



REPORT
of the Proceedings
of the
FIRST
House of Assembly
of
GIBRALTAR

First Session

Vol. 1 — No. 4.

FOURTH MEETING, WEDNESDAY, 17th DECEMBER, 1969.

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF
ASSEMBLY

THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE FIRST
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY HELD IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY CHAMBER
ON WEDNESDAY, THE 17th DAY OF DECEMBER, 1969 AT 9.45 a.m.

Present:

Mr. Acting Speaker (In the Chair)
The Hon. A. J. VASQUEZ.

GOVERNMENT:

The Hon. Major R. J. PELIZA, Chief Minister.
The Hon. M. XIBERRAS, Minister for Labour and Social Security.
The Hon. Major A. J. GACHE, Minister for Information, Port,
Trade and Industries.
The Hon. J. CARUANA, Minister for Medical and Health Services.
The Hon. W. M. ISOLA, Minister for Tourism and Municipal Ser-
vices.
The Hon. Miss C. ANES, Minister for Public Works and Housing.
The Hon. L. DEVINCENZI, Minister for Education and Recreation.
The Hon. C. B. O'BEIRNE, C.B.E., Q.C., Attorney-General.
The Hon. E. H. DAVIS, C.M.G., O.B.E., Financial and Development
Secretary.
The Hon. P. J. ISOLA, O.B.E.

OPPOSITION:

The Hon. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN, C.B.E., M.V.O., Q.C., J.P.,
Leader of the Opposition.
The Hon. A. W. SERFATY, O.B.E., J.P.
The Hon. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO, O.B.E.
The Hon. E. J. ALVAREZ, O.B.E., J.P.
The Hon. M. K. FEATHERSTONE.
The Hon. I. ABECASIS.
The Hon. Lt. Col. J. L. HOARE.

In attendance:

J. T. SUMMERFIELD, Esq., Clerk to the House of Assembly.

Prayer:

Mr. Speaker recited the prayer.

Oath of Allegiance:

The Hon. A. J. VASQUEZ made the prescribed oath of allegiance.

THE CHIEF MINISTER (Hon. Major R. J. PELIZA):

Mr. Speaker, I think I am stressing the feeling of this House when I say that we welcome you, and thank you, for filling up the gap today due to the indisposition of Mr Thomson, who I think is ill with influenza.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN):

I would like to associate myself, on behalf of the Members on this side of the House, and to hope that we will welcome you much more happily when you take office on a much more permanent basis.

Minutes:

The Minutes of the Meeting held on the 30th October, 1969, having been previously circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

Answer:

Documents laid:

The Minister for Tourism and Municipal Services laid on the table the following document:

The Traffic (Parking and Waiting) Order, 1969.
Ordered to lie.

The Financial and Development Secretary laid on the table the following documents:

(1) Supplementary Estimates No. 11 of 1969.

(2) Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for 1970.
Ordered to lie.

Answers to Questions

Question No. 16 of 1969.

Oral.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Will Government make a statement giving detailed information as to how the recently announced grant by Her Majesty's Government to Gibraltar, is proposed to be allocated?

Answer:

(THE CHIEF MINISTER:

(HON. MAJOR R. J. PELIZA)

I have given notice to Mr. Speaker that I will be making a statement on my visit to London which will cover the points raised by the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition.

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

Will Government invite the Regulation of Wages and Conditions of Employment Board to consider a revision of wages of shop-assistants in the light of the Marsh interim award?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR AND SOCIAL SECURITY:

(HON. M. XIBERRAS)

Sir, on the occasion of the last revision of the Conditions of Employment (Retail Distributive Trade) Order, in 1968, the scale of minimum wages which was recommended by the Regulation of Conditions of Employment Board and which was applied statutorily had, in fact, been previously negotiated between the Gibraltar Shop Assistants' Association and the Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce.

It would, of course, be desirable if both these organisations could again try to reach agreement.

In any event, if — after the implementation of Mr Marsh's interim report — it should appear to Government that the conditions of employment in the retail distributive trade should continue to be regulated by law, the matter will certainly be referred to the Regulation of Conditions of Employment Board for their recommendations.

Question No. 18 of 1969.

Oral

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

What is the value of the £ today in Gibraltar, taking October, 1967 as the standard; and will Government publish this information monthly in the Official Gazette?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR AND SOCIAL SECURITY:

(HON. M. XIBERRAS)

Sir, if the purpose of the question is to establish by how much the purchasing power of the £ in Gibraltar has dropped since October, 1967, then, the most I can say is that from October, 1967 to October, 1969, the Index of Retail Prices in Gibraltar (which is published quarterly in the Gazette) has risen by 12.8%, which would seem to indicate that the purchasing power of the £ is now 17/5d (or about 87 New Pence) compared with October, 1967.

If, on the other hand, the purpose of the question goes beyond that, I would ask the questioner to state what it is. Government will then consider whether the cost and effort which may be involved in producing and publishing the information sought would be justified.

Supplementary:

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, in Britain, the purchasing power of the £ is computed if not monthly, at least annually, by the British Government. It gives a picture of the purchasing power of the £ at all times; in fact it has been done since 1914 till 1968. The index of retail prices only covers certain articles, it does not cover the whole range of articles. I wonder if the Government would consider giving the full purchasing power of the £ covering all aspects rather than just a limited number.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I am grateful to the Hon. Member opposite for this information. We have, as he knows, statisticians at work. If it is considered by them, and by Government, to be in the general interest, and not at too great expense, then I will look into the matter.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

I am grateful to hear that the statisticians are at work on this. Has the Hon. Minister any idea of the expense that would be involved in obtaining this information? And if it is not too great perhaps he will put it into effect.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I do not think it is fair to distinguish between one job the statistician would have to do and other jobs. Surely one of the things would be the setting up of a statistical unit of some sort; and surely that would lead to all sorts of expense, I think the Hon. Member should be satisfied with the answer I have given him.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

I will be satisfied for the moment, Sir, thank you.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Does the Minister feel it necessary to have the value of the £ in Gibraltar published monthly; and will he ascertain whether this is in fact the case in the United Kingdom?

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I have not said that I think it is necessary, I have said that I will look into things.

Question No. 19 of 1969.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

What is the reason for the delay in sorting mail at the Central Post Office?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR INFORMATION, PORT, TRADE AND INDUSTRIES:

(HON. MAJOR A. J. GACHE)

Sir, there is no undue delay. On the contrary, I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the expeditious manner in which the Post Office staff deals with the mail.

Supplementary:

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, I am very grateful to hear that there is no undue delay but perhaps the Hon. Minister who was not here in 1963, '64, '65, does not remember that the planes used to arrive at 7 o'clock at night and the mail was sorted by quarter past 8. Today, Sir, the plane arrives sometimes at 6.50, or even earlier, and the mail is not sorted until 11 o'clock. To my mind, Sir, this is delay, perhaps the Minister will now agree.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

I certainly do not agree, Sir. At the moment, we have seven planes a week. Two of those planes arrive in the afternoon, i.e. at five minutes to two. The remainder of the planes arrive, three of them, at 2220, and in most cases they do not really arrive at that time but slightly later. There is another plane on the Saturday which arrives at 7.05 in the evening. At the moment the arrangement is, for those planes which arrive in the evening, that the following morning the BEA freight office is opened especially (and I am grateful to BEA for this) at 8 o'clock so that the GPO can collect the mail. I do not think that it is necessary or warranted to have a staff down there at 11 and 12 at night to collect the mail. By collecting it in the morning at 8 o'clock they can do exactly the same service.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, as I said before, the mail used to arrive at 7 and was sorted by quarter past 8. Today, assuming it is collected at 8 in the morning, it should, I should imagine, be sorted, at the same rate of sorting, by 9.30. It is not sorted until 11 o'clock, Sir, I am interested to comment also, Sir, that last night two Royal Mail Vans were at the airport at 22.30. I wonder what they were doing.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

First, I would like to say that whilst I was not here in 1963, '64, '65, or '66, I was in 1918, 1919 up to 1938 when I left the service. I wonder where the Hon. Member was. Now, in so far as the time taken by the people to sort the mail, he will also agree that the mail that used to arrive in Gibraltar in '63 or even '64 or '65 does not necessarily have to be the same as arrives today. People

write a little bit more because they have more money possibly to spend that way. Now, in so far as last Saturday and Sunday is concerned, it happened that last Saturday, if it was the question, if not I will provide the information free, gratis and for nothing — last Saturday morning.....

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a most unwarranted remark and I would like you to draw his attention to that. We are not here to get information free, gratis and for nothing. This is a House of Assembly and he has a responsibility to answer.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

That question has not been asked. If the question had been asked I would certainly answer it. I am giving information which has not been asked for, and if the Hon. and Learned Member will allow me to continue maybe he can ask the question after.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, and the dignity of this House, no Minister is entitled to say that he is providing information free, gratis and for nothing. I think this is beneath the dignity of this House.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

Mr Speaker, this is metaphoric use of words. I said 'gratis and for nothing' because this question had not been asked. Had it been asked, of course it would have been my duty to supply it.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Order 17 Rule 3 of the House states that if a question contains a statement the Member asking it shall make himself responsible for the accuracy of the statement. In view of the fact that the Minister was not in Gibraltar, or a Minister during the time quoted by the Hon. Questioner, do I understand that the Honourable Questioner makes himself responsible for the accuracy of the statement that a plane arrived at 7 o'clock in the evening and the mail in the plane was sorted out by 8.15 that evening — does he make himself responsible for the accuracy of that statement? I think, to me, *prima facie*, it is such a ridiculous statement to make that that is why I ask, on a point of order, that the Minister should be asked to make himself responsible for the accuracy of that statement.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister answer whether in the time between 1918 and 1935, when the Minister was in Gibraltar, whether he was still fighting from the rooftops? We have not even asked that.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

Mr Speaker, mention has been made to my fighting from the rooftops. If I remember correctly the Hon. Member once used to distribute some propaganda in connection with Spain.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

That is correct, Sir. I also distributed pamphlets of the Communist Party.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will the Hon. Minister repeat the statement on which a point of order was raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

Sir, a point of order was made that I was giving information of what happened on Saturday and Sunday. I am not certain. I do not recall whether the Hon. Member asked for information on both those days, and therefore what I did say was that if he had not asked for information on those days I would provide the information free, gratis and for nothing.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, on the question of being responsible for the statement that mail arrived at 7 and was sorted by quarter past 8, perhaps the Hon. and Learned Backbencher has not got a very good memory, or does not deal very much with mail. But I am sure that if he wishes to have a little run round the business community — and I think he should have some connection with the business community — he would know that it was common usage in the Post Office to even hang a sign up saying "Sorting completed". Of this I am fully sure, and I am quite willing to state categorically that it was the practice for the planes to arrive and the mail to be sorted within one-and-a-half-hours the same evening. And I would like the Minister to enquire whether this is correct, and challenge me at the next meeting of the House. And if it is correct to enquire why this practice is not continued.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Sir, on a point of Order, the Hon. Member did say one and a quarter hours before, now he has added to it 15 minutes. Is that his final statement on the time they took and on which he assumes responsibility for the accuracy of?

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, as the Hon. Minister has said, the amount of mail will vary from day today; I would say one-and-a-half-hours at the maximum. I perhaps may make an infringement of time by thirty seconds, I trust I will be pardoned by the Hon. Questioner.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

Sir, I have personally been down to the Post Office to see the sorting. And the sorting, when a normal consignment is received, is normally completed by 10 a.m. That is the sorting. Of course, the Hon. Member has a box and his mail goes into the box. From the sorting, the mail goes to the Postmen who yet have to sort it into the various numbers of their districts. So the mail in the posting boxes normally would be there by 10 o'clock. However, I do recall that the Hon. Member, or the paper connected with the Hon. Member, brought this up before the elections. The situation then was exactly the same as it is now. The sorting office is working to full capacity and, as I have said before, I would like to express my appreciation of the way in which they are doing it. I will certainly look further to see whether we can expedite the sorting of the mail; but I do not think it is warranted, or necessary, neither does the expense justify, to send people the night before to pick up the mail from the BEA Freight Office at the Airport, because that would only make the mail available possibly half an hour earlier.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, I am grateful that the Minister at last has agreed that he is going to look into the question; he could have said that at the beginning and saved a lot of time of this House.

Question No. 20 of 1969.

Oral

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

Will the Minister say when the works commenced in the Operating Theatre and Godley Ward, earlier on in the year, will be completed?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR MEDICAL AND HEALTH SERVICES:

(HON. J. CARUANA)

We are grateful for the Hon. Member's concern, which we all share. Ever since I took office every effort has been made by my department, and the Lands and Works Department, to obtain a definite completion date, both from the Contractors and the Consultants, for the Operating Theatre at St. Bernard's Hospital.

The unfortunate delay has been due to failure to deliver essential equipment on time.

As far as Godley Ward is concerned, the major part of the work of modernising this ward has already been completed. The whole of the work is expected to be finished within a month or so.

Question No. 21 of 1969.

Oral

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Has Government received the report which P.A. International Ltd. were instructed to prepare by the Ministry of Overseas Development on the future potential of Gibraltar's Tourism?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR TOURISM AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES:
(HON. W. M. ISOLA)

Copies of Part I of the Report prepared by P.A. International Ltd. were received in London and in Gibraltar on the morning of Saturday, the 29th November. An "Initial Assessment of a Survey of Visitors to Gibraltar" was received 2 days ago. Both are now under examination.

Question No. 22 of 1969.

Oral

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

Will Government say why Bus Route No. 8 is not in operation?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR TOURISM AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES:
(HON. W. M. ISOLA)

Sir, as the Hon. Member will recall from his own experience as Chairman of the Transport Commission up to October, 1969, this particular route has been in suspension except for a short period since June, 1969. I should add that another company has expressed an interest in providing this service and the matter is now being considered by the Transport Commission.

Supplementary:

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

When I was Chairman of the Transport Commission a request was made by the operator running Bus Route No. 8 and it was turned down by the Commission. It had been decided that service had been provided to the public. Can the Minister say why this has not been carried out?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Could you repeat the last words?

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

When I was Chairman of the Transport Commission, a request from the operator running Bus Route No. 8 to do away with that route was turned down and they were instructed to provide service to the public. Can the Minister say why this has not been carried out?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Sir, I believe that at a meeting of the Transport Commission on the 13th of August the matter was again raised — when the Hon. Member of the Opposition was Chairman. The Company informed the Acting Secretary that, at that stage, they had no bus drivers, and it is understood that at that particular moment Mr. Alvarez replied that in the circumstances there was nothing the Transport Commission could do, and the matter would have to be left as it was.

HON. E. J. ALVARZ:

I am Sorry but I must disagree with that statement. Several reasons were adduced by the operator. One of them was on economic grounds — the fact that the route did not pay. Another one was a shortage of drivers; and another one was congestion of traffic at Flat Bastion Road. All those matters were considered by the Transport Commission at the time; and as I said, and I will repeat again, the decision of the Transport Commission was that the service was to be run by the operator.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Sir, I do not doubt the Hon. Member's word because, of course, the Hon. Member was at that time the Chairman and I was not. All I can say is that from the time that I became Chairman of the Transport Commission, as I have said before, I had received from another company an interest to provide a service for that route; and at present it is being considered.

Supplementary:

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

If that is the case, will the Minister exert pressure on the other operators so that the route is in operation. I must say that Flat Bastion Road is a narrow steep road which causes any amount of inconvenience to people. The Bus route, I may say, runs from Market Place, Moorish Castle and Flat Bastion Road and it causes any amount, not only of frustration, but inconvenience, to the people living in Flat Bastion Road.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Sir, I entirely agree with the remarks made by the Hon. Member, and I will certainly take these points up.

Question No. 23 of 1969.

Oral

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

How does the matter of the construction of a Yacht Marina at Montague Basin stand at present?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR TOURISM AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES:

(HON. W. M. ISOLA)

Of some 60 firms who expressed interest in the development of the new Yacht Marina at Montagu Basin, and enquired for particulars, four were shortlisted and a priority selection was made on the 28th November.

An offer to the Company first on the short list has now been made and answered and the Government hopes to receive, after Christmas, proposals and programme for a feasibility study.

Supplementary:

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, is it not a fact that this short list of four firms was ready in June-July 1969 — about seven months ago?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Sir, if I remember rightly, in July 1969 the Hon. Member of the Opposition was in Government.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

That is why I am saying so; because I was in Government and I know that there was a short list of four firms seven months ago. And I would like to know what has been done during those seven months? Why have they waited until now?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Sir, if I remember rightly, the question of the Marina came up a long, long time before July 1969 — sometime in 1968. So just the same I can say; why was no action taken between the beginning of this project and July 1969?

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Answer the question. Do not ask another.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, my question is this, Mr. Speaker, I will agree with the Hon. Minister that this matter of the Yacht Marina was already considered in '68, but I do know for a fact that there was a short list already in June or July 1969. My question is this: What has the Government done between July '69 and the present moment? Why has it taken seven months to do the short listing?

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

On a point of order, it is not seven months, Mr. Speaker, from July to November.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

We are in December now.

Supplementary:

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I beg the Member's pardon. I said from July to November when we are told the matter was considered. It is not seven months, nor is it seven months from July to December, if my arithmetic is right. It is six months from June to December.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

I am prepared to accept that it is six months; but one can do a lot of things in six months, and the Government has been very slow on this matter.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Mr. Speaker, the question has not been answered, surely. The Minister said that there was a short list now which was being looked into. He has been asked if it was not true that there was this short list as far back as July '69, whatever number of months it may be; and the question is what has happened about this short listing which was made in July '69 to this date?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Sir, in actual fact Government was formed sometime in August. So it is really August, September, October and November. There were many other priorities which the Government thought were much more important than this particular project. And this had to take its turn like other matters.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

But Mr. Speaker, if I may insist on this. It is all very well to say that Government had other more important things. Maybe it is so — I am not discussing that. The point is that it does not take Government a lot of time, and no money whatever, to get these four firms which had been short listed in about June or July '69 to see what arrangements could be done in one of them. So it is no excuse to say that Government had other things to do; surely any civil servant could have done that.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, we are having a lot of statements and very few questions. And unless they stick to questions we are going to get very, very involved.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, but the question is not answered. I would like to know what has been done in these seven, six or five months. What has

Government done with this short list? Is it somewhere in the Office of the Development Secretary or the Hon. Minister? What happened during those six months? I am far from satisfied, I am sorry.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member, with the greatest respect, keeps looking at me as if I were responsible, and he has mentioned the civil servants. There is only one point I think I should make in fairness. There were 60 applications for this project, as the Hon. Member knows. The 60 applications had to be looked at; a short list was made; enquiries then had to be made about the short list, and as the Hon. and Learned Member who answered the question said, an enquiry was sent to the firm top on the list. The reply has only just been received.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, I must say it is a very slow process of Government.

Supplementary:

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Sir, may I ask the Minister just one question on this. It appears that the idea was first mooted as far back as 1968, and in June or July 1969 the short list was made. Is there anything on record to show the Minister why his predecessor, having full knowledge of the whole procedure that had gone on during the past four years, did not do what he is asking the Minister to do now; and that is decide the issue quickly and shortly, in a few minutes, as he said, during the month of July. Is there any record why this was not done?

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification. The predecessor of the Minister was not fully responsible for this and this is no excuse for the late Minister of Economic Development. But he was not a predecessor. There then was, happily, I must say, a Minister for Economic Development; but there is none now.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

On a point of order, Sir, there was no Minister for Economic Development in July 1969 as far as my recollection is concerned. The Minister for Economic Development resigned his office early in June 1969, and left Gibraltar.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Perhaps the Minister might ask the former Deputy Chief Minister what part he had to take in all these delays?

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

None at all Mr. Speaker.

Question No. 24 of 1969.

Oral

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Does Government receive, either directly or indirectly, any share of the berthing fees at the Waterport Yacht Marina, and does Government make any conditions concerning the day-to-day running of the Marina?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR INFORMATION, PORT, TRADE AND INDUSTRIES:
(HON. MAJOR A. J. GACHE)

In accordance with the terms of their lease the lessees of the Yacht Marina have to pay Government one third of the berthing fees received.

There is no provision in the lease regarding day to day running of the Marina.

Supplementary:

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, is the Minister aware that there is a certain amount of unhappiness at the Marina with the day to day running; and will the Government, in view that they are an interested financial party and that the Marina is a great asset to our Tourism, consider instituting some conditions so that this unhappiness may be removed? This unhappiness stems not only from the tourists who are here in their yachts, but also from some of the people located in the neighbourhood.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

I am indebted to the Hon. Member for this information. If he will pass to me these complaints I will be extremely grateful; and I will certainly investigate them and if they warrant, as no doubt they probably do, otherwise the Hon. Member would not raise them, we will certainly take steps to look after it.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, in view of this assurance I shall be very happy to meet him at another time and give him the fullest information.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

I am grateful to the Hon. Member.

Question No. 25 of 1969.

Oral

HON. I. ABECASIS:

Will the Government consider amending the qualifying date for residence in their housing allocation scheme to a more realistic one?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND HOUSING:

(HON. MISS C. ANES)

It is the intention to review the Housing Allocation Scheme shortly and the question of points for residence will be looked into. I may add that I have already directed that, for administrative purposes, and in anticipation of the proposed revision of the Scheme, points for "Residence" should be awarded to applicants who are registered in the Register of Gibraltarians and who have been continuously resident in Gibraltar for the period of 5 years prior to the date of application for re-accommodation.

Supplementary:

HON. I. ABECASIS:

Thank you very much, that is precisely what I wanted.

Question No. 26 of 1969

Oral

HON. I. ABECASIS:

What is the average cost per flat recently built by the Government?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND HOUSING:

(HON. MISS C. ANES)

The average cost of recently built flats is £3,700.

Supplementary: to Question No. 26 of 1969.

HON. I. ABECASIS:

Sir, if the cots of a flat is £3,700, as the Hon. Minister has just stated, then the total cost of the proposed 750 flats will be nearing the 3 million mark. If that is the case, bearing in mind that the total grant given by Her Majesty's Government to the Gibraltar Government was £2,800,000, may the Hon. Minister tell us how does the Government propose to build the medical centre, schools, sport centres, tourist amenities, etc., etc., etc.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think the accuracy of the statement comes into this one. The grant was 4 million pounds.

HON. I. ABECASIS:

I believe that £1,200,000 were already mortgaged from the previous commitment.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. and Learned Member of the Opposition will recall that when he came back I think it was in 1966, with £1,000,000 as grant, they were, I believe, about £400,000 less than the previous grant, or £350,000. He came back to Gibraltar and very clearly stated that he had a grant of £1,000,000.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that does not answer the question whether in fact the £4,000,000 covers the 1.2 million committed in respect of the present flats at Glacis.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, as the Learned Leader of the Opposition knows I am going to make a statement on this matter, and perhaps he could then ask for clarification on all those points.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

May I ask the Minister when she says the average cost is £3,700, is she referring to the cost of the Tower Blocks flats?

HON. MISS C. ANES:

Sir, I am referring to Block 27 — estimate £74,500. Average cost £2,482, finished in 1968. Average cost per square of flat £420. Arengo's flats 34 — estimate £92,700. Average cost £2,726, completed in 1968. Average cost per square of flat £520. Witham's 35 flats — estimate £101,400. Average cost £2,897, completed in 1968. Average per square of flat £570. Tower blocks — 240 flats — estimate £983,500. Average cost £4,098, completed in 1969. Average cost per square of flats £710. Making an average of cost per flat — £1,252,100 — equal to £3,700. Commenced prior to the withdrawal of the Spanish Labour Force; work in progress. Upper Sandpits, 60 flats—estimate £285,200. Average cost £4,753 finished, we hope, in late 1970. Average cost per square area £870. Lower Sandpits — 50 flats. Estimate £194,000. Average cost £3,880. We hope to finish it early in 1971. Average per square area £350. Glacis phase 2— 263 flats. Estimate £1,411,000. Average cost £5,366. We hope to finish it late in 1971. Average per square area £1,000.

HON. I. ABECASIS:

Thank you very much. I just wanted to know the price of one flat.

HON. MISS C. ANES:

I was answering the Hon. Backbencher.

HON. I. ABECASIS:

Whatever the cost that finally may be the true figure, because with so many figures I am almost at a loss to know exactly what the estimate would be. But with the more realistic figure, with the balance left after building the 750 flats would there be enough money to cover all the proposed schemes that the Government have announced?

HON. MISS C. ANES:

With £4,000,000 we hope so.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Perhaps the Hon. Member would like to put the question to me later when I make my statement.

HON. I. ABECASIS:

I will, Sir.

Question No. 27 of 1969.

Oral

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

Will Government cause the necessary steps to be taken to open the Gate through Charles V's Wall at the Southern end of Flat Bastion Road, so that Gardiner's Road may be opened to traffic?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR TOURISM AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES:

(HON. W. M. ISOLA)

The opening of Gardiner's Road to traffic presents a number of difficulties, such as clearing and preparing the surface and making the area safe for use by the public. It would be necessary, in the long term, to spend considerable sums to bring it up to public highway standard and also to provide Services which would be required when adjoining sites are developed. The possibility of carrying out minimum works required to enable the road to be opened in the short term, is, however, being investigated.

Supplementary:

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

Will the Minister give any indication at all when the road will be available and open to the public?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

As I said before, Sir, the possibility of carrying out minimum works required is at present being investigated.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, will the Minister agree that it is urgent that this road be open for the benefit of all the people residing around that area?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Yes.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Therefore, will this urgency not just be fogged off as before, as we do not yet have our list of priorities, and this may not be high on the list.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Sir, as I said before, the possibility of carrying out the minimum works required to enable the road to be opened in the short term is, however, being investigated at present.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

I hope it will take less time to investigate this matter than it took to investigate the short list of four for the yacht Marina.

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

I would like to lay stress on the importance why this road should be opened. As I have said before, Flat Bastion Road is a steep and narrow road, very heavily congested today on a two-way traffic. Flat Bastion Road is suffering from a malaise which today many places in Gibraltar suffer from, and that is parking places. And it is most important for the people living there, not only to do away with this inconvenience, as I have said before — which today they have to put up with — but the risk of accidents. This question of Flat Bastion Road, if my memory serves me right, has been outstanding for a considerable number of years. If I remember correctly, this was brought up in the Legislative Council in 1963 when the Government promised to open the road. Sir, I would be grateful if the necessary pressure is exerted and an interest taken by the Government to see that this road is opened as early as possible.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

I take note of what the Hon. Member has said.

HON. E. J. ALVAREZ:

Thank you.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

May I ask, since this was promised by the Government in 1963, has the Minister any record of why the Government during 1963 to 1969 has not in fact opened that road.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

None, Sir.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

Sir, why does not the Deputy Chief Minister of the day give that information?

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

I mean, does not the ex Deputy Chief Minister know that this road could not be opened to the public because of the great dangers, we were told by the Ministry of Authorities, incumbent in passing through the road, because of some magazine or laboratory that was there. Surely the ex Deputy Chief Minister should know about this.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Sir, on a point of Order, I think questions must be directed to the Minister responsible for the Department. I would gladly answer any questions if Mr Speaker would allow me but I would not take the liberty of doing so without your permission, Sir.

Question No. 28 of 1969.

Oral

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Are Head-teachers consulted by Government whenever students and/or teachers apply for scholarships or bursaries with a view to obtaining such Head-teachers' technical comments?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND RECREATION:

(HON. L. DEVINCENZI)

Apart from the scholarships and bursaries for Teacher Training, it is entirely up to the candidate to obtain a reference from his Head-teacher if he wishes.

With regard to Teacher Training Bursaries, it has been decided, following representation from the Heads of the schools concerned, that the Headteacher's report will form an important part of the selection procedure.

Headteachers from Infant, Junior and Secondary Schools form part of the Selection Board for Teacher Training Scholarships and Bursaries.

The Hon. Member will appreciate, of course, that the final selection of candidates lies with the Public Service Commission.

Supplementary:

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, I am grateful to hear that persons applying, not for teacher-training, do obtain the comments of Head-teachers in all cases. However, could that be made a condition, that they do in case in the future anybody might apply without the comments of a Head-teacher?

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, this can be gone into; but I doubt very much whether any person applying for a scholarship would not avail himself of the opportunity of asking for a reference from the Head-teacher. Actually how can one really make anyone do so if he does not so wish. But actually everybody does take advantage of Head-teachers' references and remarks.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Although there is a great deal of logic in what the Minister says, Sir, there might be the instance that somebody does not, in fact, I believe there is a present instance when I have the definite information I will give it to him, but if this is so — if he sees that there is such a necessity — could it not be made a condition?

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

This is a question which we shall certainly have to go into. The Department will be asked for an opinion on this question, and quite frankly I do not see why this could not be the case. I personally do not see any objection. So if they advise me to do so I will certainly give instructions that this be so.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Thank you, Sir.

Question No. 29 of 1969.

Oral.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Will Government take steps to enable Gibraltar Television to increase viewing hours?

Answer:

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND RECREATION:
(HON. L. DEVINCENZI)

Sir, if I remember correctly, at the last meeting the Honourable Member of the Opposition said that he knew the answer to the question he asked. Does he know the answer to this question too, or does he want a reply?

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

No, Sir.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

The maintenance of a television service is the function of an independent corporation set up under the Gibraltar Broadcasting Ordinance (Cap. 69).

This matter has, however, been under examination with the Corporation since Lord Shepherd visited Gibraltar last September, and I am pleased to say was brought to a successful conclusion during the Gibraltar Delegation visit to London earlier this month.

As a result, the General Manager of the Corporation left Gibraltar last Friday to negotiate with film distributors in the United Kingdom for the necessary programme material.

Supplementary:

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, I am very grateful to hear this. I am sure the general public will also be grateful. But on a point of order, last time, Sir, I said I already knew the answer. I said this after I had been given information by the Minister. I did not say so before asking the question. He gave a certain amount of information, and I made a supplementary to which I said I knew the answer based on the information he had just given me in reply to my question. I do not make frivolous questions, Sir.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, I accept the explanation given by the Hon. Member, which is correct. It was in fact in answer to a supplementary, but nevertheless, Sir, I did mention this because apparently, even if it was in answer to a supplementary, he did happen to appear to know the answer before I gave an answer to that particular supplementary. He did ask a question and before I answered he said he knew the answer.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that questions are not only asked for the purpose of the information of Members, but for the information of the public, and that this is the purpose and the function of the Opposition?

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Is it not a fact that the Opposition have a newspaper to do that anyway, Mr. Speaker?

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, I would take up that challenge. The Opposition do not have a newspaper. This statement that has just been made by the Hon. Backbencher would not be substantiated. I can challenge him to substantiate it.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

On a point of order, Sir, there is no Backbencher. There is an Hon. Member, he was elected by the people.

Supplementary:

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I can substantiate the statement as to the ownership of the Gibraltar Post.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, the Hon. Gentleman on my extreme left, I think he sits on my extreme right of the front bench of the Government, has made a statement. He has not yet substantiated it. Will he substantiate it with definite facts.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am making myself responsible for the accuracy of my statement and I do so solemnly now. That is what Standing Orders say, Sir, Standing Order 17 Rule 3.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

The Hon. Backbencher sitting in the front is misusing the rules for his own purpose.

HON. A. J. GACHE:

Sir, did we not use the majority of this House for other purposes on another occasion?

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, the Daily Express at one time was owned by Lord Beaverbrook who I understand was a Conservative. Was that the mouthpiece of the Conservative Party?

HON. J. CARUANA:

Is the Hon. Member of the Opposition comparing himself to Lord Beaverbrook?

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, I am much more important than Lord Beaverbrook. I have to deal with very important gentlemen in front of me.

Question No. 30 of 1969.

Oral.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Will Government investigate with urgency the possibility of setting up a colour Television station in Gibraltar?

Answer:

THE FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

(HON. E. H. DAVIS)

As pointed out by the Hon. Minister for Education, television is a matter for the Gibraltar Broadcasting Corporation.

The matter was, however, examined at the time the new agreement between Thomson Television International, the Gibraltar Broadcasting Corporation and the Gibraltar Government, which came into operation in October, 1968, was negotiated. It was then envisaged that certain pieces of the equipment to be acquired by the Corporation with Government loan finance would be colour compatible in anticipation of the advent of colour television in Gibraltar and this has in effect been done.

No further action was then taken because of the capital cost involved but the Hon. Member may be assured that the matter is receiving the attention of this Government.

Supplementary:

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, may I congratulate the Hon. Financial and Development Secretary on giving a concise answer without any prevarications; and may I suggest that the rest of his colleagues follow his example. Thank you.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Was the Hon. Member a school-teacher sometime or other during his career?

Question No. 31 of 1969.

Oral.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Will Government appoint a Committee on the terms of the Law Commission in the United Kingdom for the purpose of considering recent U.K. legislation and recommending the extent to which it should apply here, as suggested by the Honourable Chief Justice in his speech at the opening of the Legal Year on the 7th October, 1969?

Answer:

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

(HON. C. B. O'BEIRNE)

Yes, Sir.

The Government proposes to appoint a Committee for the purposes of considering recent United Kingdom legislation and recommending the extent to which it can usefully be applied in Gibraltar.

Supplementary:

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Will the Hon. Attorney-General tell us whether this is going to be done in the immediate future since over (I shall now measure my time) two months and a number of days have elapsed since this suggestion came up at the opening of the Legal Year?

HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

With respect to the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition I think this proposition was put up by me a year ago. I can give the Hon. and Learned Member the assurance that it will be done as soon as the work at Government permits.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Is it not a fact that this suggestion does not involve any Government Members, and that therefore there is no reason why the administration should not have appointed the committee before?

HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

On that point, Sir, it is the anticipation that the Chief Justice, or his representative, would be the Chairman of the committee, and the other members would be the Attorney-General, or his representative, and the senior member of the practising Bar in Gibraltar, or his representative.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, when this is investigated can particular attention be given to the provision of the Family Law Reform Act 1959 of the U.K. whereby the age of majority is to be lowered from 21 to 18, with a view to this being applied in Gibraltar for all purposes?

HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

The Hon. Member may rest assured that this particular Act of Parliament, together with others, will most certainly receive the attention of the Committee.

STATEMENT BY THE CHIEF MINISTER

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Sir, I have the honour to report to the House on the recent talks held in London.

The talks were held under the chairmanship of our very good friend Lord Shepherd and during our stay in London I was given an opportunity of discussing the problems of Gibraltar with the Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson. The Gibraltar delegation also saw Mr. Michael Stewart, the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. George Thomson and Mrs. Judith Hart.

On the immediate and vital question of overcoming the economic blockade of Gibraltar, I am pleased to report that the British Government have very generously made available to us, in the form of a free grant, the sum of £4m. to be spent during the period of three years commencing in April, 1970 as well as £100,000 towards recurrent expenditure for purposes to be approved by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

Principally, our development programme is concerned with housing as this will not only enable Gibraltarians to improve their social conditions but will also ensure that we are able to accommodate the people who are required to make Gibraltar as self-sufficient as possible in labour and to make our economy invulnerable to external pressures. To enable us to start this building programme, which will consist of 750 flats over and above those under construction, which are in the region of about 300 and to house the necessary labour force, we obtained agreement on building a hostel for about 300 workers, something we hope to complete as soon as possible within 1970.

The British Government have also undertaken to give us their support in our aim to transform our present educational system into a system of comprehensive secondary education. This will enable us not only to move ahead into a more modern and equitable approach to the education of our children but also prepare the ground for the future in conformity with the Beeching philosophy.

In the medical sphere, there is provision for the construction of a Health Centre, an establishment which will decongest the large numbers of out-patients attending St. Bernard's hospital and afford better and more regular facilities to members of the public who make use of our medical services. This will enable our hospital to function more efficiently as such and constitute the first step towards a more comprehensive health service in Gibraltar. Included in the expenditure under the medical side will be a new laboratory and an isolation unit.

The recreational side has also obtained recognition and we now have agreement for the construction of the Sports Centre at the Stadium. In addition, it is our intention, to proceed with schemes of tourist development, including a number of amenities which will also be available to the people of Gibraltar. These we hope will include a full size swimming pool possibly suitable for use all the year round. We intend to arrange holidays for school children and, we hope, adults in the United Kingdom.

Linked up with tourism and the development of trade is the much needed improvement to our port facilities and we can now go ahead with this as soon as we know the results of the feasibility study which is now being completed. We expect to receive recommendations of experts in the very near future. The commitments which the Gibraltar Government has already entered into with regard to hotel development have been recognised by the British Government. Naturally, our future policy with regard to tourism will depend to some extent on what course the Government takes in the light of the P.A. report which has still to be gone into. This report will supplement the decisions already taken by the Gibraltar Government.

The question of communications was gone into during our talks but this is a complex problem which requires further consideration. I need not ask that H.M.G. are well aware of the important part which our links with the outside world play in our daily lives in Gibraltar, socially and economically.

Technical aid, which is vital to us, will also be forthcoming. In fact, we have already been receiving that aid in large numbers following our talks with Lord Shepherd last September. We are most grateful to the experts who have been made available to us and for the advice they have given to the British Government and to ourselves.

It is not possible, at this stage, to go into the details of how the £4m. are to be allotted. The important thing is to ensure that we spend as much as possible of this huge sum of money available. The British Government fully recognises this difficulty and will accept virement within heads of expenditure. I am also pleased to say that, in order to help us to get on with it, particularly with housing development, they have given us a large proportion of the Viaduct reclamation site the value of which is approximately estimated at £2m.

It is therefore our intention to advance with our projects on a broad front in order to proceed as fast as possible with any of the projects which can make headway. I need not stress that it will inevitably take time to go through the planning stages and to this end H.M.G. have also agreed to engage a top firm of consultants who will give us the technical advice that should enable us to make the right decision and to make it possible for the schemes to proceed with top speed.

On the questions of our link with Britain and citizenship I should perhaps quote verbatim from the communique issued on the 8th December:

“The Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary took note of the views expressed by Gibraltar Ministers and reaffirmed H.M.G.’s assurances to the people of Gibraltar in the preamble to the Order-in-Council embodying the 1969 Gibraltar Constitution. He undertook to consider the resolution on Citizenship recently adopted by the Gibraltar House of Assembly, while holding out no prospect at this time that amendments to United Kingdom legislation concerned would be possible. The Gibraltar Ministers accepted that, in accordance with previous assurances by H.M.G., there are in practice no obstacles in the way of Gibraltarians who wish to do so coming to the United Kingdom under the Commonwealth Immigrants Act.”

I think that we can thus look forward to the future knowing that our legitimate interests are safeguarded and that we are proceeding, in an efficient and realistic manner, towards economic self-sufficiency.

I should of course stress that if we want to progress into a more prosperous future it is imperative that we each make our own contribution towards the economic well-being of our society. We can do this both by using our skills, ingenuity and energy and also by contributing financially in order to provide the social services which are now taken for granted in all forward looking communities.

I cannot end without recording my appreciation to His Excellency the Governor, to the Financial and Development Secretary and to all the many civil servants, both here and in Britain, who since last August have been working for long hours to make possible the success of our talk in London and who will no doubt have to continue to work hard to ensure that the money we have been given is translated into the things we want for a happy and progressive Gibraltar.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Mr. Speaker, in deference to the remark made by the Chief Minister that he was making a statement I refrained from pursuing supplementaries on my first question on the Order Paper today. But I would like a little more information on these matters and this is, first of all, the question of the actual extra money which has been granted—extra, I mean, to the commitments already incurred such as the outstanding housing estate at Glacis. Will the Minister confirm that the money in addition to that money which we have already got committed, and which according to the draft estimates there is still £1,220,000 to pay — whether this is taken out of the £4m.? This, I think, is very important. This is the first point I would like the Chief Minister to answer.

The next one is, that he cannot give any details how the money is being allocated. I know that with so many experts in fact it is going to lead to Government by experts all round. (Cries of shame).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, order.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Well, I may continue with the Speaker's ruling for the people to keep quiet. I would like to know how they propose to allocate at least the bulk of the money. We have had it from the Hon. Minister for Housing that even at the old rate of cost of construction 750 flats at £3,700 each — and I think it is fair to say that there has been a substantial increase in the cost of building since the Spanish labour force was withdrawn—would cost £2,775,000. If in fact the £1.2m. that is already committed out of the £4m.; how is the Government going to carry out all these wonderful things that have been mentioned here within the ambit of £2.8m.? I think this is essential. Otherwise people have a false sense of security or a false sense of progress, when in fact the money is not going to be available.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition is making a speech more than asking questions. Anyway, I will be delighted to answer the questions.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Perhaps, if the Hon. Chief Minister does not lose his temper, I will ask elucidating

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

First of all it is not a question of losing my temper — it is feeling ashamed that having brought £4m. to Gibraltar from the British Government, instead of getting words of praise for the British Government we are hearing words about degrading experts who have come here to help us. This is what makes me lose my temper.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I did not say degrading experts at all. I am all for experts. But not Government by experts all the time. And I am asking a very reasonable question to start with, and that is: does the £4m. cover the commitment of £1.2m. which is still to be paid in respect of the Glacis area?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would not be proud to say here today that of the £4m., which I would have brought in any case, £1.2m. had actually been money which was not spent by the previous administration. So let it be clear that I think we would have had the £4m. whether this £1.2m. were there or not. But I will even go further than that and say that his concern about spending the money on housing which, according to their calculations amounts to very nearly £2.8m.—I cannot make any calculations because this is a completely new venture, on a new site, possibly with a new form of building — I would not dare say at this stage how much any flat would cost. All I can say is that whether in the 4 years we spend this money on housing or whether because housing cannot be erected as fast as all that, it is spent on Comprehensive or on any other scheme that we have in hand the British Government over and above the £4m. has committed itself to the 750 flats; which I think is even more than figures I have given. I have not come here with this statement to try and mislead the people in any way or give them false hopes. In fact, it is transpiring from what I say that we have in fact brought much more back than we have said.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Mr. Speaker, will he answer the question whether the £1.2m. that are committed in respect of Glacis is part of the £4m. announced?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Let me say, of the £1.2m. the position was made quite clear that the £1.2m. because they were not spent during the period were lost completely and it required a new voting by the House of Commons. Therefore this £1.2m. have been brought back this time and I think that if we had not been able to put a case we might not have got that money or it might well have been deducted from the £4m.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

But is it going to be deducted from the £4m.? Let the answer be given clearly.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

It is part and parcel of the £4m. Of course it is. I have never denied that. It looks as if you are very proud of the fact that this is part of that. I would be ashamed.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

It is not a question of whether one is proud or one is ashamed—it is a question that the Government must give proper reflection of what they have done and not to shout about £4m. when in fact £1.2m. is already committed, and then talk about the number of things that are to be done.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, he is putting words in my mouth that I have not said. I made it quite clear in my statement that the 300 houses that were being constructed were part of the scheme. I do not know what he is asking the question for.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I asked the question and I want the answer. I am to be the judge of the questions I ask — I am not going to be told by the Chief Minister how I am to ask a question. Anyhow, after a little effort we have at least obtained that statement.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Sir, if the Leader of the Opposition would allow me to ask him how to put the question I could be more clear and we would perhaps not be wasting our time.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Perhaps when he has had a little experience and learns not to lose his temper he might be able to give me a lesson on these matters, but not yet.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

To approach a matter vigorously is not to lose your temper, Mr. Speaker.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

A new version for bad temper is 'vigour'.

Let me proceed with this matter. Of course the money has been re-voted, and of course that if at the end of this period all the £4m. has not been spent then another grant is made. I have had the same experience—there is no question about it. But I have said so when I have come back from England. I told the Prime Minister himself.

Now, the next thing is that I am very glad and I am very grateful, that the 750 houses have been committed, but the communique and the statement made by the Chief Minister this morning give the impressoin that all these things are going to be done in the 3-year period. And this is practically impossible. This is the point I am making. From the point of view of cost alone. Now he has brought out some idea that on that site something much cheaper — that the £3m. at £3,700 a flat is going to be much cheaper. Well, if it is going to be much cheaper so much the better, but that remains to be seen.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, if he puts the question clearly and concisely I will be able to answer it. But if he is making a speech he will grumble later that I am not answering his question.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the question if the Chief Minister will allow me. He is so vigorous this morning.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, can I suggest that the normal practice is followed in this, and that is, when obviously there is to be a lot of debate or questions on a statement of this nature, the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition avails himself of the opportunity of under Standing Orders to raise the statement as a matter of importance on the adjournment of the House. I am sure all Honourable Members on both sides of the House would be grateful for an opportunity to discuss this very serious, and I think, optimistic statement of policy made by the Chief Minister. I would have thought that the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition would have welcomed such an opportunity.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Sir, so far I shall conduct my own interventions in this House the way I think proper and I will have no indication from the Honourable Backbencher sitting on the front bench.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

On a point of order, the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition should not make speeches. He is only permitted by Standing Orders and Regulations to ask elucidatory questions. And we are having long statements from him about what he did and everybody else should do.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Sir, I am expected to put lucid, short questions and I expect a lucid, short answer. If we do that we will get on very well.

The next question I want to know is: is it as in the communique which the Chief Minister has repeated this morning with a little more elaboration, are the 750 houses expected to be built within the 3-year period of the development plan?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

No, of course not.

I do not think it possible—I wish we could. But this, as I said before, is over and above the £4m. We may get part of that going. But, if we could move faster of course we would. That is why I said quite clearly in my statement that we would have to move along a broad front. And so we could spend on those items on which we could proceed with speed. If, however, at the end of the period let us say, we have spent money on other projects and we had in fact time to carry on with housing, I think the British Government — they have committed themselves — would give us the money for the extra houses.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Is it the intention of the Government, out of this money — the £2.8m.—to build the school, sports centre, the additional medical facilities, the port development and the appropriate scheme for tourist development and the hostel for workers?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

The answer is: Yes.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Finally, Sir, is the proposal to investigate the question of the comprehensive education, which the previous Government had agreed to implement subject to help from the United Kingdom, contained within this grant or will that be an additional grant?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

It would be contained within the present grant if we could move ahead in time, which I think we could—or we should.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, in connexion with hotel development, the Chief Minister has said that the commitments the Gibraltar Government has already entered into will be respected. May I ask a further question on that point; that is that if the report of P.A. International on the future of Gibraltar's tourism potential is favourable, may we give favourable consideration to move demands for financial help for the construction of more hotels?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

The answer is: Yes, Sir.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Thank you very much.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, if at the end of this period £1.2m. is unspent and a Government, irrespective of who are the Government, goes to Britain and comes back with another £4m. including the £1.2m. unspent, will the present Leader of the House state categorically that he will not challenge £4m. having been brought back by saying: "No, you have only brought £2.8m. because £1.2m. was carried over?"

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Sir, I quite honestly do not know what the Honourable Member is driving at. Perhaps he could put the question again.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Sir can I ask the Honourable Chief Minister how this grant of £4m. compares with previous grants obtained for Gibraltar.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

I have not looked deeply into this, but I believe that the biggest grant brought to Gibraltar—correct me if I am wrong—was £2.2m. The £600,000 added to that was a loan—not a free grant.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

When was this £2.8m.?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

As far as I know during the last 3 years — 3 years ago. £2.2m.—allow me to correct that.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

I think a subsequent amount made it £2.8m. With the change in the value of the £ that is pretty close to £4m.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

May I put another question to the Honourable and Gallant Chief Minister. That is this: with regard to the £2.2m. previously granted, was there in fact a commitment on the £2.2m. or was it in fact a commitment in principle to a general scheme and in fact the amount actually allocated initially was £600,000? Is that correct?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

I am sorry to say that I do not know the details of that grant and therefore I would not like to enlarge on that.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I would like, as a matter of interest and arising out of the question raised before, when the Government is in a position to give us the details of the allocations in the various schemes, that we should have a general debate on the matter.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

I assure you, Sir, that it will be done; but I cannot promise that this will be in the near future because, as I made clear in my statement, we shall have to move along and spend where we can spend the money. I only hope that by the end of the 3 years we have spent most, if not all, of the £3m. And this, the House is aware, is not going to be an easy task.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Will the Honourable Chief Minister inform the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition that he can have a debate at any time on any issue provided the Opposition put down a motion on the matter.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

I think that is in Standing Orders.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I am fully aware of that and I do not need any indication from the Backbencher sitting on the front bench.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Just, Mr. Speaker, that I did get the impression from the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition's request that he could not debate anything unless the Chief Minister allowed him to do so.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

This is absolute nonsense. That is probably the impression he has from his own, but not from mine.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

But that is the impression you give—one of nonsense.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I never gave that impression, Mr. Speaker. I never suggested anything. What I said was that I wanted the answers now. And if I want a debate I will know how to put it.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Then perhaps the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition will raise the matter on the adjournment, Mr. Speaker.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I will do it when I wish and when I think I ought to do it, but not when he wants, Mr. Speaker.

Supplementary Estimates No. 11 of 1969.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Sir, I have the honour to move that this House should resolve itself into Committee to consider the Supplementary Estimates No. 11 of 1969 in detail.

This was agreed to and the House went into Committee.

House in Committee.

Head X. Public Works Non-Recurrent.

Item 30 (New) Facilities for Sporting Activities.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I was going to ask a question on this item, if I may.

This is in connexion with the Sports Centre in Corral Road. Is this in connexion with the Court being built at the moment? Can the Financial and Development Secretary give us some information about what this money is being spent on?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Unless I am mistaken, Mr. Speaker, I think this is in connexion with the work being carried out under the auspices of the Rotary Club.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I appreciate this. But the Government is paying?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

It is a Government contribution.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

It is for the flood lighting, is it not?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Yes, Sir.

Head XIV. Miscellaneous Services.

Item 38 (New) Rosia Cold Stores.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Sir, on this matter, I am very glad to see that at last it has been decided to purchase the cold stores. I hope that in that case the maintenance charges which have been paid before will cease despite the fact that there will be some expense involved. Cannot something be done to bring this matter to a finality? And is it the hope perhaps now that Government have agreed to purchase it to see whether it can be put to some useful purpose and not have the matter delayed by extraneous forces?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

I give the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition that assurance, Sir.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Has the Government been in possession of these stores, or has somebody else?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

I would like notice of that question, Sir.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Certainly. You shall have it.

HON. LT. COL. J. L. HOARE:

Do we anticipate any income from this purchase?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

I am sure the Honourable and Gallant Member opposite would not expect me not to try and make income out of anything.

Supplementary Estimates No. 11 of 1969 were agreed to.

Resumption:

House resumed:

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Sir, I have the honour to report that the votes detailed in Supplementary Estimates No. 11 of 1969 have been considered in detail in Committee and agreed to and I now move that they be formally approved by the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now put the question which is that this House approves the votes detailed in Supplementary Estimates No. 11 of 1969.

Passed unanimously.

Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1970.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Sir, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order 44(5) to enable me to propose the motion standing in my name.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now put the question which is that Standing Order No. 44(5) should be suspended in respect of the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1970.

This was agreed to.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Mr. Speaker,

In rising, on behalf of the Government, to propose the motion standing in my name, I am conscious of a number of things and I therefore do so with mixed feelings. I hope, Sir, that with your usual kindness you will allow me to read my address which, because of its nature, is, to a very great extent, concerned with figures. I also hope that the House will bear with me in what usually is a lengthy dissertation and which, this year, for reasons which will be readily apparent, may, in spite of my efforts to the contrary, be somewhat longer.

Many things have happened, Sir, since I came to the Legislative Council on the 20th December, 1968, to present draft Estimates for 1969 which, from the point of view of the man in the street were not unpalatable since they were mainly designed as a holding operation. They accordingly did not earn for me, or for the Government, any rude epithets. Since then, we have had a new Constitution which has converted the old Legislative Council into a House of Assembly and has merged two administrations. As a result, this is the first occasion that the new House of elected representatives of the people of Gibraltar considers a Budget which covers the whole of the City of Gibraltar; and it is, of course, the first time that the full extent of expenditure in the public sector of the City will be unfolded in one operation. From that point of view, it is a historic occasion, although I confess that the magnitude of the task before me inspires me with some awe, and the joint statement of expenditure fills me, as Financial and Development Secretary, with as much trepidation. We have also had, Sir, a General Election and a change of administration. As a result, it is the first time that, as Financial Secretary, I am presenting a Budget to a House which now has that element of Opposition which, except for a brief interlude in 1964/65, has been absent in the past. And because, Sir, I know that the Honourable Gentlemen opposite have dealt for many years with the two fields of administration now merged together, I would not be human if I did not feel some concern at the task which confronts me. On that score alone, I am sure that any Financial Secretary standing here today would have good reason for the use of what my Honourable Friend, the Minister for Medical Services would call phenobarbitone, and I know, more commonly, as tranquillisers.

I am, however, Sir, a Civil Servant and it is the duty of the Civil Servant to advise the Government of the day. Today, I am presenting a budget on behalf of the Government and that budget must reflect the policy of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, in endeavouring to give the House a reasonably clear account of my stewardship during the past twelve months, as well as a picture of what lies ahead in the coming year, I propose to divide my address into four main parts. In the first place, I intend to review what can perhaps be described as the opera-

tions on the central government in their recurrent aspect; then to do likewise with the municipal side; to try and summarise the whole into one compact picture; and then to consider the capital position in relation to both. This indeed, follows the pattern of the draft Estimates as they have been printed and presented to the House, although I would hope that in the future, and when the full implications of merger have been sorted out, it will be possible to cut round some of the corners. This year, however, time has been against us and it has been impossible to carry out the simplification which I am sure the House will welcome.

I would like to remind the House that on the 6th June last, the Acting Financial Secretary was able to give the Legislative Council an exposee of the position as at the 31st December, 1968, before the Balance Sheet at that date was actually published. If I might be allowed to recap briefly, the position disclosed was that after transferring £80,000 from the General Revenues to the Improvement and Development Fund, we still had a surplus of £95,000 which enabled us to start 1969 with reserves in the General Revenue Balance amounting to just over £1,000,000. Now that to me was exceedingly satisfactory, because it meant not only that I had the degree of insurance for which every Financial Secretary hopes, but perhaps more important still, because it also meant that, by increasing our investments, I was getting a greater return in interest to offset against increases in expenditure. In other words, the greater the Government's income from investments, the lesser the need to find additional measures of revenue.

The main reasons for the improved position, Sir, at the end of 1968, were twofold. First, there were increased collections under the Customs Head amounting to £60,000, of which £39,000 occurred during the last quarter — by which time the draft estimates had been framed. Secondly, income tax receipts were up by £34,000. Other minor increases, when offset against decreases, as well as against unforeseen increases in expenditure, cancelled each other out. But I hope that the House will appreciate that there is a limit to which one can forecast, with any accuracy, against speculation, and it is, I hope, significant that under the Customs Head, for example, the excess over the estimate was approximately a half of what it had been in the preceding year. In other words, I did try to take account of it, as I always do, but I could not allow myself to be unduly optimistic because the factor is not predictable.

Having started the year so much better than I had expected, I would indeed have had cause for self-congratulation had I been able to tell the House that we would finish 1969 according to my predictions last December. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

As you know, Sir, it has been my practice during the past few years to qualify my forecast as to how a particular year would end, with reservations relating to the external situation. Without

in any way wishing to tempt providence, I shall not do so today. Even so, however, the picture I can give the House is not an encouraging one, and I hope the comparison between the approved and the revised estimates for 1969 does not give the impression that my budgeting for 1969 went completely haywire. When the Legislature approved the estimates for 1969, it was on the basis that Revenue at £2,397,000 (in round figures) would be approximately £14,000 less than Expenditure at £2,411,000. At the time, however, I warned the House of a contingent liability of £28,500 in respect of the implementation of the Third Stage of the Marsh Report, which I said would bring the deficit for the year to approximately £42,500. The revised figures for 1969, as I now see them, give a Revenue total of £2,480,000 and Expenditure amounting to £2,832,000. In other words, a deficit for 1969 of £352,000.

Before, Sir, any Honourable Member suggests that I should have my head examined by a trick cyclist, I hasten to say that the figure of £352,000 includes £309,000 which has been required to adjust the City Council accounts to the Government system of accounting on merger. This figure has, in fact, already been voted by the House on Supplementary Estimates on the 25th September and 30th October last. The difference between that figure, £309,000, and the deficit shewn in the Estimates, £352,000, is £43,000 which is £500 more than I actually anticipated. I can only hope that any future forecast I may make will be as accurate!

I do not propose to weary the House with lengthy details as to how this came about, but I think I should point out that increases under revenue amounting to £138,000 (due to improvements under Customs, Income Tax, Estate Duties, Stamps and the Crown Piece, as well as to Interest reflecting the improved revenue position at the time) were offset by decreases totalling £55,000 (under the Heads relating to the Port, Fees, Rents and Lottery). The overall improvement of £83,000 was, in turn, completely wiped out by increased expenditure which, without taking the City Council into account, amounted to £112,000. This is not, of course, unusual in the normal run of things and it would indeed be a wonderful experience for a Financial Secretary if supplementary expenditure were not to be required in any year for whatever the reason.

Be that as it may, Sir, there is no gainsaying the fact that whereas we started 1969 with a General Revenue Balance of just over £1,000,000, we are, I am afraid, going to end it with something like £696,000. I hope that I am proved wrong and that we will go well into the £700,000 mark but even so, the drop, as far as I am concerned, is—to say the least—distressing. And it is distressing because I have been trying hard over the past five years to build up a healthy reserve; to give ourselves at least a prudent margin, and by that I mean something like four months' working capital; to ensure that we had sufficient not only for what could be foreseen, but also for what should have been done

years ago by way of creating a Housing Depreciation Account. Because as I said last year "in a large territory and with a large budget, it is of course easier to live off borrowed money, but in a small place and with a small budget like Gibraltar, it is imperative that we should at all times have working capital. I can therefore, Sir, be forgiven for feeling melancholy.

I turn now, Sir, from the present into the future to deal with the Estimates for 1970, and in doing so I must preface my remarks with some general observations.

I have, Sir, in the course of all my budget speeches to the Legislative Council, complained bitterly at the difficulties of framing estimates in Gibraltar. Those difficulties, which arise mainly from our peculiar geographical situation, have not, I am sorry to say, entirely disappeared. There is still that element of uncertainty over events which it is beyond our resources to control and this makes my task very much of a crystal gazing exercise. True, we are aiming, as the Chief Minister said on the 25th November last, at making our economy less vulnerable to external pressures. True, it is beginning to look as if we are gradually changing the whole pattern of our way of living, and, consequently, this is being reflected in our economic situation. But, as I said last year, I would at this moment in time cheerfully settle for a budget which only contained a 10% margin of error either way. This year, the margin, as far as I was concerned, has been so negligible that I was almost afraid of being accused of cooking, but that sort of coincidence seldom repeats itself.

In the second place, I have followed this year the practice I adopted last December of not falling into the trap of believing in false economies. In other words, in the same way as the 1969 Budget was realistic to the extreme of being painfully accurate, the one for 1970, by following and improving upon that pattern is I hope, even more so.

Thirdly, expenditure continues to be dominated by the Social Services where significant improvements are being provided for, as promised by the Honourable the Minister for Labour and Social Security on the 25th September last, not only under Supplementary Benefits but also, I hope, under Family Allowances. Such improvements must, of course, depend on our ability to meet the bill and in due course I hope so to satisfy the House. But following what I said last year, the aim has been to improve what we already have rather than to widen the range unduly.

Lastly, there is the effect on the Estimates as printed of that other best seller which one could foresee was coming but the implications of which, when the Estimates were framed, were not yet known. I refer, of course, to the interim report submitted recently by Mr. Arthur Marsh which has already commanded quite a lot of public attention. Now, two years ago I said I had become bogged down in Marsh. This year I shall refrain from

indulging in any such wisecracks. The fact remains that over and above the total deficit printed there is an even bigger amount to be found totalling some £220,000, and here again I shall in due course, have some suggestions to put forward. It is, as I am sure the House will appreciate, a sad fact of life that no one ever gets anything for nothing.

With those disquieting thoughts in mind, I shall come down to brass tacks. Recurrent expenditure for 1970 on the Government side, Sir, is estimated at £2,514,000 which is £100,000 or 4% over the approved figure for 1969. I do not propose, as I have done in previous years, to go through the individual Heads of Expenditure to point out where the pluses and the minuses occur but I think I must draw attention to some of the salient points.

Broadly speaking, the increase of £100,000, without the effects of Marsh added, is absorbed by three Departments, Education with £31,000; Labour and Social Security with £46,000, excluding the net cost of increased Family Allowances put at £10,000; and Medical with £23,000, all of which underlines the point I made earlier about the expansion of the Social Services. I shall not expound on the reasons for these increases because I am sure the Ministers responsible will be doing so.

There are also some other interesting points about the Estimates of Expenditure, which should be noted. Under the Head relating to His Excellency the Governor, the House will wish to know that the Ministry of Public Building and Works is assuming responsibility for Furniture and Maintenance at the Convent, not all of which is reflected in the decrease shown because reimbursement in respect of salaries is credited under Revenue. This is a welcome relief which will be of benefit to the Convent, where in the past we have not been able to provide as much as we should have liked, and naturally to the Government who will be saving some money. I am sure the House will wish to record its appreciation to the Ministry for this gesture.

Token provision is made under the Judicial Head for the Court of Appeal, which the new Constitution specified should be set up.

A substantial amount of £14,000 is also provided under the Public Works Non-Recurrent vote for the works required to be carried out to this House as a result of the changes we now have in its constitution.

Generally speaking, therefore, my aim has been progressive continuation of programmes of improvement already under way at the time work started on the Estimates, with keen attention to economy, wherever that was possible, without in any way impairing the public service.

To that extent, the Estimates are not designed to be, in their printed form, anything but conservative, with no tinge at all of

liberalisation. That came later in the shape of wage and salary increases and improvements to family allowances as I have already mentioned.

On the other hand, I have made it a point of providing for what we have by way of establishment rather than what we should, or could have. In that, the one thought I have had at the back of my mind has been that if we can implement the Beeching policy of higher productivity, if we can get the Marsh recommendations under way, we might be able to achieve reductions in establishments which would eventually be reflected under other votes.

That, Sir, is all I intend to say about Expenditure on the Government side of the Estimates, although I shall, of course, be only too happy to clarify any points that may arise in the course of debate—if that is necessary, given the knowledge that Honourable Members of the House on both sides already have of the workings of the machine. This, I realise, is possibly a pious hope.

I turn now to the Revenue Estimates for 1970 upon which the Government will count to meet, in part, the bill of £2,514,000 in expenditure. Here, on the present pattern and on current trends, I reckon that we should collect £2,450,000 leaving a deficit to be made up of £64,000. That figure, I would remind the House, exclusive of the cost of Marsh and Family Allowances, is not far in excess of the deficit of £42,000 for which we budgetted this year, and if one takes account of annual increments to staff, the difference becomes negligible.

Here again, I do not intend to weary the House with a Head by Head account of improvements and short-trends. Suffice it to say, as I have often stated in the past, that Financial Secretaries can never afford to be optimistic and that it is necessary in counting the chickens beforehand—so to speak—to reckon on single rather than double yolked eggs.

It is, if one can call it so, satisfactory that, with two exceptions, all Heads of Revenue show increases even if, in some cases, those increases are slight. For example, I would have wished for a greater income from Housing if the Tower Blocks had been completed to schedule. I would also have wished that the two exceptions which show a decrease, viz, Port Dues and Lottery, had reversed their trend. In the first case, of course, the downfall reflects the policy of waiving dues to vessels coming alongside and I would hope that Main Street is benefitting thereby. The Government of course, have lost on the deal because of the capital cost of the "Mons Abyla"—although that was cheaper than a subsidy—and the recurrent cost of maintaining the tender, a matter which will have to be closely examined in 1970. On the other hand, the downward trend in the Lottery has been inevitable and I hope that that hard-working body of public spirited gentlemen who form the Lottery Committee, and to whom the House must acknowledge its gratitude, will be able to devise ways and means of boosting sales.

Sir, if my forecast of revenue is fulfilled and collections to reach, as I hope, the figure of £2,450,000, this will represent approximately £53,000 or 2½% more than the corresponding figure last year. It will, of course, be less than the revised 1969 figure by something like £30,000 but I cannot afford to be optimistic, the more so as on expenditure, I will inevitably be somewhat out on the wrong side. The position, therefore, is not satisfactory, and, as the House will appreciate, it will be much worse because of the implications of Marsh and Family Allowances that I have already mentioned.

I think, Sir, I should now turn to the Municipal side of the Estimates in order that the full extent of our commitments, I repeat on current trends and at present levels of expenditure and revenue, may be realised.

Now, here, Sir, I must confess that I doubt whether it would ever have been possible for me to present these Estimates had it not been for the very hard work put in by the City Treasurer and Accountant, who is now on pre-retirement leave. Mr. Hermida stayed at his post until the 30th September and in addition to compiling the Estimates for the Municipal Department was good enough to prepare a comprehensive explanatory memorandum on them in which he put forward a number of valuable suggestions. It is on his workings, his calculations and his recommendations, and on the advice given to the Minister and to me by the Heads of Departments concerned, with whom I have had long consultations, that the Estimates submitted to the House today have been based.

I should perhaps explain, Sir, that Appendix K to the printed Estimates shows the pattern in which they have in the past been prepared for consideration by the City Council. In an attempt to correlate that pattern to the Government system of accounting, the body of the Estimates contains appropriate break-downs relating to particular Departments. That, I hope, will be the form of presentation adopted in future years as I feel that it is much easier to follow. And in this connection, Sir, I would like to record my gratitude to my own Treasury staff, from the highest to the lowest, for the very great amount of work they have been called upon to do not only in translating one system of accounts into another but on the estimates as a whole.

Sir, upon the translation of City Council accounts to the Government system, and I would like to assure the House that nothing is further from my mind than to enter into the field of controversy, we find that at the 31st December, 1968, the General Revenue Balance was in debit to the extent of £66,000. After effecting the necessary adjustments on incorporation into the Government Accounting System, the figure increased by £257,000 to a total of £323,000.

Now, Sir, the Revised Estimates of Expenditure of the Municipal Department for 1969 are £1,244,000 compared with £1,272,000 at the time the estimates were framed. The Revised

Estimates of Revenue are £1,272,000 compared with an approved estimate of £1,269,000. In other words, there should be a surplus of £28,000. This, however, will be reduced by £13,000 to take account of net amounts debited direct to the General Revenue Account on 14th August, 1969, leaving a surplus of £15,000. This brings the estimated deficit in the General Revenue Balance at the end of 1969 to £308,000 which we have met from our own reserves in order to start, in the future, from scratch.

These figures reflect the overall position, after account has been taken of the results of the various working accounts. As regards these, the General Rate Account is expected to exceed the original estimates both as regards revenue and expenditure by £5,716 and £14,375 respectively. The former is due to the increase in the net annual value of rateable property in Gibraltar as a result of new constructions and alterations and improvements to existing properties. The latter is being brought about to a large extent as a result of the change in accounting procedure under which a much greater part of the programme of non-recurrent works is met out of current revenue rather than from loan funds.

The Brackish Water Account again and for the same reasons is expected to exceed both estimates of revenue and expenditure by £2,426 and £3,677 respectively. The Potable Water Account, on the other hand, will probably fail to reach both the revenue and expenditure estimates by £9,188 and £16,984 respectively—the one because of a decline in sales of water to shipping and the other principally because of the delay over the operation of the distillation plant.

On current trends it is anticipated that the Electricity Undertaking will show a small excess of £3,200 over the originally estimated revenue and a saving of £27,758 on the expenditure, of which £3,245 is in respect of recurrent items and the balance in respect of loan charges partly offset by an increased expenditure on non-recurrent works.

Finally with regard to the Telephone Account the difference over the original estimates of Revenue and Expenditure only come to £800 and £1,540 respectively, and do not therefore call for any special comments.

Let me hasten to add, however, that these figures are estimated on the basis that all the electricity and water sold, all the rates levied and all the telephone bills are paid by the 31st December, 1969. In this context, I would ask the House to bear in mind that the amount owing to the Municipality on merger was £299,000; that it is not proving at all easy to make an impact on arrears because the general public appear to be very slow in co-operating; that even if they did pay up promptly, people would still be in arrears because of the time it takes between reading a meter and sending out the bill; and that I still have to be convinced that the carry forward from the last quarter of one year into the next compensates for the loss of the fourth quarter in

that year. In these circumstances, I can only express the hope that because of the efforts being made to collect arrears, and because of the determined drive to ensure that arrears are reduced to a minimum, the final picture for 1969 will be better than we have estimated. But, as I said before, we need co-operation from all, and if we do not receive co-operation we will continue to take, as we are already taking, more stringent action.

But I am sure, Sir, that here again what the House really wants me to deal with is not the past or the present, but the future. On the recurrent side, the Estimated Expenditure of the Municipal Department for 1970 is £1,320,000, to which must be added £100,000 in respect of capital works, making a total of £1,420,000, which is £148,000 or 10% more than in 1969. This, however, is mainly due to the fact that in the past capital works would have been financed not from revenue but from the Consolidated Loans Fund. The latter, however, had no credit balance when the merger took place and it is, therefore, necessary to meet the cost from revenue. If, of course, the cost of capital works is not taken into account, the increase as between this year's estimate and last year's is just over 3% and compares with the Government side.

Following what I have done with the Government estimates proper, I do not propose to analyse the various Heads of Expenditure in detail. In any event, I am sure that this will be done for me. I feel nevertheless bound to draw the attention of the House to some of the salient features of these Estimates. In the first place, the increase is attributable mainly to two Heads. The first is the equivalent of our Public Works Non-Recurrent vote. Here, last year only £7,000 was voted to complete works under way, whereas the Revised Estimate for 1969 amounted to £77,000. In, therefore, providing £88,000 for 1970 we are £81,000 over the approved but only £11,000 over the revised figure. Secondly, there is the amount of £100,000 provided as a contribution to the Improvement and Development Fund to finance essential capital works some of which, as for example The Haven, are already under construction. Against this, however, no adjustment has been made in respect of the charges which would normally have been met from revenue in respect of the charges which would normally have been met from revenue in respect of the servicing of internal loans made out of the Consolidated Loans Fund.

I think I should also invite the attention of the House to expenditure in what is the equivalent to our Public Works Annually Recurrent vote. This at £634,000, is £17,000 over and above the 1969 provision which, I would point out, did not include the effect of implementing the Third Stage of the 1967 Marsh Report. Hence the substantial difference.

Within that figure of £634,000 it is interesting to observe that cleaning and scavenging costs nearly £80,000; that on public beaches and baths we spend £28,000; and that we spend something like £150,000 in providing fuel for the Electricity Under-

taking. Another significant figure is the provision to meet Public Debt Charges which amounts to £237,000 and which is to be charged to Recurrent Expenditure because, under the Municipal system of accounting no provision is made for sinking funds, the interest and repayment of loans being met out of the revenues of the year in which they fall due. This is a matter which will obviously require some consideration in the new year.

On the Revenue side, estimated receipts for 1970, and at the risk of becoming tedious I would again underline that these receipts are based on the assumption that everyone pays up promptly, are estimated to bring in £1,328,000. Of this amount, the General Rates, at their present level, should produce £427,000 (which is an increase of £34,000 on this year) and the number of electricity units to be sold should produce £486,000 (which is £31,000 more than in 1969).

Thus, the estimated Recurrent Revenue for 1970 at £1,328,000 should be £8,000 over the estimated Recurrent Expenditure for the year but when account is taken of capital requirements, the small surplus is converted into a deficit of £92,000 exclusive of charges in respect of internal borrowings to which I have referred earlier. Not, I am sorry to say, an encouraging prospect, bearing in mind the commitments ahead, particularly the implication of the Marsh Interim Report.

So much for the overall position. With regard to the various undertakings themselves the General Rate Account, without, however, any provision for the financing of internal borrowing, is expected to show a small surplus of £9,581 which will be converted into an adverse balance of £54,000 when the deficits of £13,438 in the Brackish Water Account and £50,143 in the Potable Water Account are transferred to the General Rate Account as envisaged in the relevant sections of the Public Health Ordinance. Electricity and Telephones too show deficits of £30,219 and £7,890 respectively. There is no reason why commercial undertakings of this nature should not be made to pay their way and I shall therefore be making proposals later in the proceedings to correct the position.

Now, Sir, if I may recap, the position at the end of 1970 should be that on the Government side we will have a deficit of £64,000 and on the Municipal side one of £92,000. But to make matters worse we have, as I have just said, other commitments.

Adoption of the Marsh Interim Report will immediately mean an increase in expenditure on the Government side of £152,000 and on the Municipal side of £68,000 so that the overall deficit thus becomes the somewhat frightening figure of £376,000 without taking account of other commitments, and if we were to meet this from the General Revenue Balance, without taking any remedial measures, we would be left at the end of 1970 with £320,000.

This is obviously a situation which calls for drastic action and once the Estimates of Expenditure have been approved by the House, under the terms of the Motion standing in my name, I intend to make proposals designed to alleviate the position.

These proposals will be related to municipal rates and charges, to direct and to indirect taxation.

Except, in so far as the Municipal Department is concerned, I have not yet, Sir, referred to the capital position overall. The Improvement and Development Fund Estimates, as printed, show an opening balance of £263,000 as against £163,000 which had originally been anticipated when the 1969 Estimates were prepared. The difference of £100,000 was due mainly to the slower rate of progress than had been anticipated on a number of C.D. & W. Schemes.

For the same reason, receipts during 1969 are now estimated to total £597,000 as against an original estimate of £1,043,000. Against this, payments are now estimated at £687,000 which is £455,000 less than we had provided for. The marked slowing down in progress on capital works, of course, being due to the withdrawal of the Spanish labour force during 1969, a matter to which, as the House is aware, we are giving very close attention and which must obviously be rectified.

Accordingly, the state of the Fund as at the 1st January, 1970, should be £173,000. Further anticipated receipts in 1970 amount to £1,175,000 but commitments are £1,257,000. The latter will be mainly on new housing principally the continued development of the Glacis, Phase II. The closing balance on 31st December, 1970, should thus be £91,000 but that is after making provision amounting to £40,000 in respect of the development of the Victoria Stadium. No specific provision has as yet been made, however, for the fifth Electricity Engine which will have to be installed in the very near future and towards which a contribution is being made from current revenues.

We have, however, a number of commitments ahead and I do not anticipate that the small remaining balance will be available for very long. It is, therefore, particularly unfortunate that we will not this year be able to inject any capital into the Fund from Government sources proper other than the amounts required for Municipal capital works.

I must therefore again repeat the warnings I have given in the past that it is essential, and indeed elementary, that we should be able to set aside some money every year from the General Revenues to apply to capital projects.

I have not, Sir, in dealing with either the recurrent or the capital aspect of the Government's finances yet made any reference to the special budgetary grant of £100,000 or the £4m. development programme recently approved by Her Majesty's Government. In so far as the first is concerned, there are quite a number of items of expenditure which the Government would have liked to insert in the draft Estimates, but which until we knew the outcome of the visit to London, could not be taken into account. It will now be necessary for the Government to consider whether any of the items actually in the Estimates are a proper

charge to that grant, which might somewhat reduce the overall deficit; or what other items can be put forward as being a proper charge to the grant and which, in turn, will otherwise increase the deficit, although it will, of course, eventually be compensated. In due course, the House will be informed.

On the capital side, I am sure that the House will appreciate that schemes have to be worked out in some considerable detail and until that is done, no provision can be made in the Improvement and Development Fund. There is a precedent for this.

Before I sit down—to rise again later—I would like, Sir, to repeat one sentence of what I said last year at the end of my Budget address. And that is that “Good administration is, in my view, mainly a question of good housekeeping and the sound administration of finance is the main factor which determines the general quality of government administration.” In the long run, there is no gainsaying that principle.

May I, Sir, thank you and the Honourable Members of the House for hearing me out so patiently and attentively. I only wish I had been the bearer of gladder tidings.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Sir, I have the honour to move that the House should resolve itself into Committee to consider the Estimates of Expenditure in detail.

This was agreed to and the House went into Committee.

The different Heads of Expenditure were then considered with the following results: —

Head I.	Audit.	} were agreed to.
Head II.	Cemeteries.	
Head III.	Ecclesiastical.	
Head V.	Electricity Undertaking.	
Head VI.	Fire Service Department.	
Head VII.	Governor.	
Head VIII.	Judicial.	
Head IX.	Lands and Works.	
Head XIII.	Law Officers.	
Head XIV.	House of Assembly and Council of Ministers.	
Head XX.	Post Office and Savings Bank.	
Head XXV.	Telephone Service.	

Head IV. Education.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, Item 4 Contribution to Scholarship Fund and I think Item 5 — Training of Teachers in the United Kingdom — could come in at the same time.

What guarantee do we have that this money that is being spent on these people is going to be to the benefit of Gibraltar?

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, the guarantee, of course, is that it was proposed and there was a selection as to what were the best scholarships to be given. That is to say, should we have one for Medical, one for Law and so on.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, that I am not querying. The previous Government's policy was that the people who received these scholarships undertook to return and serve Gibraltar for a period of three years and it was the policy of this side of the House that that period could be increased—I think to five years. However, the latest advertisements for training of teachers in particular has decreased the period to two years. This would mean that a large amount of money is spent on people who afterwards may only serve us for a period of two years and then leave Gibraltar. I feel that it would be better to go to the longer period than the shorter.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, this is true. This question that the period had been reduced came to my notice not so long ago and quite frankly I was very surprised. I entirely agree that the period should not have come down to two years. The position is now being revised in consultation with the Department; but personally I think that the period of contract should be increased, certainly from two years upwards. Whether it should be five or not I cannot at this stage say. But I myself find that two years is too little.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

I am very grateful to hear this, Sir. As a suggestion, however, perhaps it might be better for the moment to the present three years; I am sure the Minister will investigate to see whether this should be increased—our side would suggest to at least 5 years—so that we do get a return to Gibraltar for the money we have spent. Thank you, Sir.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Teacher training is three years at the moment, of course.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I would like a little clarification from the Minister on this matter. I think the policy was three years. Except for the free scholarships, the policy was return and work for three years. And the Honourable Minister has said that he has found that it has been reduced to two. Surely this was a matter of policy of the Government. Either it was decided to reduce it from a three to two and if it was so decided why is it that the Minister now feels

differently? And if it was not decided like that, then whence did the decision come from? I think there must be some confusion. I am trying to help. I am not trying to be critical. In fact the Minister's attitude has been helpful—the way we want it. But it seems to me that either his information, with respect, is incorrect or that a decision has been taken. In fact, perhaps, if I may suggest, between now and lunch adjournment we might get a little clarification. I think there is a little confusion on that side of the House and I see some Honourable Ministers assenting.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Very good, I shall certainly look into the matter.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Perhaps we could leave the matter subject to it being raised at a later stage.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Sir, I would like to say something on the general policy aspect, Mr. Speaker, as mentioned by the Honourable Mr. Featherstone to the Minister but as the matter is going to be looked into by the Honourable Minister, will raise it later on when the discussion takes place.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

There is one other point, Sir. This is a very good report. I am very pleased to see that increases are in places where it is very necessary. However, there is one point, Sir, nothing in the whole of the estimates makes any possible reference to a comprehensive system of education. Are we to take it that there will be nothing in the 1970 period on comprehensive education; in other words we are going to have one more year at least of the 11 plus?

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, this is not quite the case. I do not propose to go into any major policy speech until some aspects of the development programme, which are closely linked with the building side of the comprehensive system, have been finalised. But as soon as this comes to hand I will make a speech on future policy with particular emphasis on the comprehensive system which has considered priority in Government. I may add here that considerable work is being done by the department to be able to implement, and I understand that this is quite feasible, the system of comprehensive even without the building actually having been built. But as far as we know they are going to be built. Some sort of interim measures can be taken.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Do you foresee that this year at least the 11 plus is going to be in operation?

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

I doubt very much whether in 1970 — it is possible — but I would not like to commit myself at this stage. Certainly when I make a policy speech at a later stage you will be able to get more accurate information on this question.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Thank you very much.

Head IX. Labour and Social Security.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I said I would like to make one or two remarks. I do not think it has been the attitude of this side of the House to blow up one's department and so on, but I think that it is important that we refer to one or two things about the Department of Labour and Social Security, very briefly, because this department has got now a lot of work which it did not have before.

On the 25th September I said that I had nothing but praise for the staff of that department. I would say that I must now emphasise this: that I have nothing but the highest praise for the staff of my department which has not increased despite the fact that the work—load on that department has increased considerably. There is a review of staff being carried out and we know exactly what we would like extra, and I myself am pressing for this because I think it is becoming a little bit unfair to flog willing horses even further than they could possibly go.

Another brief comment which I would like to make is the question of accommodation of labour from abroad, which has thrown a heavy burden on my department with which it has been able to cope. The figures are roughly: 500 at Casemates and about, eventually, 80 at North Pavilion. This involves a lot of work.

The next brief point is the question of the Control of Employment Ordinance which has been allowed to lapse. I think that Gibraltar as a whole will welcome the new climate — not in the sense of the people across the way—but the new climate of industrial relations which now stands a chance of emerging.

May I say that I should deal quickly with the question of supplementary benefits. A point is that the estimated expenditure there is £105,500—an increase of £20,500 over 1969. At this point I would like to announce that in keeping with the higher wages recommended by Mr. Marsh in his interim report, it is proposed to increase the basic rates of benefit by 10% from the first week in January. This means that the rate for a person living alone will go up by 4/6 to 47/- a week. And that of a married couple by 7/- from 70/- to 77/-. In the case of persons who are living with relatives, and who for a number of years now have been drawing a flat £1 per week, it has been decided that it is time that they also should enjoy an increase. And not only

this, but that the increase should make up in some way for the several occasions on which they have remained at the present sum whilst other rates have risen. It is therefore proposed to raise the benefits in these cases by 8/6 a week to 28/6.

Government is fully aware that even these increases in the rate of supplementary benefits are far from being over generous. In fact our wish would have been to improve the lot of these people, especially the elderly, much more than we are doing. There are, however, other considerations that must be taken into account when deciding on these matters where considerable additional expenditure is involved. But I can assure the House that the rates will be kept constantly under review to be further improved upon at the earliest opportunity.

I am open to questions on the break-down of this new item of accommodation of £11,000 if the House wish a break down of this rather large new figure.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Perhaps the Minister will help if he corrects the clerical errors at the end of page 24—footnote (f). The sub-head of Revenue under which it comes is 34 and not 24.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

With respect, Sir, I would like to apologise to the House for a number of printing errors which go right through. I am sure the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition will appreciate that having had to print two sets of estimates in one, the one person who has not been popular with the Garrison Library printing works in the last few weeks is the Financial Secretary. And I think the House should be really grateful to the printing works that they have been able to do this job in the time available.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

We cannot claim that we have discovered all the printing errors, but we will point out a few now because in the end it is better so that when the printed approved estimates are published they will be avoided.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and his members would like to take notes of the ones I have we might have a joint list. I have got already on page 4, page 17, page 67, page 83, page 88, page 94 and page 95.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Alright, we will deal with that over the adjournment.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Sir, I am sure we are all extremely grateful to the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition for his useful contribution to the debate on Labour and Social Security. I, for my part, Mr. Speaker, would like to take the opportunity of.....

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I had not finished.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I am so sorry.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I am sorry. If somebody can keep count of the misprints, I am sure there will not be so many as one might have expected under the circumstances the Financial and Development Secretary has pointed out, I would like to just very briefly carry on with this Head.

The increase of £3,600—Sub-head 4. Non-Contributory Social Insurance Benefits, follows the pattern of previous years. It is due to numbers of people who continue to reach the time and age and qualify for statutory benefits.

Under Sub-head 10. Family Allowances, the draft estimates show a decrease of £500. Here I would like to pause for a moment and say that since the estimates were prepared and printed, it has been decided to increase the rate of Family Allowances. When introducing the Bill to this effect at a later stage I shall give particulars of what is proposed and what arrangements are to be followed.

I think, Sir, in the spirit which moves people in this rather crucial time, I should refrain from making any further comments on this Head.

HON. LT. COL. J. L. HOARE:

There is one editing error. This is not a contribution, it is in the interest of accuracy. Item (9) of (a) Personal Emoluments—in the Establishment 1969 column you have one clerk but you are making provision for seven.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, on the question of staff, I have said that there have been no staff increases. If I have got the question correctly this is due to increments and movement of staff.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

The Honourable Member is quite correct. This is one of the ones which I hope the other side will point out to me.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

Sir, there is very little I want to say on this particular vote as it follows the pattern of other years—even on the question of supplementary benefits. It has been the practice whenever wages have gone up to increase proportionately the rates of assistance. It is not the exercise of the Opposition to oppose or try to destroy everything the Government does; and where credit must be given, it must be given publicly. I must say that I must congratulate the Minister concerned for having been able to convince the financial wizards that at long last an increase in family allowances was due. We did our best without success—we confess our failure. And I must also give credit to the Honourable Backbencher who used to support me, apart from my colleagues, in trying to convince the top floor that family allowances was due for an increase.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear that coming from the opposite side, but perhaps the member concerned must realise that these things have got to be paid for. Maybe the last administration was not prepared to find the money to pay for this.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

May, I Sir, on a point of order, I dislike being described as a wizard. According to the Oxford Dictionary 'Wizard' is someone who indulges in occult practices. And I assure the House that I do not, Sir.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

The only point I would raise is that I am extremely glad that the Honourable Mr. Montegriffo has thought fit to give credit where credit was due, because I am very mindful of the statement by the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition on television when he said: "We shall give credit where credit is due." And I was a little surprised when the Head was read I heard the Opposition say 'No comment.' It was only at the instance of the Minister for Labour that fortunately we have been able to have a little discussion.

I join with the Honourable Mr. Montegriffo in giving well-merited praise to the Minister. I think that there can be no doubt in our minds that the new Minister of Labour has given his department an inspiration and an incentive and has produced things that mean something to the people who need them most. I think it is a matter for great pride for the new Government and I congratulate them on this — their first improvements in administration and in Government policy, has come in the region who need help most. And therefore I personally would like to congratulate the Government in voting these additional supplementary benefits, in making provision for increased family allowances, and I hope, at the risk of burdening the Minister's depart-

ment too much, in making preparations during 1970 to enable families to take holidays in England. If he does all that I think he will have achieved a very important part of the duties in his Ministry at a very early stage of the present House of Assembly. I think nobody in this House, and nobody in Gibraltar, whether he be rich or poor, will begrudge paying additional taxation in order to achieve these laudible aims. I thank you, Sir.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, may I say that I am quite overwhelmed by the praise I have received, but I would like to point out something which must be quite obvious to all Members, that one person alone can obviously achieve nothing. It is in fact a matter for congratulation for the Government as a whole; for even though one might have bright ideas, if there is no support from the Government as a whole; these things would remain unachieved.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Just on a point of clarification. When I suggested the Heads on which we had no objection, I was not, of course, preventing discussion on them. I think the Honourable Member is being facetious about these matters which are very serious.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Mr Speaker, I am terribly sorry but as I understand it, if this had been allowed to go past we would have just voted saying 'Yes' or 'No', so I am not being facetious at all. I am welcoming the opportunity of being able to debate this Head properly and as it should be done.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

All I said was we had no comments. It was up to the Government to have them and they made them. We are trying to help in expediting the work of the House.....

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr Speaker that is precisely what the Honourable Member means — that they had no comments.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Mr. Speaker, they are all explaining each other all the time.

Head IX. Labour and Social Security was agreed to.

Head X. Lands and Works.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

This new Stores Department that is going to be provided — this is under Municipality — is there going to be any attempt at merging the stores of the two administrations together?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Is the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition referring to Sub-head 33 where it says: "1 Stores Officer"?

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Yes.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

This is exactly as it stands at the moment, Sir.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Yes, I know. What I mean is, is there going to be any attempt now to try and bring the Stores Department together?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Very much so, Sir, under the Coutts report.

Head X. Lands and Works, was agreed to.

Head XI. Public Works Annually Recurrent was agreed to.

Head XII. Public Works Non-Recurrent.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I would like to refer under Head XII if the Financial Secretary considers it proper in this way, to deal with the Appendix in the summary of Non-Recurrent expenditure on the Municipal side. Or should we come to that later on?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

It is summarised for the purposes of convenience in pages 33 and 34, Sir.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Yes, but I mean the summary of the non-recurrent expenditure at page 84 — I want to draw attention to an apparent mistake, it is not just a misprint — which may or may not have substance, but I think it has substance to the tune of £5,500 in the way in which the thing is presented.

If you look at page 84, the figure for non-recurrent works in the second line is £88,351. If we add up the amount for non-recurrent works under the different Heads given at pages 81 to 83, we find that Rates provided for £20,699; Brackish Water £5,161; Potable Water £4,896.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

May I allay the fears, Sir. When I stood up this morning to say that there were errors in the printing I did refer specifically to page 83. If the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposi-

tion will allow me to give him some corrected figures, I think that if he will then add them up he will find that the addition comes out quite correctly.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

There is a difference of £5,500.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

There is, very much so. In Non-Recurrent Works in page 83—in the second line—Electricity instead of £40,540 it should be £46,040. If he will then go to the last column, instead of £37,539 that should read £43,039, which again is the £5,500 which is worrying the Honourable and Learned Leader. Similarly, when he comes to the Deficit and Surplus column at the bottom, instead of £551,464, it should read £557,464. And then in the Increase column instead of £73,983 it should be £79,483. Then immediately below in the first column, instead of £24,719 it should read £30,219. And in the final column instead of £20,573 it should read £26,073. So that in the last line it then becomes instead of £73,983, £79,483, and then £50,150. This is the £5,500. And I am very grateful to the Honourable Members opposite for having spotted it too. Thank you.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

There is something I would like to say on the Public Works Non-Recurrent vote, Sir. That is that there are an alarming number of items that were budgetted to be done in 1969 — the preponderance of which fell on the Municipality. If I may just an example: as far as the Government was concerned, there are 5 items I would like to refer to under Head XII, Government. And they are the last 5 on page 32, that is 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29, most of which have reference to water-proofing of roofs and renewal of soil pipes and various repairs to various Government properties. I notice these sums were voted to be done in 1969, and in fact not a single penny was spent on them in 1969.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, I do not think that these monies were voted to be spent in 1969.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I think that if the Honourable Member looks at his estimates he will find that that is the case. The original estimate for these particular items were: £900, £1,100, £1,300, £2,000 and £1,500. There was a revised estimate total expenditure for 31st December Nil—of this year: and they were voted for next year. Where the items are entirely new, the Honourable Member will see that there is no original estimate and no revised estimate, but purely and simply an estimate for 1970. If we are going to vote money let us make sure that we can spend it. It looks as if the monies voted in 1969 were not spent. That is only a point I would like to make and I would like some assurance from somebody that these works will in fact be carried out.

On the Municipal side

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Sir, I am afraid that this is an error on our part in the sense that it has got an original estimate and a revised estimate, but it is an entirely new estimate in respect of 1970; and no sums in respect of these works, Sir, were voted in 1969. May I allay the fear of the Honourable Member on that.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I am very grateful to the Financial Secretary for this explanation, but as regards the Municipality, is it the same as well? There is a long list of items that appear from this estimate to have been voted for by the Municipality in 1968 to be done in 1969.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

May I on that score, Sir, again allay the fears of the Honourable and Learned Member to the extent of saying that in so far as the Municipal works are concerned, these are continuing works which are started in one year — and I am sure that the Honourable Gentlemen across the way will bear me out when I say that these are continuing works which are started in one year and normally, in many cases; there is no intention, there cannot be any intention, of finalising them in the same year.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I am grateful for that explanation, Mr. Speaker. The only point I would like to make on this, is that with regard to the whole list of Municipality improvements, a great number of items, for which apparently money was voted in 1968 in making the accounts of the City Council or the estimates for the City Council for the year 1969, a large number of items was included on which not a single penny seems to have been spent although all the money was voted for—such things as improvement of public lighting, at Laguna Estate, in Corral Road and Market Place, in Rodger's Road, in Witham's Road, Landscaping of Piazza, additional planting of trees, Litter Bins, Sunshades at Little Bay — I could go on reading Sir. There are a great number of items on the Municipality vote

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

May I rise again, Sir, to answer the Honourable Member. I am no expert on Municipal affairs, Sir, but in so far as lighting is concerned, I again appeal to my Learned and Distinguished Friends across the way, that as I understand it, in certain matters, such as Electricity, there are certain things as rings which have to be done and fixed up, and they go round and cannot possibly do them in the same year. They are planned and programmed, but I am sure the Honourable Member will find that this will carry on for many years to come.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I am very grateful for that explanation. But there is an item here that says: "Total Estimated Expenditure to the 31st December 1969" and I note that there has been no expenditure

at all on all these items according to the estimates prepared by this House. I am only mentioning the items on which there appear to have been no expenditure. And I think it mounts up to some £30,000 of expenditure. There are items in the General Rate account, the Brackish Water account, the Potable Water account, in the Electricity Undertaking account and in the Telephone Service account. There seems to be quite a lot of items which were provided for in the estimates of the City Council for 1969 on which not a single penny appears to have been spent. I raise this matter as the Honourable Financial Secretary himself mentioned in the course of his budget address, we did in fact vote quite a large sum of money to put the City Council accounts right, but it does appear that they did not in fact spend the money that they said they would spend on all these particular items—in fact not a single penny. The only reason I bring this up is can I be sure that these £30,000 that we are voting for will in fact be substantially spent during 1970? If we can have no promise it seems to me to be useless to vote these sums of money.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

May, I say, Sir, that on these estimates I had very close consultations with the heads of departments concerned, and that I am assured that the estimates are realistic within the capabilities of the departmental stands to accomplish.

Head XII. Public Works Non-Recurrent was agreed to.

Head XV. Medical:

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

Sir, I do not know if the Minister concerned wants to say something about his estimates, but as far as I am concerned they are almost a replica of last year's. I appreciate that perhaps Government has not had the time to perhaps change the whole pattern. I have got no quarrel with the inclusions. I was going to have some quarrel with the omissions, but the Chief Minister this morning mentioned that the Laboratory and the Health Centre to decongest the Outpatient Clinic was being proceeded with under the Development Aid programme and that again follows the pattern of the last Government; so I have nothing to say on the estimates except to agree with them.

THE MINISTER FOR MEDICAL AND HEALTH SERVICES

(HON. J. CARUANA):

Sir, I did not quite get the trend of what the Honourable Member opposite is trying to get at. But I think he is absolutely right that at the time when I took over this Ministry, the time was drawing near to the estimates for the ensuing year and, therefore, I think that the estimates submitted had to be, necessarily, of a conservative nature. And for this reason, the estimates in front of you are very little different to those of last year—the basic requirements of the department as a whole.

We have included in these estimates the cost of new equipment which, relative to last year's, would balance out. Nevertheless they are new equipment required for the good function-

ing of the Medical Department, and I think that most of all, excluding the provision for Marsh, all-in-all I can safely assure the House that there has been no curtailments of any sort whatsoever of the facilities which are available to the public in the Medical Department. If you look at Head XV. Public Works Non-Recurrent, the requirements for minor works for the department may appear not to be very extensive but, nevertheless, within reason they include everything which is possible and reasonable to anticipate will be finished within 1970. Amongst these things I would like to point out a few because they are part and parcel of a very long list but which bear very importantly on the functioning of the Medical Department. The first of these minor improvements, minor in our way of thinking in relation to the hundreds of thousands of pounds we are talking about, nonetheless, they are very important. And that is: (a) the much needed improvements to the Sister's Quarters. (b) I think we can say, the conversion of No. 9 Castle Road into accommodation for Nurses. I think we all agree that this is something which has long been awaited and finally we will get on with it during this current year. And (c), the general improvements of the Medical Department—they are too numerous and too small nevertheless very important; and they will be included and carried out.

I think the Honourable Member opposite did mention the question of the capital works. Here, however, there are some new items which begin to reflect the new aspects of policy which, even at this very early stage, reflect the policy of this Government. After consultation with my advisers and experts in this department, these new projects are part and parcel of the development plan formulated by us and submitted to the United Kingdom Government. And I think it is up to us to be very grateful to Her Majesty's Government for having given us this money which, if I may venture to be very brave here will probably be in the region of £100,000 total expenditure for the Medical Department, which exceeds by about £50,000 the last figure allotted to the Medical Department in the last development plan. However, the other bit of construction is the question of a laboratory for the Pathological Department and also the Analytical Department. These are two things which are very essential and are at present situated across the road in very cramped and inadequate conditions—I think we all appreciate this. They are working under very strenuous circumstances, and it is high time that they were transferred to near the hospital where consultations between Analysts and Doctors is very desirable.

The other thing is the question of isolation for certain contagious diseases — epidemics will always go to Poca Roca — but other contagious diseases which it is not advisable to include in the general wards. After doing away with King George V hospital there is this vacuum: where do we put people with certain types of diseases? We cannot put them in the general wards, so provision had to be made, and it was a question of having to make a decision within 3 or 4 weeks before my colleagues went to Great Britain and provision was made. I am glad to say that in that short time we were able to get the money for that part of the

building. We hope that we will be able to economise by having the two things in the same block and, we hope, at the same time, to utilise the basement for a much needed Chapel, and I must here declare a bit of interest, Sir. A Chapel which will cater for the growing needs of the patients at St. Bernard's as the present Chapel is too small and a bit outdated. We hope that with the basement space beneath the new two-floor block to be constructed adjacent to the Mackintosh Wing with access to and fro, will render this very important service to the spiritual welfare of our patients as well.

On the question of the Health Centre, I think I have to say that when I took over this Ministry one thing which stood out—and I think my colleague opposite will bear me out—one of the major problems confronting the staff and personnel in the hospital is the congested condition of the Outpatients. Having experienced in Great Britain the advisability, and he having actually visited a Health Centre in Great Britain, I brought this idea back with me which I have kept under my hat. It is no original plan but nevertheless it had to have enough strength to push it through. I think a Health Centre in Gibraltar will, to a large extent, revolutionize the Medical services in so far as the Outpatients is concerned. And I hope that all the outpatients will come out of the hospitals where all the preventive work will be carried out. Amongst the service which we hope to provide in this Health Centre is the provision for general practitioners' services. Several clinics instead of one as we have at present in the hospital for the general medical cases. The specialist cases will naturally be referred to in the hospitals. We hope to cater also in the Health Centre for a dental service—also done at present in the hospital. We also hope to do the pharmaceutical service in the Health Centre so that this service will be given to the same patients being seen at the Health Centre.

A children's Welfare clinic is also very much in our minds. The medical officer of Health is very concerned with this question—he is very active on this and I supported him on this question. We have plans for moving the Children's Welfare Clinic, which was intended to go in the ground floor of the Haven, into the Health Centre, and make it more comprehensive. At the same time we hope to provide in the Health Centre all local health services and school services. We also hope to house in the Centre the Public Health side, where it concerns the administration, and probably the general medical administration.

I would like to take this opportunity to say, Sir, that I am sure this House will be very glad to know that tenders for the conversion of KGV Hospital into a Psychiatric Unit are expected to be invited during this current month. I think I have answered a question on the Theatre which is related to this question of going out to tender. The equipment only arrived on the 13th November when it was supposed to have arrived way back in June or July. This is unavoidable; this sort of thing happens. I am very grateful to my colleague on my right for her support in getting Lands and Works to do a tight programme to get this moving.

Here again I have done this after extensive consultation with the experts and the consultants who came in November who were very concerned as they had been in charge of the programming of this since way back in April and then it was prolonged.

I think that the House at the same time — whilst we are on the medical services—must have gathered from the local information services that is the intention of the Medical Department to run an emergency dispensary service. I am glad to have the opportunity, Sir, to make a statement on the matter. That is that on the day after I took office I found on your desk a letter from the Gibraltar Pharmaceutical Society—this was on the 12th August — telling me that on the 15th August, they had come to the conclusion, they would discontinue the voluntary night service in Gibraltar I quite naturally was very concerned and asked them to come and see me. After talking the matter over with them it was patently clear to me by the Gibraltar Pharmaceutical Society, that the system had for a number of years not worked satisfactorily. All this is on file. There have been numerous complaints. It was a question of reconciliation one way or another, nevertheless, the whole question has come to a head. The main complaint that the Chemists have had all along is that the system had been abused too many years. I think I sympathised with their predicament and I undertook to try to regularize this service without depriving the public of a service which had been in operation since 1965. There were then put forward 5 proposals by the Gibraltar Pharmaceutical Society, which I took very seriously with great concern. These were that the public should be charged a special fee for medicines obtained after hours. That the scheme should be discontinued and that the doctors be asked to call the chemist in case of emergency. That the Government should pay the chemists a lump sum to be shared by those chemists who were willing and able to participate in this scheme. That the Government should run the scheme. There was yet another alternative, and that was the question of promulgating some legislation which was drawn up back in 1965 which I considered with my colleagues and discounted this as repugnant; as I believe in the axiom that you can take a horse to water but you cannot make it drink, and I think this would have been the case with the chemists. We could have passed legislation—they took legal advice—but I am sure it would have been to no avail. The second proposal was not acceptable to me because it would bear much on the tax-payer, it would bear on the rate-payer and it would bear on the public at large. The only satisfactory solution to the problem was obviously the fourth alternative which came from the Gibraltar Pharmaceutical Society. And this was mainly that Government should run an emergency service which would be open to the public during the same hours as operated by the chemist on duty at the moment. The supply of emergency medicines will be as at present, against a doctor's prescription, and at the retail price presently charged by private chemists. I feel that this solution has the advantage that it continues to provide a service at no extra cost to the consumer and it will also be a useful exercise for a more general pharmaceutical

service to be provided at the Health Centre when it is constructed. To this end the Hall Porter's room in St. Bernard's Hospital has been very efficiently and quickly converted for this purpose. And we hope to be able so start this small dispensary as from the beginning of the new year. Details of this service will, I am sure, be made available to the public in due course. I hope, before the new year.

I think like all things, this scheme depends on the close co-operation of the public and the medical profession. I am confident, Sir, that this co-operation will be forthcoming, and that the public in particular will appreciate that the Government has taken the unusual step of undertaking what might be termed an incursion into the field of private enterprise solely for their own personal interests which for this precise reason it should not be abused.

In an endeavour to streamline and rationalize the system for ensuring the health of alien workers in Gibraltar, and that it is adequately protected, it is proposed too that as from the beginning of the year the necessary medical and radiological examination of such workers coming into Gibraltar will be centred in the Medical Department.

Sir, as Minister for Health generally I have always been very conscious of the importance of the adequate accommodation for the health of our alien workers, especially in view of current reports going out and which have caused us great concern and which we are investigating to the utmost of our capabilities. This department will very soon have available a team of enforcement officers whose duties will be to look into this whole question of alien workers: as to conditions of health; conditions of employment, security and so on. I think this is a very welcomed task for which we must be very thankful for the co-operation of the Labour and Social Welfare Department which has worked very closely with the Medical Officer of Health and myself.

As can be gathered from what I have said, 1970 promises to be a very interesting year indeed for the Medical Department; as we in the Medical and Health Department are pioneering the merger of a Central and Local Authorities in Gibraltar. It is at this point that I wish to inform the House that the Medical Officer of Health, Dr. Bacarese-Hamilton, has accepted the appointment of Director of Medical Services with whom I have been working closely since taking office. I would also like to say that Surg. Capt. E. H. Murchison has also been appointed Deputy Director of Medical Services. It is only logical to assume that the measure, by its nature, will slowly bring about changes in the administration of the department which at present are not apparent. But given time, I think we all accept this, in the light of Coutts, come about it must.

This year too, Sir, we have seen the creation of the Hospital League of Friends, and at this point I would like to end by thanking very sincerely all the voluntary bodies and individuals — friends of our hospital — whose help and assistance is so valuable to our staff and so indispensable to our patients. Thank you very much, Sir.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

This morning when I stood up it was for the purpose of giving a pat on the back to the Minister of Labour and Social Security. Now I think it is my bounden duty to stand up in reply to some of the points made by the Minister for Medical and Health Services to give a pat on the back to civil servants. And I find, without in any way trying to take away any of the magic of bringing anything out of his hat, as when the Minister referred to the Health Centre, that it was on the advice of his present advisers that the last administration agreed on the building of a Health Centre. The place earmarked for that — I do not know where it is going now — was St. George's School. That is where we were going to take and decongest the outpatient's clinics and all auxiliary services which are more appropriately given outside the hospitals so as to leave the hospitals exclusively for more academical type of medicine. But I will agree that at that particular time we did not agree, or rather the experts did not agree that the adult patients should be mixed up with the Child Welfare Clinic. I would appeal and plead with the Minister — I am not saying I am right on these things, as you very well know I must follow expert advice. But one finds oneself bedevilled when experts give different advice on different occasions; and this is the penalty one pays for being a politician; but one has to listen to advice — but I would urge and plead with him that he should enquire again whether this is the right thing. It might be the right thing, I am not criticising it, but I would plead with him to look into it again. The same thing happened with the laboratory. The laboratory had to go to the hospital as a result of the merger, some work was done, an estimate was given and it was down, as far as I was concerned, to go down in the 1970 estimates. So there again I must give a pat on the back to my previous advisers for at least having given the same advice to the Minister as they gave me, and that the present Minister is following what I was advised during my period. Thank you very much.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr Speaker, I am very pleased to hear a Member on the other side of the House praising experts. I believe this morning, the Learned Leader of the Opposition was saying something about being ruled by them.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

He is putting words into my mouth which I did not say. I am praising civil servants, the Heads of Departments and all the people that one works with and not experts — imported.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr Speaker, with all due respect, I think he used the word; 'experts'.

HON. J. CARUANA:

Mr Speaker, nevertheless I think it is no use getting hot under the collar. I am very grateful for the advice given by everybody in my department, because without the advice, without the facts, I could never have come to a definite conclusion on policy.

On the question on the Health Centre, I will challenge the member opposite to produce any piece of paper where the Health Centre has ever cropped up in the last administration. Whether it has ever been suggested and whether in fact St. George's was ever suggested as a venue. The last thing I knew I was fighting against a youth club for the site of St. George's. The Children's Welfare Clinic was intended, and the drawings are made, to go on the ground floor of The Haven. There was obviously always quite a general desire that the Outpatient's should be decongested from the general hospital. This is very much so. I think it takes a little more than that to take the thing to this stage. I have not only been able in three months to put this across to my colleagues and put all the facts of my advisers and my assistants; but I have been able to obtain well over £100,000 from Her Majesty's Government; and I can assure you, Sir, that I told my colleagues very jokingly when they went to England that if they did not bring back the money for the Health Centre, they had better not come back to Gibraltar.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I would be wrong in not expressing my appreciation to the Minister for at least telling us where at least £100,000 of the £2.8m. is going which the Chief Minister did not want to tell me this morning.

HON. J. CARUANA:

Sir, we must bear in mind that the Chief Minister made a qualification this morning, that if towards the end of the development programme of the £4m., if it was anticipated or it was not possible to complete any specific project, it could be in fact utilised on other projects. So it could well be that given the size of the projects for the Medical Department, you never know, if I press hard enough, we might get away with more.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

Sir, I am left with a challenge on my hands. If the Honourable Minister for Medical and Health Services cares to look in the files at the hospital he will find that it had not yet been released. This was sometime in March or earlier on — those papers must be available to the Minister in some file or other. I did not do the filing system, but I am sure they are in some file or other in the Medical Department or Lands and Works if they have not been lost — which I am sure they have not.

HON. J. CARUANA:

I accept that we all asked, Sir. I have asked for the moon and I cannot get it — I need an Apollo to get there. I think we have to work within reason. The scope to which we can develop the Medical Services within 1970-1973, I think, comes within what I have asked for. I could have asked for more; but what is the use of asking for more if you cannot complete it. What happens if at the end of the programme I am left with £1.2m.? That I cannot use.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I am sorry, Sir, where is this Health Centre in fact going?

HON. J. CARUANA:

You missed it. I did not in fact mention it. The Honourable Member opposite mentioned it. It is intended to go at the St. George's School site.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Sir, I thought that as a result of this discussion I was going to have some idea what that enormous monument to the last City Council was going to be used for. But it appears that the Health Centre is not going there. We are going to have it in St. George's School. Can I ask where the Youth Centre is going? I do not suppose this particular Minister can answer this.

HON. J. CARUANA:

It certainly does not concern me. I think, Sir, that the House appreciate that that is a question that affects possibly the Minister for Education. Nevertheless, on the question of priority, I think youth is uppermost in our minds, but prime sites are at a premium like turkeys. The Health Centre requires, because of the flow of patients, we will probably be dealing with anything over 200 people in one day, so therefore the site needs expansion, it needs to be on its own to design a proper flow of people coming in and out.

As to the Youth, I am sure that consideration has been given already as to the siting for Youth Clubs.

Head XV. Medical was agreed to.

Head XVI. Miscellaneous Services was agreed to.

Head XVII. Pensions.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, may I, on Subhead I, ask Government whether they intend to do anything about increasing the retiring age of members of the civil service? This is a matter which has been discussed before; and I was under the impression that it was a matter on which a lot of progress had been made. And considering that

people are living longer and having a longer working part of their lives, and also considering the shortage of labour, which to a certain extent includes clerical and others, it might not be a good opportunity for Government to consider seriously following the United Kingdom pattern and increase the retiring age for say another 5 years, both for men and women.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Sir, as the Honourable Member opposite knows, there are inherent difficulties in changing conditions of service of serving officers unless the serving officer is prepared of his own volition, to agree to a change. The Honourable Member may be aware that we have got certain legislation in hand, the effect of which is to hold out a certain amount of carrot to the officer to stay on. It is a complex piece of legislation which depends, to a certain extent, on similar legislation which has been under consideration in the United Kingdom for some time. It is a matter which my office is dealing with, and I have every intention of pursuing it. It is also a matter which I intend to refer at a very early opportunity to the Labour Planning Committee of which I happen to be the Chairman.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

I am very grateful to the Hon. Member. I would just like to add two things. One is to remind him that if a scheme like this were to be implemented the chances of promotion would not be stopped but delayed for a number of years. And may I also ask him whether it would be difficult to implement this idea with new entrants to the service?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

It would not, of course, be difficult to implement with new entrants, and I am very well aware of the wisdom of his words.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Thank you.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, may I say, in a more general context, that the Honourable Financial and Development Secretary is responsible for the service and so on; but in the wider context, this is certainly the object of my own department. That is, to try and convince employers to take on people who have passed the age of 60 and who are still fit enough and can do a fair day's work. And as the Honourable and Financial Secretary has said, in the case of the Labour Planning Committee, it is my intention, once the Productivity Committee really gets under way, to submit this to them as well.

Head XVII. Pensions was agreed to.

Head XVIII. Police.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Just one point, Sir, that I would like to raise on that Head. The establishment is 182 and provision is made for 161 Recruits and Constables—footnote (e). I know there are difficulties in obtaining recruits, but what if the position were to improve during the year?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

If the position were to improve during the year, Sir, I would obviously be bound to come to the House and ask for supplementary provision.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

The establishment remains as it is?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Oh yes. There is no change in the establishment.

Head XVIII. Police was agreed to.

Head XIX. Port.

HON. MAJOR A. J. GACHE:

Sir, I would just like to draw attention to two items of expenditure. One is under (b) item 10 of the revised estimate for 1969, that is £14,775. You will readily see that the approved estimate for 1969 was £21,574. The decrease is due to the revision of rents agreed in 1969 with retrospective effect to 1967. This is in respect of rent which is paid to M.O.D. (Navy) for the use of the North Mole and part of the Detached Mole. We are hoping, and representations have been made to M.O.D. (Navy), for them to agree to waive future charges. It is felt that we should not, certainly not the Government of Gibraltar, pay rent to the M.O.D., whether it is the Navy or any other department, for the use of property or land in Gibraltar. If this should happen, it would be of great assistance to recurrent budget. If it does not, and we sincerely hope that there will be agreement, then there is a revision during 1970 when it is hoped we will get a further reduction. But I will stress again that we anticipate getting these charges waived. However, in so far as the £14,775 is concerned, I am sure this House would like to know that the Financial and Development Secretary will be putting up a case at least for the waiving of this £14,775 against the £100,000 which was approved by Her Majesty's Government towards recurrent expenditure.

The next item which I would like to refer to is item (14). In this case it is the estimate for 1970 of £8,578. This is for Running of Passenger Tender Service. The maintenance of this service at a cost of £8,578, for the limited use it has — that is eight vessels in 1969, and an anticipated use of three vessels in 1970 — is everyone I am sure will agree, uneconomical. Consideration will be given, early in 1970, to the question of its retention. In the

Estimates however, we have had to allow for a full crew which would give a wage bill of £3,453 for the year. However, owing to the fact that the vessel is scarcely used, we propose to reduce the crew to the minimum required for maintenance purposes, that is: three men full time plus overtime as necessary. This is expected to furnish a saving in the region of £1,600. We shall also carry out the minimum repairs in dry-docking that are necessary in order to preserve the vessel in a fit state to be used with a statutory Passenger Certificate. But I cannot say whether or not we shall be able to reduce the dry-docking expenses below the £4,000 anticipated. I would ask the House to take note of the current running expenses in relation to what it would have cost the Government by way of subsidy had the tender remained under private ownership. For 1969 the total subsidy would have amounted, I understand, to £12,091. This was made up as follows: Basic subsidy at £5,542 per annum. Then there was a subsidy due to the discontinuance of the Italia Line of £6,030. Then there was extra income concession on depreciation of £519. This came to a total of £12,091. I should mention that the amount of this subsidy was based on the estimated amount of earnings which, in the event, did not materialise because no sooner had the previous administration bought the Mons- Abyla the ships that used to anchor in the bay started to come alongside and we were not able to collect the fees. As I have already stated, this matter will be investigated early in 1970. We shall then be in a better position as we shall have the full anticipated business for the vessel in 1970; and we shall also have available the Feasibility Study regarding the development of the Western Arm. However, when the extension of the wharf is carried out — and we sincerely hope it will be — and this is out of the way, I must make it clear that to dispose of the Mons Abyla would have to be considered because, if at any time liners were to resume regular calls at Gibraltar, the period of turn-around does not usually allow for them to come alongside. Thank you, Sir.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, the Honourable Minister has mentioned the reduction of Ministry of Defence rent on the Western Arm. Can he tell us if he sees any possibility of the Ministry of Defence rental charges on the storage of oil being reduced so that the price of oil bunkers can be reduced in Gibraltar and we can attract ships from other places?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

The question of the charges Sir, in so far as the Government is concerned, is for negotiation as between the Government and the Ministry of Defence. We have, by negotiating our own charges with the Ministry tried, so to speak, to set the pattern for others to follow in our footsteps and do their own negotiations.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, do I take it then that negotiations will carry on so that the Ministry of Defence may feel inclined to reduce their charges?

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

The Government is concerned, Sir, under the agreement entered into with the Ministry of Defence. The existing charges are due for re-negotiation with effect from the 1st January, 1970. One would hope that other people would similarly do their own negotiations. As the Member knows we have ourselves tried to put our little bit of help.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, I only hope that the Ministry will decrease it that little bit. It needs it, I am afraid.

HON. MAJOR A. J. GACHE:

Sir, we will certainly support whichever side tries to lower the charges to attract more shipping to Gibraltar.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Thank you, Sir.

Head XIX. Port was agreed to.

Head XVI. Tourist Office.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, I notice that under item 19 the amount of £34,400 for advertising, Public relations and Field Sales has remained intact. May I ask, in view of the fact that another 430 beds have been added to our tourist industry by the completion of the Both Worlds scheme, if the Minister does not think that this addition of 430 beds, which amounts to about 33% of our previous capacity, would have justified an increase in our advertising expenditure?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

No, Sir. I do not know if the Honourable Member is aware that this year, for instance, Cooks have published something like a million-and-a-quarter Brochures on Gibraltar. Exchange Travel have increased their advertising and so has the Bland Cadogan Group. In the circumstances the expense of £34,400 for this year is more than justified.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Is not the Minister aware of the fact that the advertising done by the Gibraltar Tourist Office has been the most effective

of all; and that an increase in our own advertising would be a really good investment considering particularly that we have another 33½% beds to sell and fill?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Sir, I considered £34,400 on advertising in Gibraltar for 1970 to be quite sufficient and ample, even though we may have more beds in the coming year.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Well, let us hope that the results are good. I would be the first to be happy if the results are really good as the Minister thinks.

May I just put one little question on this question of Public Relations. Does this item include any expenses by Public Relations undertaken when the Chief Minister and his party visited United Kingdom? I understand that Public Relations did help in the promotion of that visit.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

These are the estimates for next year, not this year, Mr. Speaker. It could not have been included, surely.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Sir, they are expenses which would have been incurred this year.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Of course.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

I mean so that I am able to establish a comparison between next year's estimate and this year's.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

The breakdown of the Sub-head includes £4,250 for the firm mentioned by the Honourable Member, which is a slight increase of £250 as compared with this year. But this is the estimate for 1970.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

What I have in mind is that money voted for tourist promotion should not be used on anything else — even on the visit of our Chief Minister.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Member have any objection if any fraction of that money has been utilised for obtaining what I consider to be about £6m. for Gibraltar. That is if something had to be taken out of that?

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

I have no objection whatever in any amount of money being spent on the visit of our Chief Minister to United Kingdom, but I do object to money voted for tourist promotion being spent in any other way.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, does not the Honourable Member realise that the fact that I have been there, and that people have been speaking about Gibraltar in connection with my visit itself, is a tremendous tourist promotion?

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Is the Chief Minister trying to tell us that his visit to United Kingdom promotes tourism to Gibraltar and brings in more people to spend two weeks here? I refuse to believe it.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would say most certainly so. In fact we got lots and lots of free adverts in the press because of that.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Wishful thinking, Sir.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

A matter of great importance is raised here. Of course, if the Government now in a position to spend money on public relations for the visit of Ministers to the United Kingdom, it is perfectly proper — nothing about it. But let us not mix the issues. If there is going to be promotion for visits of Ministers to England, let it appear in the estimates as such, and let it not be used under a vote which has been made for other purposes. Whether a visit of a Minister to England promotes or does not promote tourism, he did not go there on tourism promotion. And therefore it is essential that money that is voted for one purpose should be spent for that purpose. I am sure that the Financial Secretary will agree that from the point of view of audit this is absolutely essential.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition knows that the visit of the Chief Minister to England is not a weekly or monthly, or even sometimes a yearly business. Therefore, it is impossible to provide in the estimates for an occasion that we cannot know it is going to take place.

The Honourable and Learned Member must know that when we do spend money on such items it will come out as a supplementary estimate.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

No, Sir, this is not satisfactory. And it is not good enough to say that you do not anticipate. You make a provision in the estimate for £1 — a nominal amount — in order to be able to say that the House has given authority for that money to be spent on those promotions. But if you do not provide for that you cannot spend it out of another vote — this is absolutely essential. And, therefore, I would not object to having a provision in any other of the headings that we have agreed, for proposals of promoting visits of Ministers in the public interest of Gibraltar. We were not allowed to do that in the past, except that public relations in England touched on foreign affairs. The domestic issues had not been defined as they are now, under the new constitution, and therefore we can see the difference in approach in the possibility of it coming within that. But let us, if we are going to have any money spent on promotion of Ministers, which is proper these days, I do not disregard that at all — let us make provision from the proper vote and not from a vote taken on something else. This is just a matter of principle. I would urge the Chief Minister, before he answers any question on this on the spur of the moment, to think about it seriously; it is meant in the best interest of public spending.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would be quite honestly very interested in finding out how the Learned Leader of the Opposition used to do it in his days

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

At my own expense.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

An extraordinary proposition to put forward, Mr. Speaker, by the Honourable Member of the Opposition.

The Chief Minister goes to London with a delegation and he is not entitled to use the services at the disposal of the Gibraltar Government. It is an extraordinary proposition. I have never heard.....

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

On a point of order, Sir. This is not what we have said, Sir.

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

I am arguing on the estimates before the House and the comments that have been made. I am not raising a point of order. I am just remarking on the extraordinary propositions that have been put forward. I have never heard any inhibitions

to previous delegations to using all the services available to the Government in London. The Tourist Office was at the disposal of previous delegations and everybody connected with the public relations side of the Government was at such a disposal. And I remember the Minister of Public Relations specifically accompanying a delegation at public expense. Surely it must be in the interest of Gibraltar that when the Chief Minister travels to London he should have every facility and everything available to Government to promote his visit. Of course there can be no question about it, that the Chief Minister of whatever Government Gibraltar may have at the time, is probably the greatest promotion Gibraltar can have in London. He gets free press, free publicity — for which the Tourist Office and the Public Relations pay too much money in my view — and he gets quoted in all the national newspapers. What more publicity can Gibraltar have than a visit of the Chief Minister to London? I wish he did it every month — we would not need a tourist vote.

Sir, I was about to suggest — but in deference to the person holding the seat of Minister of Tourism I will not — cuts in expenditure in the tourist department. It is an extraordinary proposition the Honourable Mr. Serfaty puts forward: that because we have 430 beds we must increase the amount spent on advertising. When one considers that the Government maintains a tourist office in England at enormous expense, and spends £34,000 on advertising some 1,500 beds in Gibraltar, is that not enough, Sir, by any standards? Can the Honourable Member opposite, who has made this extraordinary proposition, give me one instance, in any part of the Commonwealth, even in England itself where there is a similar spending per head of population on tourist promotion and advertising? I would be very surprised to hear if there was one. But, in view of the fact that I support the Government, I will have pleasure in supporting the vote.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

The Honourable and Learned Backbencher may be surprised to hear that the cost to the Gibraltar Tourist Office per visitor is much less than most other countries in the world.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I am very glad to hear it, Mr. Speaker; but I doubt it.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

He can believe what he likes.

Mr. Speaker, on item 23, may I — just on a pure matter of information — know why the estimate for literature has so considerably been reduced from £3,500 to £600?

HON. W. M. ISOLA:

Yes Sir. I can answer that quite easily. Literature ordered for £3,500 was a vast quantity. Next year this literature will be used again. Therefore, only £600 has been estimated for next year. Mostly, I think, to deal with literature on a foreign language which was not done previously.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

I am quite satisfied. I am not laughing at the answer.
(Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point I would like to mention here which I might have taken up under Public Works Non-Recurrent vote: I understand that the Airport is going to be enlarged. I see no mention of it any where in these estimates. May I enquire if this work is going to be carried out and under what vote?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, this is in fact one of the items that we hope to bring under the £4 m. from Great Britain.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Mr. Speaker, may I get an assurance that before this scheme is proceeded with, we of the Opposition will have a chance of having a look at it? I have a hunch that the scheme which has been prepared will not meet our satisfaction.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think I can put the Honourable Member at ease. Of course we shall give an opportunity to them to have a look at the plans.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Thank you very much.

Head XXVI. Tourist Office was agreed to.

Heads XXVII. Town Planning and XXVIII. Improvement and Development Fund were agreed to.

HEAD IV. EDUCATION (contd.)

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

The question, Sir, of the considerable sum of money that is being spent on the Scholarship Fund and Training of Teachers. It was brought up this morning that the period for which advertisements had recently stated applicants had to contract to return and work in Gibraltar had been reduced from the previous time of three years to two years. I think the Minister said in answer to my colleague on my left, that he would inquire into this during the lunch period and give us a statement on it.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, it appears that Scholarships from 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968, have been at two years all the time. It appears to me that in some particular paper there was a reference made about increasing the period from three to five years; but this seems to be wrong. We have been checking on the contracts of different people and all of them have been for two years. So this question of an increase from three to five years was wrong. The suggestion might have been made from two to five years, but not from three to five. I agree it is recorded as three to five, but there is no contract showing it was for three years — not for scholarships. For teacher training it is three and continues to be three.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

You say that members who take scholarships are only bound to return for two years?

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

That is the position since 1964.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I think we had better inquire a little more into this. I am not disputing the fact, but it will be recalled that at some time we even passed an Ordinance to be able to make it beyond any doubt that there was a statutory right, whatever the contract, for the Government and the City Council — as it then was — to impose conditions of this nature in order that the bulk of the money spent on scholarships, the benefit would be derived in Gibraltar. And I am quite sure that this was done at the time on the clear understanding that it was three years. I am not disputing the information now being given by the Honourable Minister, but it seems to me that somewhere there must be something that could clear up this matter. Happy as we are to leave it at that now; between now and the next meeting we can clear the matter either by getting together or he can make a statement subsequently.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, I would certainly be quite happy, as I said this morning, to go into this question. I personally am in favour of going for three years. I do not know about increasing it much further. Perhaps one should agree on the terms of one year contract for each of training — this seems to be fairly satisfactory — as long as we keep it from three years downwards. If we go above three years it could very well happen that we might have a doctor coming back, we can tie him down for say five years, but if that man is not happy, the results would not be good for the community. So there is some flexibility here.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I agree, but what I am mentioning now is the factual finding of what has happened before — this is the important thing. The

policy we can decide and look at the various aspects, but it is the factual situation. I see the Financial Secretary nodding. He may have been under the same impression in respect of this. I certainly have been under the impression that generally it was a three year contract to all scholarships.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

I was certainly under the impression, Sir, that it was three years. It is something that we will have to look into.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

If I may draw on my experience, Sir, in this matter. The Ordinance that was in fact passed in the previous Legislative Council related to enforcing contracts entered into with the Government, not with changing the conditions in those contracts. And the policy was not necessarily three years for everything. For instance, as far as the City Council was concerned, it was five years for inspectors. As far as teachers it was three years. One year bursaries was only one year, although it had been two years before. There was in fact no set rule. The problem usually arose in connection with the training of teachers. And that, of course, was a problem which most Members used to focus their attention because of the problems there were at one time with them. In their case it has always been three years. But I would not like the House to get the impression that this was a uniform rule applicable to all scholarships granted by the Government; because it was not.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I may just put in a word here in a very general way again, on the question of what is a fair contract. It is my own feeling, without in any way being dogmatic about a matter which is not directly my concern, that there should be no discrimination if possible between one profession and another profession. Some attempt should be made to level things out so that some people do not feel themselves to be victimised. I would very much support, however, my colleague's point that the contract should not be allowed to extend — certainly in those cases where it is under three years — to over three years. I think that it is important that people should stay in Gibraltar of their own volition as much as possible; and balance the two principles: that the community should get an adequate minimum return for the investment in education, but also that the community should recognise its obligation to provide for the development and fulfilment of the aptitudes of its members.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

I think the only slight possibility in the consideration might be that the time, although one does not want to differentiate automatically, of the contract for which they agree to serve should bear some relation to the money being spent on the person. If the person goes for something which is very expen-

sive for the Colony, then the return should, I think, be greater to the Colony than the person who costs very little. Otherwise we go along very much with the general principles as suggested by the Honourable Minister for Labour.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, perhaps I can summarise this by saying that there are different aspects on this question of scholarships which should be gone into with great care — there are many relevant points which should be studied.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Sir, there is a point which the Honourable Mr. Featherstone has raised which causes me some alarm, having regard to the policy put forward by the AACR during the elections.

I thought there was general support on the Opposition benches with the principles being propounded by the Minister of Labour. But I sensed, in what the Honourable Mr. Featherstone said, when he was talking in proportion to the money spent by the community on the individual and the time he came back, a feeling that the period should be lengthier. I do hope he is not, in effect, putting forward what I would call the preposterous position that was put forward in the AACR manifesto: that people benefitting from scholarships, should have to pay back the money spent on them over a period of 20 years, unless they stayed in Gibraltar those 20 years. To my mind that would be preposterous. I am sure all Honourable Members, in this modern world and age, would agree that the social services are services that the Government owes to its people. It would be intolerable to suggest that the person who has the ability and the brain to obtain further qualifications and to be a credit to the community, should be tied down to that community in this particular way of having to serve in that community 20 years. This is not done, I think, in any of the Western democracies: and I hope that it is not suggested for one second, in what the Honourable Mr. Featherstone has said, that we should tend towards such a policy; because personally, and I am sure certainly the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Education, and all those connected with the social services, would object strongly to such a policy being the policy of a Government in Gibraltar.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

What the Honourable Mr. Isola senses, and what are the true facts, may be completely different to each other. What we put in our electoral programme, we will either raise as a substantive motion from the Opposition side, or we will try to implement when we are in power. At the moment we are simply discussing the estimates. And in the present instance I have neither stated that we wished to increase the time nor decrease it. I think, as the Honourable Minister for Education has accepted, what we are suggesting is that the whole thing should be looked at on

its merits. But I would give a word of warning to whoever considers this; we do not want, in our zeal for assisting people to obtain higher education, to fall into certain traps of the unscrupulous person who is willing to go at public expense, possibly study something else at the time, come back and break his contract at the shortest possible opportunity. It is because we have had examples of this in the past, that we wish to have care in the future.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, without disputing that most good things in life are open to abuse, yet, the general principle is surely established that the community does owe people the chance to develop. And, therefore, I hold entirely with the Honourable and Learned Member on this side of the House, that it is important to dispel any fears that anything at all like what was proposed in the AACR manifesto, is being entertained at all by this Government. I myself hold rather strong views against the proposal that a person should pay for his education and serve, if necessary, the next 20 years. Surely we should not be guided by one, or two, or three, or four unscrupulous people, but should try to formulate rules according to reason and good sense.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think I owe it to the Government to stand up and declare, very categorically, that this Government will not support or undertake any measure which curtails the freedom of the individual. I think proof of this was the way we allowed the Ordinance controlling employment to lapse. And I assure you that we cannot associate ourselves with the Honourable Mr. Featherstone, if his idea is to compel individuals to serve in Gibraltar for 20 years.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Sir, once again we are back to the stage of the Honourable Chief Minister coming out with his panic stations appeal. Nothing whatsoever has been said of any of the ideas suggested by the Honourable Peter Isola and even aided and abetted by the Hon. Minister for Labour. We put forward in our manifesto some ideas. Before they came to the actual House they would be looked into. A committee could even study them. But there is no need for panic calls now by the Honourable Chief Minister, once again. He seems to have a habit of this — to deny things that do not even exist. The position as I say, Sir, is quite simple. We have suggested to the Honourable Minister for Education, on the question of scholarships, that the period of time which a person should contract to serve in Gibraltar, if he obtains a scholarship, should be looked into. That this should be looked into, partly dependant on the type of scholarship, on the amount of money that is spent on such a scholarship. We have said nothing more, Sir. There is no need for any panic calls from anybody. There is no need to give any assurances. We could play the same game. We could suddenly say: assur-

ances on the question of housing, etc. — that we are not going to support this unless the 750 houses are built within the period of three years. All this question of putting up something and denying it, when it has never even been raised, is simply a political weapon which it appears the Honourable Chief Minister is trying to exploit at every opportunity. All he needs to do is to come back to the basic statement I have just made, that when the Minister for Education looks into this, he takes into consideration the points I have raised. Nothing further has been mentioned whatsoever from this side.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to see that he obviously does not hold by what he said in the manifesto.

Head IV. Education was agreed to.

Resumption.

House resumed.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to report that the Estimates for 1970 have been considered in Committee and agreed to without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now propose the question which is that this House approve the Estimates of Expenditure for 1970.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Sir, on previous occasions the Financial Secretary has made the statement on the financial policy of the Government and the measures that he had proposed to deal with the situation. On this occasion he has chosen to do it separately. I do not think that any useful purpose would be served to have a general debate on the estimates which have been, except for remarks here and there, tacitly agreed by the whole House. And any remarks on the estimates as they may be reflected in any measures that may be brought forward by the Financial Secretary will be left till later. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by having a debate on the estimates without knowing how the amount required is going to be raised.

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

I do not think I can agree with the proposition that has now been put forward by the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition. The Financial Secretary's address deals with the policy of the Government, as I understand it, on expenditure for the year 1970. I think that it is at this stage that the Honourable Members will no doubt wish to congratulate, or criticise the

Government, for their policy in expenditure for 1970. The issue of how you are going to pay for this policy is a separate issue. If what the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition is saying in effect, is that they might not be prepared to vote this expenditure without knowing what revenue measures the Government has in mind, one can only assume from that, that the Opposition are not in fact supporting, as they have done in the different Heads, the general aspects of policy as have been disclosed in the estimates of expenditure of the Government for 1970. I do not know whether they have a policy on expenditure for the different departments for 1970. Judging from their election manifesto of 1969, it did appear that they had some policy and I would have thought that they would have taken this opportunity to propose to the people, or to propound to the House, their Party policy, and their Party's observations on the expenditure estimates for the Colony for 1970. It is true that this also can be done through newspapers; and perhaps it will be there that we will find out the real feelings, and the real views, of the Members of the Opposition on the policy of the Government as put forward for 1970. If that is not to be the case, I can only assume, in view of the fact that none of the Members opposite appear to be interested in taking part in a debate on the Government's policy for expenditure for 1970, that they are in full agreement with all the measures proposed by the Gibraltar Government for expenditure for 1970, and the policy implications thereof. If that is so, I am very glad. And I am sure we all are, that we have been able to reach some sort of unity towards the end of 1969. Whether it is so or not, I do not know, time alone will tell. But I certainly, Sir, would want to take this opportunity to associate myself with the policy of the Government for 1970. I think this has been an interesting budget statement. I think the Financial Secretary's address was most illuminating, without being too detailed on matters that are perhaps not of tremendous interest to Members of the House who have made themselves fully acquainted with the estimates for 1970. And I think that we have been presented with a picture of a Gibraltar, in 1970, which is going to meet some difficulty. I never take the same view as the Financial Secretary, who always looks depressingly forward into the following year. Or rather, looks forward into the following year with a certain amount of depression.

I think there are two items of revenue that obviously call for comment in the coming year, two items of revenue on which we have seen a drop, and which does not augur too well for the commercial side of Gibraltar for 1970. I have noticed an actual drop in customs in 1968. But on the other hand it is possible that with the intense speculation there has been about the budget measures to be taken to rectify the position in 1970, it may be that the Financial Secretary finds himself with a happy windfall during this month of December. I see he is smiling. I am sure he has already had figures right up to date of the duty that has been paid on a great variety of goods which people suspect, or it is rumoured, may come under the tax burden.

In the Port I see too a drop in fees; but I am glad to see that it has been explained to a certain extent by the Financial Secretary, by the fact that we are waiving fees to ships that come alongside the wharves. Therefore, Sir, looking at the revenue estimates of the Financial Secretary for 1970, it does appear to me that the economy is holding well. And that the reason for additional expenditure really springs from a desire by the Government to improve standards of living and improve the lot of the community in 1970. In other words, although I think we need not have had any measures of taxation at all, on the present manner on which revenues are coming, it is quite obvious that we want to improve and expand the social services.

If you want to bring a better standard of living to your people, you must be prepared to take measures to do so and therefore that must inevitably result in increased expenditure for the Government. Because, if one looks at the two items of expenditure — principle expenditure in our deficit — they relate mainly to the increase of wages that have just been announced or have occurred, which will bring the very large section of the community a better wage or salary, thus going some way to justify the promise of this Government, when it was first formed that it would seek improvements for those who needed them most. And, therefore, we have seen, and we must welcome, a programme of expenditure for 1970 which has as its first priority the worker; the old person; the publicly assisted person; the big family man; family allowances; and the person who will have to be helped inevitably if he is to go on a holiday and get away from Gibraltar. These are the striking features of the expenditure budget. And I think it is a matter for congratulations for the Government, that they have had a policy and have followed it.

I do not think there is any reason for anybody to fear that the Government, in doing this, is in any way thwarting the efforts of the community to improve themselves, and indeed, trying to prevent the progress of the rest of the community. The duty of the Government first is to help those that need help. But I hope, and I am sure, that during 1970 policies will be produced and put into effect that will increase the wealth of the community as a whole — that will bring the economy to higher standards for everybody. And I am, of course, referring to policies in relation to tourism, communications, development and policies generally, that will be of great benefit to the private sector of the economy as well as to the official and public sectors. In fact, I am sure that this will be so; I can think of a great number of things, but I will not burden the House with telling them now. A great number of things could be done to ensure that the economy flourishes and becomes an economy of which we can all be proud. My only general comment, as I said, on the estimates as presented by the Government is, that they have, in the four months period of office, got down to it and done some of the things that they said they would do. And this is a matter, I think, that will be a sign to the people of Gibraltar that the

present Government means business. That when the present Government says: we shall consider and will do this, they do not consider for too long before doing it. This is, I think, a good start for the 1970s for Gibraltar. And I would have thought that the Honourable Members of the Opposition, having regard to the general agreement they have shown to the estimates of expenditure for 1970, would have taken the opportunity to welcome them.

In the expenditure also, the Financial Secretary made his remarks, and stated in his statement about the help that was being received by the people of Gibraltar from the British Government. I would have expected the Members of the Opposition to have welcomed this, and to have thanked the Chief Minister and his delegates for the excellent work they did in London, and not cross-examine them as to whether it was £2.8 m. or £1.2 m. that was needed for housing in a programme which the previous Government unfortunately — I suppose for very good reasons — failed to fulfil. But, I would certainly like to debate the statement of the Chief Minister; but the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition has declined to debate it on the adjournment as was suggested by us. As I have been deprived of the opportunity of doing so, I would like to take this opportunity of saying to the Chief Minister and those who accompanied him: congratulations for a job well done. And at the same time, Sir, stating publicly the appreciation of the people of Gibraltar for the biggest grant that to my knowledge has ever been given to the people of Gibraltar by a British Government.

The Honourable Members opposite smile, but I can remember — and I have a memory that goes back not many years but it certainly goes back to 1965 when I visited London with the present Leader of the Opposition — and there we were granted by Mrs. Barbara Castle a grant of £1m. and £200,000 Exchequer loan funds. Of that grant of £1m. we got, £400,000 or £600,000, I do not quite remember the figure, was a revote. We did not come back to Gibraltar saying it was a re-vote. We said we got a grant from the British Government of £1m. because that money had lapsed. If you do not spend the money in the time they give you it lapses. The only other time the Gibraltar Government got money during the last four years was an agreement in principle by the British Government to a Development plan of £2.2m. of which the late Colonial Secretary, Mr. Frederick Lee, gave us £600,000 as an instalment. Later on the British Government agreed to provide finance, or loan assistance, up to the sum of £600,000 for hotels — but that was loan assistance — most of which was not taken up. So we had a total grant, if my memory serves me right, of £1m. and £2.2m. exactly, over the five years; and we were not able to spend £1.2m. in that time. So that the British Government having seen that record of spending, for the British Government to have been convinced by the present delegation that it was right and proper that they should agree to

give Gibraltar £4m. in aid for a period of three years, is truly generous and truly a tribute to the work of the negotiations in London. Let us not belittle their efforts for political or Party reasons. And let us not throw any doubt either, Sir, on the generosity of the British Government, and throw back the money at them as if it was peanuts. It is not peanuts. It is a substantial sum; and the people of Gibraltar themselves will judge over the period of the next three years, the magnitude of the aid and assistance that has been given by the British Government to Gibraltar.

I want an opportunity to say this, Sir, because unfortunately the Members of the Opposition talk about the Government having been in power six or seven months — actually it is less, as we all know — but in all this time all they have done in this House is to ask questions. We have not had a single motion suggesting constructive measures for the labour improvement of Gibraltar. I remember the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition saying on television: “We shall be constructive”, well, let us have some construction, Sir. Let us not remain like that building over there all our lives. And I would have hoped that by now we would have had an opportunity by motions put by the Opposition to discuss Government policy. An opportunity to hear what the Opposition have to say about it, and not always have to rely on the Gibraltar Post for the views of the A.A.C.R. on matters concerning Gibraltar’s affairs where we have not an opportunity to argue and answer.

It seems to me, Sir, that we are due for a period of time in this House of Assembly, where the Government puts forward policies and the Opposition ask an opportunity to debate them and never in fact take the opportunity — which is obviously open to them under our present Standing Rules and Orders. I did not intend to speak so much on this aspect of it, Sir. I am inevitably drawn into this because I do feel that it was extremely mean of the Opposition, after a statement from the Chief Minister, to decline an invitation to debate it at the adjournment of this House, and give us all an opportunity to say what we really felt on the visit to London. Not only on the financial matters, to which I have had to keep myself on this address, but on the other aspects of the visit to London; which received a certain amount of publicity in the local newspaper and, on which the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition, as I understand, having had a tape recording of what he said on television, had to say about it. It would have been a good thing, I think, to have had a debate on the adjournment. It would have been a good thing for Gibraltar to have heard what the Honourable Members felt about the visit to London. It is a pity they did not take the opportunity and allow us to debate these issues that are of fundamental importance to Gibraltar, and not keep them for the headlines of a certain newspaper.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will conclude by saying that I support entirely the measures for expenditure put forward by the Gov-

ernment, and congratulate them on having got up to date so quickly on the matters that affect the welfare of our community in Gibraltar. I thank you, Sir. (Applause and tapping on table).

MR. SPEAKER:

I now put the question which is that this House approve the Estimates of Expenditure for 1970.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to make a point of personal explanation and repeat something I said this morning. I shall conduct the affairs on the side of the Opposition the way I consider in my own judgment to be the right one and not the way the last speaker does, however much he may provoke me.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to prolong this, but I think one point should be made clear. Whatever the efforts of the people who went to negotiate this grant from the British Government, I think that the Opposition as Gibraltarians are duty bound, if they approve the enormous grant given by Her Majesty's Government, to approve this grant and say they welcome it, and side with the Government on this and say that they are grateful for the support Her Majesty's Government has given. They have spared no effort at all — knowing that our capacity for production had been weakened by the withdrawal of Spanish labour — nevertheless, they have done everything in their power to put things in such a way, as is obvious from the joint communique released so that we are able to be flexible and spend as much money on as many fronts as we possibly can. This is the spirit of the constitution and, I think, this is something for which all Gibraltarians should be grateful. I am sorry that the Members opposite, because of one thing or another, do not want to say the words, that they are grateful to Her Majesty's Government for providing this £4 m. grant, plus the £100,000 in special grants.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

Sir, it is not that we are grateful or are not grateful, of course we are grateful. If we get a penny we are also grateful. The point we are trying to make is that the Government has not got a development plan for £4 m. The fact is that of those £4 m., £1.2 m. is to pay for the work commenced under the development plan of the last Government. And this is the point that we have been trying to make, that the whole development plan amounts to £2.8m., and in the present circumstances, when prices have gone up, the aid compares very favourably — perhaps unfavourably — with the £2.2 m. or £2.4 m. that was mentioned before that the other Government got. That is all we

wanted to make. If you want us to say: "Thank you,, mum", yes, we do say so: "Thank you mummy for having given us £2.8 m."

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Mr. Montegriffo referring to the new penny or to the old penny?

HON. MAJOR A. J. GACHE:

Mr. Speaker, we seem to be bandying millions about here as we bandy pennies. We seem to have heard that during the previous development programme the late administration received £2.2 m. and a loan of £600,000. This administration now says, and indeed it has been said, came back from London with £4 m. It is said that of this £4 m., £1.2 m. was a re-vote, or came over from the previous administration. Well, we cannot have the £1.2 m. on both sides — and we seem to have them on both — and therefore, since it is a re-vote, all right, let us scrap the £1.2 m. on both sides, and what are we left with? That the previous development programme was £1 m., and the present development programme is £2.8 m. And by whatever way you look at it, that is in fact what it is.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Will somebody explain to me, because again I must stress that it is unfortunate that there is no Minister for Economic Development; or am I to take it that the Chief Minister is the Minister for Economic Development?

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I take full responsibility for Economic Development.

HON. A. W. SERFATY:

Will you kindly answer this one. These 750 flats — whatever the Hon. Minister for Housing says are going to cost more than £3 m., perhaps nearly £4 m. The Chief Minister said the other day on television, and he is quite right, that these schemes take a long time to plan, and a long time to get started. He also said this morning, that if he cannot spend the money on the 750 houses in these three years, the British Government would agree to other schemes being implemented. I would like to know from the Chief Minister, as Minister for Economic Development, how is he going to set about all this? Is he going to start preparing schemes for all these projects now? Or will it be too late in twelve or eighteen months time when he feels and sees that it is going to be too late to build the 750 flats in three years? I would like to know what his thinking is on this, because I am not happy about it — really I am not.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, as I said before — and I think the Honourable Backbencher said very clearly before, all these matters could have been cleared if, as suggested by the Honourable Mr. Isola, they had had a debate on these issues I am prepared, very willingly, to answer his questions at this late hour although they are not connected with the debate that we are having now. I also would like, Mr. Speaker, with the agreement of the Opposition, not to count this as my participation in this debate. Otherwise I would like to wait until later on. If this is agreeable to both sides of the House, I will give the Honourable Member a good answer to that one.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

The Chief Minister this morning, Mr. Speaker, refused to tell me how he was going to spend the money. He said he wasn't ready, and I said that I would then discuss the matter in a debate at a later stage. We have had a revelation . . .

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is speaking twice in this debate.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I am standing up on a point of order. The Chief Minister has provoked . . .

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

With respect, Mr. Speaker, I did not provoke it. It was provoked by a Member of the Opposition.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I am being accused now of not wanting a debate — this is a point of personal explanation . . . (Cries of Order, order.)

Order, is for you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, order. I believe this is on a matter of personal explanation.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Absolutely. All I am saying now is that this morning I asked the Chief Minister for details of the programme to have a debate. He refused to give them to me. He said later on that they were not yet finalised. Then, by a stroke of luck, we were able to know that £100,000 is for a particular project, which the Minister for Medical and Health Services gave.

I am giving a personal explanation, Mr. Speaker, and it is for Mr. Speaker to rule, and perhaps Mr. Isola will cease being the attempted Speaker and the Chief Minister . . .

HON. P. J. ISOLA:

Order. The Honourable Mr. Isola

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

I beg your pardon. The Honourable Backbencher. (Laughter).

And it is because he is not ready to discuss all the items that we do not want a debate until we have all the details. If this is going to be a congratulatory club each one banging at the other — then we are not going to be a party of that club.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the Learned and Honourable Leader of the Opposition. We have given them every opportunity to hold a debate. In fact, he was assuming that I was going to say things, of course, that I cannot say. All I was going to explain to the Honourable Mr. Serfaty was that he is completely under a misapprehension if he believes that the 750 houses necessarily form part of the £4m. These houses may, or may not, form part of the £4 m. In fact, it may come to much more than the £4 m. in the end. This is what the Members of the Opposition do not seem to have understood, or do not want to understand. I think they are just trying to belittle the whole gift from Great Britain. I think they seem to be rather envious, more than co-operative, on something which is good for Gibraltar. Going back to the Honourable Member, Mr. Serfaty, the position is that we have £4 m. to spend on such items as we may be able to spend within the next four years. It may not be possible to build 750 houses. We may only have built 200 houses by the time the four years are up, or even less. But yet, the British Government has committed itself to 750 houses. Which means, that any money left over from the 100 houses, if we were to build 100 houses, can be spent on something else. And therefore we are in the difficult position at the moment of being unable to say on what items we can allocate the money to. But one thing is certain — and I think this will please him even more — and that is, that the British Government has agreed, and all this is in the statement; I am just repeating what I said in the statement, this is nothing new — the British Government has committed itself to give us a firm of top consultants who will come out and help us in getting on with the different schemes. It is only after we have been able to get expert advice — on which I believe now the Opposition is beginning to have a little more faith than this morning — when we get this expert advice that the Government will be in a position to start crystalizing, in figures, the different projects. I think that the Opposition must realise that we have only been in Government four months, and so far we have had one million for each month in office, which I think is jolly good going. (Laughter).

But I can go even further if we take account of the Reclamation Viaduct — which is a jolly good piece of land to have in

Gibraltar, and which I believe the Opposition, when they were in Government, had been after for many years. Now we have it, for the good of Gibraltar and if we realise that that in itself has a value of about £2 m. I think the figure begins to £4 m. plus £2 m. plus 750 houses.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

And another two months in office, at a million a month.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Maybe we shall be another four years in office if the Opposition can do no better than it is doing up to now.

HON. M. K. FEATHERSTONE:

Mr. Speaker, I did not quite hear the last statement. Will the Honourable Chief Minister correct me if I am wrong. He said we have £4 m. plus another £2 m. plus 750 houses.

HON. CHIEF MINISTER:

Mr. Speaker, shall I go through all this again? I am not being cross-examined now. I am trying to give an explanation. If the Honourable Member wants to get away with an answer which is not a true one just by saying 'Yes' or 'No', of course, he is just cheating himself and nobody else. What I am trying to say is, that we have £4 m. to spend on Gibraltar in the next three years on such schemes as we might be able to develop from now till then. And in them are included 750 houses. If, unfortunately, we cannot spend the money on 750 houses, we shall spend it on other schemes if we can do so, because it is physically impossible to build them. The commitment of the British Government is that even if we do not build the 750 houses, and we spend the £4 m. they are committed to 750 houses.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, to clarify the House on this, I should remind the House of the first statement I made to the present House of Assembly.

I think this is as much a technical thing as anything else. For instance, if one is going to use prefabricated or industrialised methods, one needs a bulk contract as I explained at very great length in that statement. If one is going to have a bulk contract — big bulk — then surely the building programme must extend over a number of years. Therefore, what the 750 flats represents, is the commitment of the British Government to a housing programme of such dimensions that the biggest builders will be attracted to it. As with housing, so with other things. Technical considerations are important. Of course, the British Government could have given £10 m. or £20 m. and said build for the next 20 years. But the British Government

does not do things in that way. It says: here is aid for three years — three years is the figure. Therefore, so as not to turn down any, and I repeat any of our plans, what the British Government said is: fine, as far as housing is concerned, we are going to give you commitment to a big contract so that you can go to the contractors and say: 'Look, you have the site, you have the commitment to this money for so many houses, start building, and if you do not finish in three years', well — as one man said — we are not going to leave the houses without any roofs. This is obvious. So too with other programmes. I think the Opposition finds it rather difficult to understand because, as I explained in the statement of the 25th September, this is a new method which was invaluable in getting the British Government to recognize that it is much more convenient to Gibraltar, and if for Gibraltar the first consideration is to build the houses, to build the schools and so on, it is much more convenient to have grants on a longer term — with longer term commitment. Therefore, the Honourable Chief Minister is perfectly right in saying that it is £4 m. for the projects which can be covered in those years, but these are but the tips of icebergs. These can be extended over a certain period, and so the phrase: 'commitment to this and commitment to that', appears continuously in the communique. And, to prove also that the programme is a comprehensive thing, and that we intend to have serial tendering and serial programming, because of this, the figure must be a big one and we must have centralized control from consultants. So, too, technical advisers must come; it is down in the communique if Honourable Members opposite care to read it. And will come to expedite this building programme. There are very important new principles here. One is the principle of flexibility in the use of money, and the second is the principal — no less important — of continuity. That we do not have to stop short as we have after the end of the last development programme and say: 'right, what are we going to build now, we have to wait so many months, see what is going to happen, what we are going to build and so on'. This is the fault not of this Government but of the last Government, if I may say so. If we had had this principle of continuity accepted already, we would not waste time in planing future projects. So, far from belittling and trying to find loopholes in the method with which the present Government has tackled the problem, I think Members opposite should realize that this is a tremendous advance. It means that the next Government, whoever that might be, can carry on, it does not have to wait and think where is the site. You have the Admiralty site there. You have a method. You have the people established. You have the workers at work. We have experience in that kind of work and this can be continued. To try to divide the number of projects into the number of pounds is not realistic in this case. Because if you do that you are not paying attention, due attention, to the principles of continuity. So I appeal to the Members opposite, if they are not trying to belittle the one given by Her Majesty's Government, to understand why the development programme was couched in these par-

ticular terms, and why the development programme was pushed forward with this method of building. This has a bearing on how much we can do at once — which is the other argument brought forward by the Government. Well, we can do as many things as we like at once as long as we have the money to pay for the workers. How much money do we have? We have for the next three years £4 m.

HON. A. P. MONTEGRIFFO:

£1.2 m. whether one likes it or not, has to be allocated to the scheme started at Glacis. So that cannot form part of the development plan, we have got to pay for those. It is committed.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I am grateful to clarify any point. This was announced too in my statement of the 25th September. The principle was announced as concurrent building. Here is the twist. If we had not been prepared to go for big programmes, we might have had to wait until the present building was finished before we started anything else. This is not what the Government intends to do. You say the present housing will take up so much of the money. Well, is there any guarantee that we will spend all the rest of the money that is left in the three years. There is a lot of planning to be done mostly because it was not planned by the last Government. And I feel that even accepting the argument, which I do not, but accepting for a moment the argument the Honourable Member has put forward, if we were to spend all this money — the remaining money — surely, on the thought that I put forward before, is the British Government having committed itself to 750 flats going to cut that in half if we have built a school in the meantime and seem a bit short on houses, if the method of producing houses has gone faster than the building of the school? This is not so, Sir. It is important to realise that we have £4 m. for the next three years. We can use them on project such as Mr. Montegriffo's. We can also start new projects. And if we run out of money, I ask Members opposite: will the British Government honour its commitment to, for instance, the 750 flats? Yes, it will. It says so in the communique. Will it honour its commitment to comprehensive? Yes, it will. It says so in the communique: Therefore, Sir, it is not £4 m. plus Admiralty, it is also a very firm commitment in various things — mainly on housing and in schools which appears on that communique. And this adds up to a great deal more than £4 m.

Mr. Speaker then put the question which was resolved in the affirmative.

The matter was accordingly carried.

Investment and Development Fund.

HON. FINANCIAL AND DEVELOPMENT SECRETARY:

Mr. Speaker, I promise I shall be very brief. I referred during the course of my address on the Estimates to the services

to be met from current revenue and to the schemes to be financed from the Improvement and Development Fund. No expenditure, however, can be incurred under either of these heads until the necessary authority to do so has been given by the House. I shall deal with the recurrent budget in due course, when the Appropriation Bill is dealt with. But in the case of the Improvement and Development Fund, formal resolution of the House is required. I accordingly, Sir, move that this House approve the expenditure in 1970 of £1,257,161 from the Improvement and Development Fund for the purposes set out in Appendix G to the Estimates of Expenditure for 1970.

Mr. Speaker then invited discussion on the motion.

There being no response Mr. Speaker then put the question which was resolved in the affirmative.

The motion was accordingly carried.

The Genocide Ordinance, 1969.

First Reading.

The Honourable the Attorney-General moved that a Bill entitled "An Ordinance to provide for the punishment of the crime of genocide" be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker then put the question which was resolved in the affirmative.

The Bill was read a first time.

Second Reading.

HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

Sir, I have the honour to move that this Bill be read a second time. In 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a convention on the subject of the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Over the years, Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have found themselves in something of a difficulty in relation to this convention. This difficulty arose from the conflict of principle between the British tradition on the one hand of granting political asylum to refugees and at the same time their desire to accede to the convention with which they agreed in principle. In particular, the main difficulty faced by successive Governments in the United Kingdom, stemmed from Article 7 of the convention, which provides that offences of genocide shall not be considered as political crimes for the purposes of extradition. It was thought that this provision, together with the wide definition of 'genocide', and this is to be found in our Bill, as extended by the list of related offences, which will be found in Article 3 of the convention, might place unacceptable limits on the right to grant political asylum. Her Majesty's Government have, however, recently come to the conclusion that this is not an insuperable obstacle; and accordingly they enacted in the early part of this year the Genocide Act of 1969 which received the Royal Assent on the 27th March. It is the intention of Her Majesty's Government in

the United Kingdom to accede to this convention as soon as possible. Under the Extradition Act of 1870, and subsequent Acts and the Fugitive Offenders Act of 1967, genocide is now an extraditable offence. The enactment of the Bill, which is now before the House, will enable the convention to be extended to Gibraltar. The wording of the Bill before the House is taken, word for word, from the corresponding provisions of the United Kingdom Act. It is shorter than the United Kingdom Act because that Act was required to be rather more extensive. It had to amend the Extradition Act, the Fugitive Offenders Act, the Army Act, the Naval Discipline Act and the Air Force Act, and the County Courts Act as applicable to Northern Ireland. We were only required to create the crime of genocide in terms of the convention, and that is what this Bill seeks to do.

Sir, I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. Speaker then invited discussion on the general principles of the Bill.

There being no response Mr. Speaker then put the question which was resolved in the affirmative.

The Bill was read a second time.

HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

Sir, I beg to give notice that the Committee Stage and Third Reading of the Bill will be taken at a subsequent meeting of the House.

The Criminal Justice Administration (Amendment)

(No. 2) Ordinance 1969.

The Honourable the Attorney-General moved that a Bill entitled "An Ordinance to amend the Criminal Justice Administration Ordinance (Cap. 36)" be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker then put the question which was resolved in the affirmative.

The Bill was read a first time.

Second Reading.

HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

Sir, I have the honour to move that this Bill be read a second time. This Bill, I should explain, has two objects. It is, clearly, a very short document. The first object is to amend Section 156 of the Criminal Justice Administration Ordinance to bring it into line with the corresponding provisions of Section 2 of the Criminal Appeal Act 1968, which has been reproduced in Section 17 of the Gibraltar Court of Appeal Bill which is at present before this House. The amendment is intended to ensure that the Supreme Court, on hearing an Appeal from the Magis-

trates' Court, and the Court of Appeal on hearing an appeal from the Supreme Court in its Appellate jurisdiction, will take the same considerations into account in assessing the merits of the Appeal. This amendment, which is now before the House, is clearly consequential upon the Court of Appeal Ordinance which has been agreed in principle by the House. The second object is achieved by the amendment made by clause 3 of this Bill which enables a court to order the passport of a person to be impounded when that person is remanded or released on bail. At the present moment there is no power in the court to order a defendant to surrender his passport. And it is considered that this is a desirable and proper step to have available to the courts.

Sir, I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. Speaker then invited discussion on the general principles of the Bill.

There being no response Mr. Speaker then put the question which was resolved in the affirmative.

The Bill was read a second time.

HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

Sir, I beg to give notice that the Committee Stage and Third Reading of this Bill will be taken at a subsequent meeting of this House.

The Children and Young Persons (Employment — Temporary Provisions) (Amendment) Ordinance, 1969.

THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION AND RECREATION:

Sir, I have the honour to move the suspension of Standing Orders Nos. 29 and 30 in relation to the Children and Young Persons (Employment — Temporary Provisions) (Amendment) Bill, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER:

I now put the question which is that Standing Orders Nos. 29 and 30 should be suspended in relation to the Children and Young Persons (Employment — Temporary Provisions) (Amendment) Bill, 1969.

This was agreed to.

The Honourable the Minister for Education and Recreation moved that a Bill entitled "An Ordinance to amend the Children and Young Persons (Employment — Temporary Provisions) Ordinance, 1969" be read a first time.

Mr. Speaker then put the question which was resolved in the affirmative.

The Bill was read a first time.

Second Reading.

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, I have the honour to move that this Bill be now read a second time. Sir, as Honourable Members are aware, this is really an extension to a Bill which was passed about six months ago. I will be very brief because I am sure all Honourable Members of the House are aware of the objects and reasons for this Bill. I will just go very briefly through the main points. In the first place, Sir, the main object of this Bill is to give the Youth Employment Officer power to fix a rate of remuneration per hour, if it appears to him that a child or young person in employment for which no minimum wage has been prescribed, is not receiving a fair and reasonable rate of remuneration. The employer, of course, Sir, has the power to appeal to the Director of Labour and Social Security. Another point, I would like to bring to the notice of the Members is that in addition employers, by virtue of this Bill, will have to make a return giving particulars of employment, including those of wages and working hours to the Youth Employment Officer. Another important aspect of this Bill, Sir, is, that children who are attending school cannot be employed for a period longer than two hours — and certainly not for more than five-and-a-half days a week. These, Sir, cover the main items in this Bill.

Sir, I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. Speaker then invited discussion on the general principles of the Bill.

HON. SIR JOSHUA HASSAN:

Sir, when the temporary original Bill was produced here immediately after the withdrawal of Spanish labour, when there was fear that young people were offering themselves for employment were being exploited, we said, at the time, that this would be only of a temporary nature and that work had already started on more permanent legislation for the protection of youths. I am glad that the temporary Ordinance must have been working reasonably well; and I hope that in the time the extension has been given now, the six months extension, there will be time between now and then to produce a comprehensive Ordinance providing for the proper protection of young persons in employment.

HON. M. XIBERRAS:

Sir, I entirely sympathise with most of what the Honourable and Learned Leader of the Opposition has said. This matter, I am sure, is in the mind of my Colleague. I simply speak now because I am allowed to speak once on this, and I think I should.

This involves the Education Department and the Department of Labour. There is, I must report, increasingly good relations between the departments in this particular aspect, and the departments have co-operated on a number of questions

especially on the proposed Industrial Training Ordinance. However, what I wanted to say is that this existing Ordinance seems to me to be very much a temporary thing. I agree with this. Perhaps one of the most important things that could be done to improve the control, which is obviously desirable, is to extend the powers of inspection of the Youth Officer and, in fact, his powers generally. This is very much under consideration, I take it, especially in relation to the work of the Education Commission. I am told that in fact it has got near the drafting stage already. But I support my Honourable colleague in this extension of the present law — whatever its shortcomings,

HON. L. DEVINCENZI:

Sir, very briefly, this Bill will certainly be of a temporary nature. Perhaps it is not a perfect Bill but, as the Honourable Mr Xiberras has mentioned, they are working on the Education Ordinance, and when this has been finalized, which will be early next year, this Bill could perhaps be cancelled — this is possible, I am sure — and revert to the more permanent nature of one under the Education Ordinance which would cover it very adequately.

Mr. Speaker then put the question which was resolved in the affirmative.

The Bill was read a second time.

The Honourable the Minister for Education proposed that the Committee Stage and Third Reading of the Bill should be taken at a later stage in the meeting.

This was agreed to.

HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to move that this House should resolve itself into Committee to consider the next six Bills clause by clause.

This was agreed to and the House went into Committee.

House in Committee.

The Price Control (Amendment) Ordinance, 1969.

The Bill passed the Committee without amendment.

The Overseas Service (Amendment) Ordinance, 1969.

The Bill passed the Committee without amendment.

The Gibraltar Court of Appeal Ordinance, 1969.

Clauses 1 — 5 were agreed to and stood part of the Bill.

Clause 6. The Hon. Attorney-General moved that clause 6 be amended by deleting the words "Court of Appeal for Gibraltar" in lines 2 and 3 and replacing them by the words: "The Seal of the Court of Appeal for Gibraltar."

This was agreed to and the clause as amended stood part of the Bill.