both result in a tax debt, both result in a write-off but in one case it is the write-off of an estimated assessment as opposed to an assessment based on a return.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Chief Minister have the information as to what years this refers to, because the fact that it was done in 2002/2003 does not indicate how far back it goes?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have the information but certainly it would be many years, because they are not written off until there is absolutely no doubt that there is no possibility of being collected. The hon Member can see that from some of the answers that he gets from some of the other questions he asks. They do not disappear for several years.

**NO. 2488 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government confirm whether the tax collected from companies in respect of the tax year 2003/2004 as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004 was £15.1 million, as given in answer to Question No. 1863 of 2004, or £18.401 million as given in answer to Question Nos. 1864 and 1865 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Following a comprehensive reappraisal of the computer programmes utilised to extract data in the manner required by the hon Member, the Income Tax Office has concluded that the information provided in reply to Question No. 1863 of 2004 was incorrect.

The corporation tax collected from companies in respect of the year of assessment 2003/2004 was £18.2 million as at 14<sup>th</sup> December 2004 and not £15.1 million as at 30<sup>th</sup> September 2004, as stated in answer to Question No. 1863 of 2004. So in other words, I think they are saying that the figure of £15.1 million was wrong and the current figure as at 14<sup>th</sup> December 2004 was £18.2 million.

The statistical data provided in reply to Question No. 1863 is therefore replaced by that contained in the schedule that I now provide the hon Member.

The schedule also provides an overview of the techniques employed to extract data in the manner required by the hon Member.

I am advised that the data required by the hon Member is extracted solely for the purposes of answering his questions and is not utilised for management purposes given that tax estimates are based on financial year revenue yields and not on yields by year of assessment.

### **Answer to Question 2488 of 2004**

This update of the statistical table provided in reply to Question No. 1863 of 2004 incorporates corrections to the split between amounts discharged and amounts paid. In all other respects the original table is correct.

|                    | 1995/96<br>£m | 1996/97<br>£m | 1997/98<br>£m | 1998/99<br>£m | 1999/00<br>£m | 2000/01<br>£m | 2001/02<br>£m | 2002/03<br>£m | 2003/04<br>£m |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Assessed           | 15.8          | 15.6          | 19.8          | 25.7          | 88.8          | 27.4          | 30.0          | 33.5          | 29.9          |
| Discharged         | 5.6           | 4.9           | 9.1           | 10.9          | 74.7          | 13.9          | 15.1          | 16.8          | 8.3           |
|                    | 10.2          | 10.7          | 10.7          | 14.8          | 14.1          | 13.5          | 14.9          | 16.7          | 21.6          |
| Paid               | 9.5           | 10.3          | 10.3          | 14.3          | 13.4          | 13.1          | 13.9          | 14.2          | 18.2          |
| Outstanding        | 0.7           | 0.4           | 0.4           | 0.5           | 0.7           | 0.4           | 1.0           | 2.5           | 3.4           |
| No of<br>Companies | 1444          | 1418          | 1466          | 1454          | 1537          | 1563          | 1493          | 1402          | 1195          |

The incorrect split in the original table arose due to the way adjustments are recorded. The flagging of entries other than adjustment entries can be easily identified. However adjustments (e.g. transfer of amounts paid from one year of assessment to another) have in the past been incorrectly allocated when extracting the data for the purposes of the analysis required by the hon Member. The problem has now been identified and should not present difficulties in the future.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2488 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the answer is that both answers were wrong that I got in the last House, because if it is £18.2 million now it could not have possibly been £18.4 million then.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well £18.2 million as at 30<sup>th</sup> September, is that what the hon Member was told?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, in answer to Question No. 1863 of 2004 I was told it was £15.1 million, and then in answer to Question Nos. 1864 and 1865 which breaks up the under 20 and over 20 turnover, the small and the big companies, if one adds up each component of those the total of all those companies should come to the same answer and that one comes to £18.401 million. So if in fact it was not £15 million on 30<sup>th</sup> September it could not have possibly been £18.401 million either, otherwise the amount collected would have gone down since 30<sup>th</sup> September. So it must mean that both those answers were wrong.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the accurate information is the one provided in the schedule which I have handed over. That is Question No. 1863, the one that was wrong. The schedule handed over is the replacement schedule to that answer. The hon Member will also see there in the bottom of the schedule a small explanation as to how the figures are extracted. In fact, I am told that this information is extracted only for the purposes of answering his questions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am glad I have been of assistance to the Government in the analysis of their financial statistics.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No one apparently feels the need to analyse them to this sort of extent.

ORAL

**NO. 2489 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government state whether the figure of 2,650 employees in respect of whom PAYE was deducted for the year 2002/2003 by MOD, persons in receipt of an MOD pension are included, and if so, can they state the breakdown between pensioners and persons still in employment and the relevant amount deducted for PAYE from each group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2490 and 2491 of 2004.



ORAL

**NO. 2490 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government state whether the figure of 5,700 employees in respect of whom PAYE was deducted for the year 2001/2002 by the Gibraltar Government, persons in receipt of a Government pension are included, and if so, can they state the breakdown between pensioners and persons still in employment and the relevant amount deducted for PAYE from each group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 2489 and 2491 of 2004.

**NO. 2491 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government state whether the figure of 6,050 employees in respect of whom PAYE was deducted for the year 2002/2003 by the Gibraltar Government, persons in receipt of a Government pension are included, and if so, can they state the breakdown between pensioners and persons still in employment and the relevant amount deducted for PAYE from each group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes, it does include pensioners and the breakdown that the hon Member has requested has been set out in the schedule that has been handed to him.

**Answer to Question No. 2489 of 2004**

|                                      |              |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1,450 Pensioners – PAYE tax deducted | £0.3m        |
| 1,200 Employees – PAYE tax deducted  | £4.4m        |
|                                      | <u>£4.7m</u> |

**Answer to Question No. 2490 of 2004**

|                                                    |               |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1,700 Pensioners – PAYE tax deducted               | £0.9m         |
| 4,000 Employee/Deduction Cards – PAYE tax deducted | £18.0m        |
|                                                    | <u>£18.9m</u> |

**Answer to Question No. 2491 of 2004**

|                                                    |               |
|----------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1,700 Pensioners – PAYE tax deducted               | £1.0m         |
| 4,350 Employee/Deduction Cards – PAYE tax deducted | £20.1m        |
|                                                    | <u>£21.1m</u> |

ORAL

**NO. 2492 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

How much was collected in PAYE each month since February 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2493 of 2004.

ORAL

NO. 2493 OF 2004

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

What was the amount of Company Tax collected in each month since March 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The information the hon Member requests is set out in a schedule that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question No. 2492 of 2004**

The PAYE tax (net of refunds) collected in the months of March 2004 to November 2004 is detailed hereunder. Also included are corrected figures for the months of December 2003 to February 2004 given that the figures provided in reply to Question No. 1420 of 2004 included other taxes in addition to PAYE tax and were therefore incorrect.

|                | £m  |
|----------------|-----|
| December 2003  | 4.5 |
| January 2004   | 6.1 |
| February 2004  | 4.9 |
| March 2004     | 6.3 |
| April 2004     | 4.8 |
| May 2004       | 4.6 |
| June 2004      | 4.6 |
| July 2004      | 7.1 |
| August 2004    | 5.0 |
| September 2004 | 5.1 |
| October 2004   | 5.0 |
| November 2004  | 4.9 |

**Answer to Question No. 2493 of 2004**

The Corporation Tax collected (net of refunds) in each month since March 2004 is:

|                | £m  |
|----------------|-----|
| April 2004     | 3.6 |
| May 2004       | 0.9 |
| June 2004      | 2.3 |
| July 2004      | 1.2 |
| August 2004    | 0.2 |
| September 2004 | 1.0 |
| October 2004   | 1.5 |
| November 2004  | 0.2 |

ORAL

**NO. 2494 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST (NO. 2) PENSION SCHEME**

Can Government say who was the employer under Government Contracts that contributed to the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No 2) Pension Scheme in the financial year 2003/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 2495 of 2004.

**NO. 2495 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST (NO 2) PENSION SCHEME**

Have any additional employers joined the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Scheme since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question 2494 of 2004**

The employer under Government Contracts that contributed to the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No 2) Pension Scheme in the financial year 2003/2004 was the Government of Gibraltar.

**Answer to Question 2495 of 2004**

Twenty two employees of the Gibraltar Bus Company Ltd have joined the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No 2) Pension Scheme since April 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 2494 AND 2495 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the Government saying that they had an employee who was a Government employee covered by that Scheme?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, a contract officer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. I assumed that all the contract officers were in fact covered by this system that they get a gratuity at the end of three years and then they are not pensionable.



**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This particular individual started life as a GDC employee on contract, on fixed contract. He continued on fixed contract but under the Government rather than the GDC, basically because he came to work in my office, and therefore remains on contract under the Scheme and has ceased to be under the Scheme by virtue of the GDC and is now under the Scheme by virtue of Government. In other words, his employer has changed, he remains on contract terms.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So he was in fact in the Scheme previously under GDC?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**NO. 2496 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**OCCUPATIONAL PENSIONS**

Is it Government policy to require Government contractors to provide for an Occupational Pension for their employees?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is Government policy to encourage employers to establish occupational pension schemes for all their employees. However, the Government have not made this an official condition of tender award.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2496 OF 2004**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it something the Government take into account in evaluating the tenders? I think at one stage the Government indicated that it would take into account the level of local employment provided but not as the only factor. Is this something that is also taken into account or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member knows, because we have had occasion to talk about it on several occasions, that the Government attach considerable importance to the higher incidence of occupational tenders in the private sector. The Federation of Small Businesses launched a particular scheme which has not had a huge take up. We have opened the Gibraltar Provident (No 2) Scheme to the private sector, it has not had a huge take up. The Trade Union movement who share the Government's view that this is something that should be tackled, say that they are going to make this an issue in their negotiations in the future. The Government are biding their time, we intend to escalate the degree of pressure that we bring to bear to bring about higher incidence of pensions coverage in the private sector from doing nothing to making them compulsory by statute, there is a range of things that one could do. One of the steps that one could take somewhere along that road is to make it compulsory for award of a Government tender. It has not yet reached that stage, the Government have not yet made that decision but I can envisage that the day will come when the Government might well make that a condition for the award of a tender.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I seem to recollect that in fact when the Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses launched their presentation of their scheme, that there were indications that in fact they were doing this in anticipation of having to move in that direction in any case because of EEC requirements. Is there any indication of that being in the pipeline?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is actually a hugely controversial issue in the EU. There is enormous resistance from private business in the EU from some Member States to the concept of compulsory occupational pension schemes. My own personal view is, I do not know whether Gibraltar will be at the forefront or in the rear of this, but I think it is inevitable. I think that the level of state old age pension provision across Europe is not at levels that can be funded at levels of benefits which provide a decent income stream for people of retirement age who to boot are living longer than they used to. My own personal view is that it is inevitable at some stage that there will be compulsory pension schemes in the private sector, just as there is now compulsory contribution to the social security. When that will emerge and whether it will emerge here before in Europe is moot, but in terms of strategic social engineering I think it is inevitable myself. The pressures building up are simply too big.

**NO. 2497 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

Can Government explain what is the multiplier used to gross up Corporation Tax for the purpose of calculating GDP and what is the source of the net figure prior to grossing up?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

For the period 1996/1997 to 1999/2000, the level of corporation tax billed in each of those years was grossed up by 28 per cent. From 2000/2001 to date, following the introduction of the 25 per cent tax rate, the grossing up rate was changed to 22 per cent. The source of the net figure is the total amount of corporation tax billed in the year as supplied by the Income Tax Office. So that is corporate tax billed.

ORAL

**NO. 2498 OF 2004**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 102 – SALE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTIES**

Can Government say how much has been received to date by the Improvement and Development Fund under Head 102 – Sale of Government Properties?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

To date to within the last few days it was £3,381,644.17p.