

ORAL

NO. 1 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – ALLOCATION PROCEDURES**

Can Government state if they are now in a position to make an announcement of the major reforms to the Housing Allocation procedures that they referred to in answer to Question No. 2055 of 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Not yet.

**NO. 2 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – MINOR WORKS**

Can Government state how many Government tenants are currently listed as requiring work to be done in their homes by the Housing Department as landlords?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

The total number of Government tenants currently listed as requiring response maintenance work to be done in their homes is 1,722.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 2 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can the Minister tell me if in that figure of 1,722 the Department makes any distinction between pensioners and elderly people who need work done to them?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Reports emanating from pensioners requesting response maintenance type of work are normally prioritised but also it would all depend as well whether they are an emergency, urgent, very urgent, routine, but normally they tend to get prioritised and that is taken into account by the Reporting Office.

ORAL

**NO. 3 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – APPLICANTS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many applicants on the Housing Waiting List to date are medically recommended giving the breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 4 of 2005.

**NO. 4 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – PERSONS MEDICALLY RECOMMENDED**

Can Government state how many persons to date are medically recommended, excluding those that are described as applicants on the Housing Waiting List, giving a breakdown of their medical category?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

There are 43 housing applicants who are medically recommended. The breakdown is as follows:

Medical 'A'	-	15
Medical 'B'	-	12
Medical 'C'	-	16

There are also 217 persons medically recommended excluding those who are also applicants. The breakdown is as follows:

Medical 'A'	-	83
Medical 'B'	-	56
Medical 'C'	-	78

ORAL

NO. 5 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – PRE-WAR FLATS**

Can Government state how many pre-war housing units have been allocated to date since the end of November 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

A total of eight pre-war housing units have been allocated to date since the end of November 2004.

ORAL

NO. 6 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – PRE-LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the pre-list for housing to date giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Answered together with Question No. 7 of 2005.

NO. 7 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – WAITING LIST**

Can Government state how many applicants are on the Housing Waiting List to date, giving a breakdown of their flat requirements?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

There are 502 applicants on the pre-list. The breakdown is as follows:

1RKB	-	303
2RKB	-	43
3RKB	-	102
4RKB	-	49
5RKB	-	4
6RKB	-	1

In addition to that there are 650 applicants on the waiting list. The breakdown is as follows:

1RKB	-	376
2RKB	-	48
3RKB	-	146
4RKB	-	68
5RKB	-	10
6RKB	-	2

ORAL

NO. 8 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – NUMBER OF REPOSSESSED FLATS**

Can Government state how many Government flats were repossessed in the financial year 2004/2005 giving a breakdown of pre-war and post-war?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

A total of 15 flats were repossessed and the breakdown is as follows:

Pre-war	-	5
Post-war	-	10

ORAL

NO. 9 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households on full rent relief for the financial year 2004/2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Answered together with Question Nos. 10 to 13 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 10 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that had the level of rent relief reduced for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 9 and 11 to 13 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 11 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households on rent relief that had this benefit terminated during the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 9, 10 and 12 to 13 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 12 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that received rent relief in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 9 to 11 and 13 of 2005.

**NO. 13 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – RENT RELIEF**

Can Government state what is the final figure of households that applied for rent relief in the financial year 2004/2005 and how many of these were approved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 9**

A total of 185 households were on full rent relief for the financial year 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question No. 10**

A total of 365 households had their level of rent relief reduced for the financial year 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question No. 11**

A total of 149 households had their rent relief benefit terminated in the financial year 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question No. 12**

A total of 802 households received rent relief in the financial year 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question No. 13**

The total number of households that applied for rent relief in the financial year 2004/2005 was 77 of which 66 were approved.

ORAL

NO. 14 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**HOUSING – ARREARS OF RENT**

Can Government state how many tenants entered into agreements to pay arrears of rent during the financial year 2004/2005 and what was the total of arrears covered by such arrangements?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

A total of 167 tenants entered into an agreement of rent arrears in the financial year 2004/2005. The total amount of arrears covered by such agreement is £804,607.65.

**NO. 15 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 9A CRUTCHETT’S RAMP**

Can Government state if they are aware of the dilapidated state of the landings and main stairways of the Government housing units known as “9A Crutchett’s Ramp”?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Yes, Government are aware.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 15 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is there any plan that Government have to remedy this?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Temporary measures were introduced and the situation is being monitored. This is already included in the wider plan maintenance strategy being implemented by Government.

**ORAL**

**NO. 16 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government state what is the composition of the Housing Advisory Council established in October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

Answered together with Question No. 17 of 2005.

**NO. 17 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government state how many times the Housing Advisory Council has met since its first meeting in October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING**

**Answer to Question No. 16**

The composition of the Housing Advisory Council is as follows:

- The Minister for Housing who is the Chairman;
- The Minister for the Environment, Roads and Utilities;
- The Principal Housing Officer;
- The Chief Technical Officer of the Technical Services Department;
- The Chief Executive of Buildings & Works; and representatives from the Association of Private Landlords, Association of Private Estates, Government Housing Tenants Associations, Action for Housing and the Gibraltar Bankers Association.

**Answer to Question No. 17**

The Housing Advisory Council has met on two occasions.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 16 AND 17 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Can the Minister tell me if one of the purposes of this Council is to advise, to monitor and maybe to look at pricing in the housing market in Gibraltar?

**HON J J NETTO:**

Yes I can confirm that.

ORAL

NO. 18 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUILDINGS & WORKS DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state what progress has been made in the discussions taking place with the Unions regarding the movement of the workforce of Buildings & Works Department into a proposed authority?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HOUSING

Discussions are on-going.

ORAL

**NO. 19 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state how many of the persons receiving Social Assistance in respect of each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 have been employed since and how many are still receiving Social Assistance giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 20 to 22 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 20 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state how many of the persons receiving social assistance in respect of each month of the first quarter of 2005 have been employed since and how many are still receiving social assistance, giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 19 and 21 to 22 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 21 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving Social Assistance for each month of the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 2004 giving a breakdown of age and sex?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 19 to 20 and 22 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 22 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

Can Government state what was the number of persons receiving Social Assistance for each month of the first quarter of 2005 giving a breakdown of age and sex?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 22/2005**

Answer to Question No. 19

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE FOURTH QUARTER OF 2004**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 4 2004	Oct-04	199	286	485	82	153	114	136
	Nov-04	197	290	487	81	152	116	138
	Dec-04	197	292	489	88	150	114	137

**PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING THE FOURTH QUARTER 2004**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 4 2004	Oct-04	4	2	6	2	1	2	1
	Nov-04	11	3	14	2	4	7	1
	Dec-04	3	2	5	1	3	1	0

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 20TH APRIL 2005**

AS AT	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
20-Apr-05	184	292	476	70	151	119	136

....contd...

**Contd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 22 OF 2005**

Answer to Question No. 20

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE FIRST QUARTER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 1 2005	Jan-05	200	294	494	86	152	116	140
	Feb-05	189	294	483	77	153	116	137
	Mar-05	194	291	485	80	149	120	136

**PERSONS EMPLOYED DURING THE FIRST QUARTER 2005**

QTR	MONTH	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
QTR 1 2005	Jan-05	4	0	4	0	1	2	1
	Feb-05	8	0	8	3	3	1	1
	Mar-05	5	3	8	3	2	2	1

**PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE AS AT 20TH APRIL 2005**

AS AT	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
20-Apr-05	184	292	476	70	151	119	136

...contd....

**Contd..ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 22/2005**

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 21 AND 22 OF 2005**

**PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE 4TH QUARTER OF 2004 AND 1ST QUARTER OF 2005 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE.**

2004	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
OCTOBER	199	286	485	82	153	114	136
NOVEMBER	197	290	487	81	152	116	138
DECEMBER	197	292	489	88	150	114	137

2005	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL	18/25	26/35	36/45	46/60
JANUARY	200	294	494	86	152	116	140
FEBRUARY	189	294	483	77	153	116	137
MARCH	194	291	485	80	149	120	136

ORAL

**NO. 23 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a Disability Allowance under the Social Assistance arrangements for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 giving a breakdown of their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question No. 24 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 24 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL ASSISTANCE – DISABILITY ALLOWANCE**

Can Government state how many persons were in receipt of a Disability Allowance under the Social Assistance arrangements for each month of the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2005 giving a breakdown of their age and sex?

**ANSWER**

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

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

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 24/2005**

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 23 and 24

**PERSONS RECEIVING DISABILITY ALLOWANCE FOR EACH MONTH OF THE 4TH QUARTER OF 2004 AND 1ST QUARTER OF 2005 BY MONTH, SEX AND AGE**

Months	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	Total	Male	Female
Oct-04	26	28	21	13	16	10	0	114	81	33
Nov-04	27	28	21	13	16	10	0	115	81	34
Dec-04	26	29	21	12	17	10	0	115	81	34

Months	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	Total	Male	Female
Jan-05	25	30	21	12	17	10	0	115	81	34
Feb-05	25	29	22	11	18	10	0	115	81	34
Mar-05	25	29	22	11	18	10	0	115	81	34

ORAL

**NO. 25 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund, giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners showing the number of Gibraltar/UK nationals, Moroccans and other nationals for each month?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 26 to 30 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 26 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the number of pensioners being paid or with entitlement to payment in each month of the first quarter of 2005 from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving a breakdown of pre-1969 Spanish pensioners and locally funded pensioners, showing the number of Gibraltar/UK nationals, Moroccans and other nationals for each month?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 25 and 27 to 30 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 27 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 25, 26 and 28 to 30 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 28 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the first quarter of 2005 showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

Answered together with Question Nos. 25 to 27 and 29 to 30 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 29 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 25 to 28 and 30 of 2005.

**NO. 30 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN/CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what transfers have been made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund giving the amounts for each month of the first quarter of 2005?

**ANSWER**

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

**Answer to Question Nos. 25 to 28**

I hand the hon Member lists giving the information requested in Question Nos. 25 to 28.

**Answer to Question Nos. 29 and 30**

The transfers made from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund to the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month in the 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter of 2004 and 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter of 2005 are as follows:

October 2004	-	£900,000
November 2004	-	£850,000
December 2004	-	£1,350,000
January 2005	-	£600,000
February 2005	-	£850,000
March 2005	-	£900,000

**ANSWER TO QUESTION 30/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 25/ 2005**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from Oct 2004 – Dec 2004.

	<b>OCT-04</b>	<b>NOV- 04</b>	<b>DEC- 04</b>
<b><i>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</i></b>	6431	6415	6385
<b><i>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</i></b>	4912	4936	4941
<b><i>Moroccan Pensioners</i></b>	1511	1510	1512
<b><i>Other Nationalities</i></b>	431	434	437
<b>Total</b>	<b>13285</b>	<b>13295</b>	<b>13275</b>

...Contd....

**Contd. ANSWER TO QUESTION NO.30/2005**

**Answer to Question No. 26/ 2005**

The following pensioners were in receipt of payments from the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund from Jan 2005 – Mar 2005.

	<b>JAN-05</b>	<b>FEB- 05</b>	<b>MAR- 05</b>
<b><i>Pre-1969 Spanish Pensioners</i></b>	6371	6336	6299
<b><i>British Pensioners (Gib/UK Nat.)</i></b>	4941	4959	4961
<b><i>Moroccan Pensioners</i></b>	1569	1607	1626
<b><i>Other Nationalities</i></b>	443	449	444
<b>Total</b>	<b>13324</b>	<b>13351</b>	<b>13330</b>

.....Contd.....

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 30**

Answer to Question Nos. 27 and 28

The income, expenditure and balance of the Closed Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005, showing the amount from UK and local funds and the expenditure to former Spanish workers and to pensioners from local funds is as follows:

**CLOSED LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

	<u>31-Oct-04</u>	<u>30-Nov-04</u>	<u>31-Dec-04</u>	<u>31-Jan-05</u>	<u>28-Feb-05</u>	<u>31-Mar-05</u>
<b>Fund Account -</b>						
<b>Opening Balance</b>	<u>£866,646</u>	<u>£589,677</u>	<u>£526,132</u>	<u>£871,654</u>	<u>£559,427</u>	<u>£550,651</u>
<b>"Local Account"</b>						
Opening Balance	£72,107	£85,987	£67,911	£229,374	£73,831	£39,927
<u>Add</u>						
Transfers from the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund	£900,000	£850,000	£1,350,000	£600,000	£850,000	£900,000
Other Receipts	<u>£2,566</u>	<u>£2,091</u>	<u>£588</u>	<u>£1,343</u>	<u>£1,791</u>	<u>£3,989</u>
	<u>£974,673</u>	<u>£938,078</u>	<u>£1,418,499</u>	<u>£830,717</u>	<u>£925,622</u>	<u>£943,916</u>
<u>Less</u>						
Pension Payments	<u>(£888,686)</u>	<u>(£870,167)</u>	<u>(£1,189,125)</u>	<u>(£756,886)</u>	<u>(£885,695)</u>	<u>(£928,768)</u>
Closing Balance	<u>£85,987</u>	<u>£67,911</u>	<u>£229,374</u>	<u>£73,831</u>	<u>£39,927</u>	<u>£15,148</u>
<b>"Spanish Account"</b>						
Opening Balance	£794,539	£503,690	£458,221	£642,280	£485,596	£510,724
<u>Add</u>						
Receipts from DFID	<u>£40,000</u>	<u>£90,000</u>	<u>£1,480,000</u>	<u>£20,000</u>	<u>£170,000</u>	<u>£1,010,000</u>
	<u>£834,539</u>	<u>£593,690</u>	<u>£1,938,221</u>	<u>£662,280</u>	<u>£655,596</u>	<u>£1,520,724</u>
<u>Less</u>						
Pension Payments	<u>(£330,849)</u>	<u>(£135,469)</u>	<u>(£1,295,941)</u>	<u>(£176,684)</u>	<u>(£144,872)</u>	<u>(£1,060,870)</u>
Closing Balance	<u>£503,690</u>	<u>£458,221</u>	<u>£642,280</u>	<u>£485,596</u>	<u>£510,724</u>	<u>£459,854</u>
<b>Fund Account</b>						
<b>Closing Balance</b>	<u>£589,677</u>	<u>£526,132</u>	<u>£871,654</u>	<u>£559,427</u>	<u>£550,651</u>	<u>£475,002</u>

ORAL

NO. 31 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the fourth quarter of 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

Answered together with Question No. 32 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 32 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – SHORT-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Short Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the first quarter of 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

I hand the hon Member a statement with the information requested.

### **ANSWER TO QUESTION 32**

Answer to Question 31 and 32

The income, expenditure and balance of the Short-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005 is as follows:

#### **SOCIAL INSURANCE (SHORT-TERM BENEFITS) FUND**

	<u>31-Oct-04</u>	<u>30-Nov-04</u>	<u>31-Dec-04</u>	<u>31-Jan-05</u>	<u>28-Feb-05</u>	<u>31-Mar-05</u>
<b><u>Fund Account -</u></b>						
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£6,005,597	£5,970,078	£5,957,947	£5,933,080	£5,960,064	£5,962,202
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Receipts	£46,315	£46,284	£43,558	£90,439	£84,179	£194,684
	<u>£6,051,912</u>	<u>£6,016,362</u>	<u>£6,001,505</u>	<u>£6,023,519</u>	<u>£6,044,243</u>	<u>£6,156,886</u>
<b><u>Less</u></b>						
Payments	(£81,834)	(£58,415)	(£68,425)	(£63,455)	(£82,041)	(£82,150)
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<u>£5,970,078</u>	<u>£5,957,947</u>	<u>£5,933,080</u>	<u>£5,960,064</u>	<u>£5,962,202</u>	<u>£6,074,736</u>

ORAL

NO. 33 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the fourth quarter of 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

Answered together with Question No. 34 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 34 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

Can Government state what is the income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund in respect of each month of the first quarter of 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

I hand the hon Member a statement with the information requested.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION No. 34**

Answer to Q. Nos. 33 and 34

The income, expenditure and balance of the Open Long-Term Benefits Fund for each month of the fourth quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2005 is as follows:

**OPEN LONG-TERM BENEFITS FUND**

<b>Fund Account -</b>	<b><u>31-Oct-04</u></b>	<b><u>30-Nov-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Dec-04</u></b>	<b><u>31-Jan-05</u></b>	<b><u>28-Feb-05</u></b>	<b><u>31-Mar-05</u></b>
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£10,069,197	£9,901,120	£9,858,821	£9,142,890	£9,432,885	£9,369,493
<b><u>Add</u></b>						
Receipts	£832,656	£883,371	£738,792	£971,037	£869,039	£902,924
	<u>£10,901,853</u>	<u>£10,784,491</u>	<u>£10,597,613</u>	<u>£10,113,927</u>	<u>£10,301,924</u>	<u>£10,272,418</u>
Payments	<u>(£1,000,733)</u>	<u>(£925,670)</u>	<u>(£1,454,723)</u>	<u>(£681,042)</u>	<u>(£932,431)</u>	<u>(£989,457)</u>
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<u>£9,901,120</u>	<u>£9,858,821</u>	<u>£9,142,890</u>	<u>£9,432,885</u>	<u>£9,369,493</u>	<u>£9,282,961</u>

**NO. 35 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – OLD AGE PENSION**

Can Government state when they intend to introduce a scheme whereby divorced women will be entitled to the full benefits of their future old age pension based on their ex-husband's contributions?

**ANSWER**

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

The Government have a manifesto commitment to introduce a scheme to rectify the fact that at present when a woman is divorced she loses all the benefit of future old age pension entitlement based on her ex-husband's contribution. I cannot yet tell the hon Member when the Government will implement this particular commitment. It is possible that it will be during this year.

ORAL

**NO. 36 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – REDUCED RATE**

Can Government state whether their policy to introduce the opportunity for married women who have paid the reduced rate of Social Insurance contributions to make retrospective payments of the difference to the level of a full contribution will apply to women aged 60 and over?

**ANSWER**

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

The details of this policy have not yet been worked out and therefore I cannot address questions relating to what those details will be.

**NO. 37 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE – MINIMUM INCOME GUARANTEE**

Can Government confirm that all pensioners not living with relatives are legally entitled to the Minimum Income Guarantee irrespective of nationality and whether they have paid Social Insurance contributions or not?

**ANSWER**

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

The Minimum Income Guarantee is not the subject of any legal entitlement nor is it linked to status of pensioner but to age.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 37 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Yes, but does it apply to different nationalities of people living in Gibraltar?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

When the scheme was devised the categories eligible were any person who is residing in Gibraltar who has either a certificate of permanent residence or indefinite residence, or any person who holds a residence permit which at the date of issue was valid for a period in excess of one year.

**NO. 38 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**MOUNT ALVERNIA**

Can Government state where the four emergency exits in Mount Alvernia are situated within the building and are Government satisfied that they are clearly sign posted?

**ANSWER**

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

The four fire escape exits are situated as follows. The north staircase which exits to the rear alley at the back of the building on the ground floor, the central staircase which exits to the west, that is Engineers Road, at the front of the building on the ground floor, the annex staircase which exits to the east of the building at the back entrance to Mount Alvernia on the third floor, and the south staircase which exits to the alley at the rear of the building at the ground floor. Government are satisfied that the ECA has ensured that the recommendations of the Supervising Health and Safety Officer and the Fire Prevention Department have been complied with.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 38 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

That may be so but I can assure the hon Lady that the emergency exits are not clearly signposted and I would suggest that she looks into the matter.

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

Well, the ECA can only follow the recommendations of the professionals. Neither the ECA Manager or myself, or himself with all due respect, is qualified to decide where, how and when signposting should be placed.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

That may be as it may but I have had suggestions from relatives of residents in Mount Alvernia that these are not clearly signposted and again, as the hon Lady has stated, we are not experts in these matters but if I could suggest it to her it might be worth her while to have a look, please.

ORAL

NO. 39 OF 2005

THE HON C A BRUZON

**POST OF SOCIAL WORKER**

Can Government state how many applications have been received for the post of Social Worker after the vacancy was advertised earlier this year by the closing date of 5<sup>th</sup> April 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

There have been nine applicants.

ORAL

NO. 40 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government provide a breakdown for the return of Social Insurance schedules as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 in respect of each quarter since quarter 1/01, giving the number of employees in the private and official sectors and the self-employed?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

Answered together with Question No. 41 of 2005.

**NO. 41 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**SOCIAL INSURANCE SCHEDULES**

Can Government provide a breakdown for the return of Social Insurance schedules as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 in respect of each quarter since quarter 1/01 giving the number of employees in the private and official sectors and the self-employed, of persons entering insured employment in each such quarter?

**ANSWER**

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

**Answer to Question No. 40**

I hand the hon Member a list giving the information requested in Question No. 40.

**Answer to Question No. 41**

As I stated in answer to a similar question asked previously, the DSS computer system cannot provide the information requested in Question No. 41.

**ANSWER TO QUESTION NO 41/2005**

Answer to Question No 40 of 2005

**Social Insurance Returns for 2001 as at 31 March 2005**

	All			Private			Official			Self Employed				
	Number of Employers all	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending
Qtr. 1/01	1248	14678	706	397	1068	9889	588	280	4243	87	29	546	31	88
Qtr. 2/01	1257	15058	809	401	1075	10215	688	282	4293	84	30	550	37	89
Qtr. 3/01	1269	15191	1042	400	1076	10378	869	278	4267	119	33	546	54	89
Qtr. 4/01	1278	14986	1990	619	1072	10134	1860	457	4282	90	35	570	40	127

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2001.

...cont...

**Contd ANSWER TO QUESTION NO 41/2005**

Answer to Question No 40 of 2005

**Social Insurance Returns for 2002 as at 31 March 2005**

Qtr.1/02	All			Private			Official			Self Employed				
	Number of Employers all	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending
Qtr.1/02	1301	15433	908	646	1076	10527	822	473	4363	51	46	543	35	127
Qtr.2/02	1319	15522	1013	630	1078	10610	879	457	4366	92	46	546	42	127
Qtr.3/02	1333	15664	1201	628	1086	10742	1033	455	4365	120	46	557	48	127
Qtr.4/02	1342	15456	1255	662	1079	10466	1088	488	4437	100	47	553	67	127

**Note:-**  
Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2002.

...cont...

**Contd ANSWER TO QUESTION NO 41/2005**

Answer to Question No 40 of 2005

**Social Insurance Returns for 2003 as at 31 March 2005**

Qtr.	All			Private			Official			Self Employed				
	Number of Employers all	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers returned	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending			
Qtr. 1/03	1370	15552	1005	1156	1069	10518	916	846	4523	55	97	511	34	213
Qtr. 2/03	1395	15895	1267	1136	1071	10763	1145	826	4619	82	97	513	40	213
Qtr. 3/03	1409	15487	2160	1128	1051	10310	2016	820	4662	95	95	515	49	213
Qtr. 4/03	1422	15341	2075	1134	1054	10180	1922	828	4661	86	95	500	67	211

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2003.

...cont...

**Contd ANSWER TO QUESTION NO 41/2005**

Answer to Question No 40 of 2005

**Social Insurance Returns for 2004 as at 31 March 2005**

	All			Private			Official			Self Employed				
	Number of Employers <i>all</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Number of Employers <i>returned</i>	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending	Returns	Non-Return	Pending
<b>Qtr.1/04</b>	1447	14470	1392	3263	1029	10017	1216	2162	3912	149	882	541	27	219
<b>Qtr.2/04</b>	1470	13857	2311	3250	1004	9475	2054	2149	3876	179	882	506	78	219
<b>Qtr.3/04</b>	1491	13639	3183	3233	975	9305	2820	2136	3848	247	878	486	116	219
<b>Qtr.4/04</b>	1506	12244	4710	3242	882	7933	4357	2141	3852	200	882	459	153	219
<b>Qtr.1/05</b>	1518	4690	1467	14281	419	2674	1299	10645	1787	154	3036	229	14	600

**Note:-**

Those classified under pending are in respect of contribution records for which no notification of termination has been provided and no contribution return has been recorded since the introduction of the new system or in the 1st Quarter of 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 40 TO 41 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

It is not the computer system, I take it it is the programme that is not able to extract the information and therefore has any attempt been made to see whether it is possible to do it since the last question?

**HON MRS Y DEL AGUA:**

It is a question of modifying the programme as opposed to the system. I did ask the Department in the last House when the same question was raised, I asked them to look at it. Obviously I was prompted of the same matter when I read the question this time round, I asked again and apparently they have not considered it.

ORAL

NO. 42 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

Can Government state what was the income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the months of January to March of 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR SOCIAL AND CIVIC AFFAIRS

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

**Answer to Question No. 42 of 2005**

The income, expenditure and balance of the Employment Injuries Insurance Fund in the months of January to March 2005 is as follows:

**EMPLOYMENT INJURIES INSURANCE FUND**

	<u>31-Jan-05</u>	<u>28-Feb-05</u>	<u>31-Mar-05</u>
<b>Fund Account -</b>			
<b><u>Opening Balance</u></b>	£5,083,894	£5,046,606	£4,985,936
<u>Add</u>			
Receipts	£27,070	£21,653	£43,274
	<u>£5,110,964</u>	<u>£5,068,259</u>	<u>£5,029,210</u>
<u>Less</u>			
Payments	<u>(£64,358)</u>	<u>(£82,323)</u>	<u>(£63,001)</u>
<b><u>Closing Balance</u></b>	<u>£5,046,606</u>	<u>£4,985,936</u>	<u>£4,966,209</u>

ORAL

**NO. 43 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government confirm whether the excavation works at the Theatre Royal site have caused any damage to adjacent buildings?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 44, 45 and 46 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 44 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state whether there have been any problems with the structure of the walls left at the site of the Old Theatre Royal?

ANSWER

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 43 and 45 to 46 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 45 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Can Government state what were the subject matters of the full range of reports mentioned in answer to Questions 953-958/2004 in relation to the Theatre Royal giving a breakdown by report and the purpose of each report?

ANSWER

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 43, 44 and 46 of 2005.

**NO. 46 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**THEATRE ROYAL**

Are Government in a position to publish the two reports that were commissioned to Theatre Projects Consultants?

**ANSWER**

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

The excavation works have not caused any damage to adjacent buildings, neither have there been any problems with the structure of the walls left at the site. There have only ever been two reports commissioned by Government on the Theatre Royal as follows. First the February 1998 M E Belilo and Partners and others report, which was a building survey report for the rehabilitation and refurbishment of the Theatre Royal. The second one was the September 1999 Theatre Projects Consultants Report, which was one on the practicalities of re-opening the Theatre Royal. Government do not consider there is a need to publish the reports.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 43 TO 46 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

I have asked these questions specifically because in answer to questions as mentioned in Questions No. 953 to 958 of 2004, when I asked this question in the previous House the Minister actually stated that there were only two reports, I can confirm that, and he stated exactly that they were M Belilo and Partners and Theatre Projects Consultants, but in supplementaries after that the Chief Minister intervened and he said that there were a full range of reports that were commissioned. Therefore this is why I have posed these questions. Why did the Chief Minister then say that there were a full range of reports? One would assume that the word 'full' means more than two and 'range', 'full range' means more than two that is why I have posed the question. I would also like to add another supplementary which is that the Minister has stated that there is not any problem with adjacent buildings and I would like to ask, which he has not answered, if there is any problems and why they have contractors in now, or do they have contractors in now in order to fix some of the walls or at least make them safe?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

On the second supplementary I have to say that the site is regularly inspected by structural engineers and in fact the walls are firmer than they have ever been. There was piling work done there a year and a half ago and they are in a perfectly safe condition. As I say, there are regular inspections carried out by structural engineers so the Government are content in that respect. As to the first part of the supplementary, if the hon Member looks at Hansard I think the Chief Minister himself subsequent to having said that there were and in reference to ARUP the engineers part of the team, in reference to ARUP's work the Chief Minister did say there was a full range of reports and then he went on to qualify that there is a difference between the reports and indeed there is a difference between the two reports that I have mentioned, which were commissioned by Government, and the on-going exchange of information of the design team which is something that is very normal and part of the RIBA stages of design. In other words, at each stage of design there is an exchange of information within the design team, which of course Government are privy to, in all sorts of things and I think the Chief Minister explained during those questions and supplementaries to Question Nos. 953 to 958 of 2004 and exchange of information in respect of services such as architectural matters, structural matters, sound and acoustics elements, quantity surveying elements, that sort of information. That is what the Chief Minister was making reference to and not to further reports commissioned by the Government in respect of the structure of the building and so on. Government are content that the structure is perfectly safe and that is the position as it stands now.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just one last point, does the Minister have any indication as to when or if the project is going to get off the ground?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Certainly the Theatre Royal project very much continues to have its place on the list of Government projects but I think the Chief Minister has reminded me that he has in fact announced that this will take its place after the leisure centre and the housing is carried out.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So much for the vision thing, but the one issue that the Minister has studiously avoided replying to, is this question of the surrounding buildings that the Hon Mr Linares has asked about. In fact, it is obvious to anybody who cares to walk around the area that a lot of the surrounding buildings are being pinned by a Government contractor in the fashion that buildings are pinned when their foundations have been disturbed by building works around them. Now can the Minister specifically address that point and can he specifically confirm that no structure adjacent to the Theatre Royal has been affected by those works?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think it is the same question disguised in rather different, more colourful language but the answer is the same.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, the answer cannot be the same because the answer provided to date has not addressed the issue of adjoining buildings or buildings surrounding the Theatre Royal. The Minister has given an answer as to the structure of the building itself but he has studiously avoided answering the question that was put about the structures of buildings around the Theatre Royal. Again, anybody who cares to walk around the area will see that the buildings that face onto I think Cannon Lane, which are those old colonial homes that are there, I think one of them is in the ownership of the Catholic Church and the others are in private ownership, are being pinned on the Theatre Royal side by JBS. It is obvious, it is visible, why would they be pinned by the Government's own contractor if their structures are not somehow affected or potentially affected by the massive crater that has been left by this project?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether the hon Member has the problem suffered by some people I know that their brains do not crank up until a certain time of the morning and until they have had a certain minimum number of cups of coffee, but I do not know on what basis he says that this issue of damage to adjacent buildings is a supplementary and that the answer that the Minister gave has studiously avoided addressing that issue. He clearly leaps to his feet without any background information and without even having listened to what has been uttered in his earshot in the last 60 seconds before he rises to his feet. One of the questions asked was, 'can Government confirm whether the excavation works of the Theatre Royal have caused any damage to adjacent buildings?', to which the very first part of the Minister's answer was, 'the excavation works have not caused any damage to adjacent buildings'. So he has had the Government's answer and that is it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister might need a caffeine injection himself. These buildings, as I am trying to explain to him, are not necessarily adjacent. They do not necessarily touch the Theatre Royal, they are on the other side of the crater. Now, if the answer is simply that even those buildings on the other side of the crater, not adjacent like all the others that are on the eastern side of the Theatre Royal, are also not affected then so be it but can we just have an answer to that question, because those buildings and it may be that the Chief Minister does not deign to walk around that area given the state in which it has been left in by his Government, those buildings are being pinned by JBS. So what is the answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is that the word 'adjacent' has a clear meaning in the English language, if he does not know what it means there is a very useful publication called 'The Concise Oxford Dictionary' which he is free to refer to at any time, and he cannot

alter the meaning of the word to suit his political convenience on a particular Friday morning in Parliamentary debate in Gibraltar. That is the answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Let us be more precise then. The buildings that face onto Cannon Lane that back onto the area of the crater left by the Theatre Royal are being pinned by Government, whether adjacent in his definition or adjacent in my definition, are they being pinned as a result of the works carried out by the Government which has left that crater where the Theatre Royal used to be? Yes or No? Very simple, even the Chief Minister without his first cup of coffee should be able to answer that one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Those buildings by any definition are adjacent and therefore covered by the answer that the Minister gave.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Are Government spending any extra money in relation to the Theatre Royal since my last question in this House, where I asked how much was spent?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

All building sites require a certain degree of monitoring, routine monitoring, routine supervision to render them safe. Every building site. The crater, as they like to call it, in the Theatre Royal building site, any building site in Gibraltar, any building site anywhere in the world has and places the public authorities in a particular need, where it is a public site, to monitor and to carry out works to make sure that the building site is kept safe. That has its costs. Of course there is a cost, it is not a huge cost but it costs more than a site which is not a building site to inspect, to monitor and to keep safe, that is absolutely correct and hon Members can rest assured that the vision is but delayed. The vision stands Gibraltar will get its Theatre Royal but I think it will get its housing and its leisure centre first.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Have the Government, although the Chief Minister and the Minister have said that there is no damage to adjacent buildings, are the Government spending any money on adjacent buildings just to keep it safe?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I think that the Chief Minister has just answered that question. It is the same question again in a different form. I mean, there are on-going works in the building site and that is what is happening there, that is all.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government confirm that JBS is now working on an adjacent building in order to secure its safety?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

JBS carries out work from time to time pursuant to the answer I have just given the hon Member a few seconds ago, in order to ensure the continuation of the safety of the site, not in order to bring about its safety. The site is already safe.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government state how much is going to be the cost of keeping JBS inspecting its safety?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it depends on what works they do from time to time but remember that JBS is a Government-owned company, they use their own labour which is already paid for whether they inspect the Theatre Royal or not. There is therefore not any real cost unless and until they actually carry out work which involves labour and which involves materials and the redeployment of labour from other sites. Then the cost is the delay to the other works that they could be doing if that labour was not otherwise engaged.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But is not the work that they do there charged to a particular Head of Expenditure then in the Government Estimates?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well it may be but then there is revenue of a Government-owned company.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, my question is, is the work that they do there actually billed by the company to the Government and paid for and charged to a Government Head of Expenditure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is yes but then it is the revenue of a Government-owned company.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well yes, of course, I know that so is everything else that they do and so is what they do in Industrial Cleaners, and so is what they do in Community Projects, what has that got to do with it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer that I have given him. I may not have chosen the words that he wanted me to choose but that is exactly the answer. Yes, but it is then in turn the revenue of a Government-owned company.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but then in turn it is the revenue of the workers that work for them and then they pay tax which in turn is the revenue of the Government. We know all that, that is how the whole of the economy works.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So why did the hon Member ask the question?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The question that I want to ask is whether they are actually charging the Government for the costs they do so that we can identify where it is being paid from, that is all.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer was contained in the first word of my answer which is 'yes', and then I have added 'but then it is the revenue of a Government-owned company'. He appears to take umbrage at the fact that I add things to the answer that he wants to hear.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well no, the implication seems to be that somehow it does not matter because it is paid to a Government-owned company and it would matter if it was paid to a different company. Well look, of course it is revenue of a Government-owned company, what has that got to do with it? That has got nothing to do with the answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot believe I am hearing what the hon Member is saying, that cannot be the extent of his powers of economic analysis. If the cost of referring these works were flowing out of the wide umbrella of public funds, which includes funds in the Government and funds in publicly-owned companies, and it was being paid to an outside contractor, that would be a loss of funds from the public out into the private

sector. If on the other hand labour that is already being paid for out of public funds is used to deliver a service somewhere on the public estate, and the Government for the sake of accounting propriety causes a charge to be raised to the appropriate Government account, the money then flows from one Government pocket into the other Government pocket and stays in the general and wide umbrella of public funds, because the labour that the hon Member is saying then gets paid, was going to be paid anyway. JBS does not hire and dismiss people depending on whether it has Theatre Royals to inspect or does not have Theatre Royals to inspect. Therefore the cost of those inspections are already being borne by a Government-owned company. So when a revenue is generated, well an expense to the Government and a revenue to the company, is generated for that service it is just moving from one to the other and it is staying under Government control. It is not being used to pay the wages, those wages were being paid anyway.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, I have to say this is a new approach on the part of the Government. In my knowledge the only Government company that has been treated as if it was an extension of the public service is Community Projects, where the work that they do is not identified and when we have asked questions in this House we have been told they get given £2 million to meet their labour costs and it does not really matter how they spend it because there is no billing and no invoicing. But JBS is required to tender for projects on occasions against private contractors, why does the Chief Minister not apply the logic of the answer he has just given me and in order to keep it within the ambit of public spending as he has described today, give priority of all the work to JBS and only goes out to contract when JBS is incapable of doing the work?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What the Leader of the Opposition has just said has got absolutely nothing to do with the subject that we are discussing and it is just an attempt to divert the issue. JBS does not tender for internal Government work. JBS does not tender to do works in the Education Department, JBS does not tender to do the vast majority of work. JBS tenders, when it wants to, when there are projects to be done which the Government have put out to tender and it tenders for relatively few of them, and often the Government requires the tender to be done in order to make sure that JBS is doing the work for a market tested value for money basis. As, for example, happens in some of the hon Member's housing schemes but I do not see what this has got to do with the fact that a charge by JBS to the Government when JBS does a labour service for the Government, is not money that flows out of the definition of publicly-controlled funds because JBS is a Government-owned company. In contrast to what would be the case if the contractor were a fully private sector company which would then be an outflow of cash from the Government. That is the issue we were debating, nothing about whether JBS should or should always get the work without tender, and nothing to do with the comparison between JBS and Community Projects.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, the Chief Minister started his answer by saying he does not know what this has to do. The only thing it has to do is that he has chosen to create this debate about the mechanics of payments to JBS when my simple question originally was simply 'is

there going to be a sum of money billed somewhere which we can identify?' That is all I was asking.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is yes but then it becomes the revenue of a Government-owned company.

-----

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I raise an issue in relation to Question No. 43 of 2005, which has been raised with me as a result of somebody listening to our debate this morning. Question No. 43 of 2005 deals with the Theatre and the buildings adjoining or opposite it et cetera. I have been contacted by a member of the public who heard the debate, he tells me that his property is now being pinned as a result of his being told that it has become unsafe because of the works carried out at the Theatre Royal. The company doing the pinning is JBS and the safety issue relates to the wall of the property, sliding in layman's terms, I do not know what it is I suppose displacement of the wall into what I called this morning figuratively the crater that has been left by the Theatre Royal. There was a lot of exchange about that this morning and I wonder whether the Chief Minister or the Minister for Culture, I say Chief Minister because they were both involved in the debate, could comment on that given that what they were saying this morning where they were giving the impression that there was no such problem with any property.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I know of no procedure in this House which entitles the hon Member, if the hon Member wants to put down a substantive motion in relation to the subject of the safety of premises adjoining, he is perfectly free to do so but I know of no procedure that entitles him to come back to this House and to say 'I have been told in the street this or that, does the hon Member want to comment on it?'. I am sorry. I am not willing to comment.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well, we have often come back to questions in this House after debate, so if I simply have to say to him, change my request for comment and simply say to him: 'do the Government not agree that that suggests that the information that they provided to this House this morning was either erroneous or misleading?'

**MR SPEAKER:**

I allow the hon Member to invite the Chief Minister or the Minister for Culture to comment on something that he has been appraised of during the course of the day, the Chief Minister has declined to comment and that must be the end of the matter.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

He has declined to comment on the basis I have asked him to comment, but he has not necessarily said that he is not going to answer a question and that is why I would ask Mr Speaker to allow them to answer the question. They may take the view that they want to rely on Mr Speaker's ruling in order not to answer the question. Perhaps so would I if I were them, having told this House this morning that there is absolutely no problem to now be faced with this problem.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is not going to re-engage in debate on that issue on the basis of hearsay that he brings to this House. The Government stand by the answers they have given in this House this morning and there is no procedure which entitles him to properly re-open that debate now. He is free, if he is not satisfied with the accuracy of the information that the Government have given to him, to put down a substantive motion on this issue if he wants to. I am quite happy to debate it with him in the proper place, at the proper time and under the proper procedure.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will take the answer that the Government stand by their answer this morning as the answer.

**NO. 47 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**CULTURE – SPRING FESTIVAL**

Can Government state how many events in this years Spring Festival have actually been organised by the Ministry of Culture?

**ANSWER**

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

The Ministry for Culture is involved in the organisation of the Spring Festival in its entirety.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 47 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does that mean, for example, that they organise the plays, they direct the play, the Ministry of Culture actually acts the play? This is the point I am trying to make. It is a question of are the events organised, not the actual whole Spring Festival, but each individual event?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Minister for Culture does not direct plays even though he has been known to take part in plays in the past.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

A pantomime.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Well, I could answer that but I choose not to Mr Picardo. It is not a pantomime no, it is a very serious matter actually and people involved in culture take it very seriously, both in the Ministry and those who participate.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No I mean this pantomime.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Well not on this side of the House Mr Picardo. The involvement of the Ministry for Culture as organiser of the Spring Festival obviously varies. The extent of involvement varies. In some cases it will be providing a venue, in other cases we will actually be hands-on such as the Spring Art Festival for example. In others it will be financial support, as in the case of the Sea Scouts who hosted a pipe band from Asturias. So the degree of involvement varies with the event but the Spring Festival is organised in its entirety by the Ministry for Culture.

**NO. 48 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**ARTS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

Can Government state how many times the Arts Advisory Council has met in 2004 and 2005 respectively?

**ANSWER**

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

Once in 2004 and to date once this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 48 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is the Arts Advisory Council involved in organising the Spring Festival?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Arts Advisory Council advises the Ministry for Culture on all aspects of culture.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does that include the Spring Festival?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The Spring Festival is part of everything that happens in culture of course.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state that if they have only met once, it seems that that meeting must have been a very, very effective meeting to have organised all the things or advised the Government on all the things including the Spring Festival. Does the Minister not agree that the Arts Advisory Council in one meeting had such an effective meeting that they were able to organise the Spring Festival, does the Minister agree with that?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

They do not organise the Spring Festival, they advise Government on all aspects of culture.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister say how long the meeting lasted, a week? Or is it like the House where we adjourn and we carry on the same session?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

In those meetings I can confirm that we do not tend to get the kind of lengthy extensions to questions which are unnecessary and usually quite beside the point, hence those meetings of the Culture Advisory Council are very productive and not necessarily as lengthy.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Maybe these meetings are lengthy because of the extended answering to the question from the Chief Minister which diverts, and the Minister as well, divert from one topic to another like we did in the previous question. I would like to ask the Minister then, does the Minister envisage that they will be having another meeting in 2005?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

Meetings are held as and when required.

ORAL

**NO. 49 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state what is the cost to the Youth Service to run the Youth Leaders Course every year?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 50 and 51 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 50 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**YOUTH SERVICE – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state how much it costs each student to enrol in the Youth Leaders Course?

ANSWER

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 49 and 51 of 2005.

**NO. 51 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – LEADERS COURSE**

Can Government state how many people have enrolled in the Youth Leaders Course for the current year?

**ANSWER**

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

Ten persons have enrolled in the Youth Leaders Course for the current year.

There are no fees charged to students of the Youth Service Youth Leader courses.

The Youth Leaders Courses run by the Youth Service have cost the following:-

2001/2002	-	£1,500 – tutor costs	
2002/2003	-	£1,500 – tutor costs	
2003/2004	-	£1,500 – tutor costs	
2004/2005	-	zero extra cost	- consequent on in-house staff now having acquired the necessary expertise and experience to conduct the courses and these being carried out during programmed Youth Worker sessions as part of their normal working week.

**NO. 52 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – YOUTH CLUBS**

Can Government confirm whether our Youth Clubs are opened every evening to cater for the needs of young people?

**ANSWER**

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

Our Youth Clubs are scheduled to open under the direct supervision of the Youth Service, on average on three weekdays every week.

However, clubs do open on other days during the week for specific events, either organised by the Youth Service or in response to specific requests from organisations dealing with young people. Other events, not necessarily club-based are of course also held on other days; including weekends, in order to cater for the needs of young people.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 52 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

What I would like to ask again is, are the clubs open in the evening, the Minister stated three days a week but not for events, just opened with a Youth Leader there in order for young people who might be roaming about or be bored, or just wanting to go somewhere without having something organised for them but to chat to somebody, for counselling? Can the Minister confirm whether these Youth Clubs are open for that purpose as well in the evening?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

The hon Member seems to be out of touch somewhat with what the Youth Service work is like nowadays. I think the type of Youth Service that he is referring to used to work in the past. Nowadays they are much more structured in their approach and of course they are open in the evenings, as I said, at least three evenings, three days including the evenings under the direct supervision of the Youth Service, but then other evenings and other days of the week other things happen but the service is like that nowadays. It is not just a question of going in there if one feels like it, it tends to be much more structured. Of course, people walking in from the street are very welcome.

**HON S E LINARES:**

It is virtually impossible for people walking in the streets to go into a club that is closed. If it is three days a week and two of them it is shut, they cannot walk around and go into them, but can the Minister confirm whether this happens to all Youth Clubs or just a specific one or is it the Youth Club which is near the Youth Service Office?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, the days they open varies with the needs of their catchment area as it were.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I would appreciate if the Minister would enlighten me as in to the new programmes and new ways that the Youth Service now works on another day, he does not need to do it today, I can have a chat with him about it because I am really interested. I think I am very, very up to date but he seems to be more up to date than myself.

**HON C BELTRAN:**

That is my job but I mean, he is very welcome to talk to the present Youth Leaders who will enlighten him, and I am very pleased to enlighten him as well.

ORAL

**NO. 53 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – MONIES STOLEN**

Can Government confirm whether the monies stolen from the Youth Service has been replaced by Government from the Youth Service budget or whether extra funds have been allocated to cover this shortfall?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question No. 54 of 2005.

**NO. 54 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**YOUTH SERVICE – MONIES STOLEN**

Can Government state what were the conclusions of the investigation into the Youth Service theft?

**ANSWER**

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

The matter is still with the Royal Gibraltar Police as regards the investigation.

As for the monies stolen from the Youth Service, which was extra income from fund raising from youth activities and not voted funds, these have nonetheless been replaced from savings identified in other sub-heads of the Youth and Sport vote.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 53 AND 54 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes, I do know that it is not funds that were allocated for Youth. Can the Minister confirm whether these monies were the monies collected by the Youth or the young people at the fair, and therefore it was money which was to be allocated for charities that was stolen?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I can confirm that the monies stolen were indeed raised through various activities held in the Youth Pavilion at the fair by young people from a variety of organisations, dance groups, sports clubs. I cannot confirm whether all those funds were going to go to charity through these organisations or whether they were just simply fund raising for their own organisation but they were not voted funds, they were monies collected by these young people.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I know that the Minister has said that the Police are still investigating and probably it would be sensitive to talk about the investigation but can the Minister state whether there will be any time limit, because if the perpetrator of the theft is still at large and

will be at large and not caught, surely the investigation must come to a halt at one point.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Member well knows, the Government have no role whatsoever in relation to and certainly no control over the investigation by the Police of alleged possible offences. The hon Member to ask us whether there is any time limit to the Police investigation is with respect to him a nonsensical question, but if he wants a strict answer the answer is no. The Government are not going to put any time limit because they are not in a position to put in a time limit. How the Police carry out their investigations, how they go about it, how long they take, indeed whether they ever finish, indeed whether they ever investigate is a matter entirely for the Police and he is free to write to them. If he is a concerned citizen or as a Member of this House he can write to the Commissioner of Police but he cannot come to this House to ask the Government whether they are going to time-limit the Police in the conduct of an investigation.

**ORAL**

**NO. 55 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

In view of the reply given by the Minister for Sport in answer to Question 2141 of 2004, when he said that works to the changing rooms and spectator facilities for the water based hockey pitch were expected to reach practical completion in February 2005, can he now confirm whether this has happened, and whether the pertinent facilities are now being used both by the public and hockey players?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 56 and 57 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 56 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether the new Sports Hall is now fully operational since he has said in this House that this would happen during the latter part of Autumn of last year?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 55 and 57 of 2005.

**NO. 57 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GIBRALTAR SPORTS AUTHORITY**

Can the Minister for Sport now confirm whether or not the Government have advertised vacancies for personnel to be employed by the Gibraltar Sports Authority?

**ANSWER**

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

The new Sports Hall has been ready for use for some time now and will be used by the public as soon as the staff are employed. The relevant posts have already been advertised and as for the hockey stand it is projected that it will be available for use next month.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 55 TO 57 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say how many additional posts are required for the Hall to be opened? He says that they have been advertised. Is it that all the jobs that have been advertised are to be filled?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

I am sorry I did not get the last bit.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Have all the jobs got to be filled before the Hall can be opened or once they have got a certain number they can proceed?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

No, all the posts need to be filled before we can proceed. The hon Member may have seen the advert and it is for Sports Attendants and also for an Assistant Sports Development Officer and a Clerical Assistant.

ORAL

**NO. 58 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**VICTORIA STADIUM**

Can Government specify the nature of the proposed infrastructure works at the Victoria Stadium put to tender on the 17<sup>th</sup> March 2005?

**ANSWER**

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

The infrastructure works put to tender on 17<sup>th</sup> March 2005 for the Bayside Sports Complex consist of the provision of all cable ducts, fresh and salt water services and sewage and surface water drainage systems to service the new sports facilities projected to be constructed west of the new Sports Hall on the reclaimed land.

**NO. 59 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**LEISURE CENTRE – KINGS BASTION**

Can the Minister for Sport state the estimated date of completion for the leisure centre, which was promised by the GSD in 1996?

**ANSWER**

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

The Government were elected in November 2003 on their manifesto for that election which does indeed contain a commitment for a leisure centre. It is envisaged that construction works will commence in June this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 59 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

In view of the reply from the Minister can he confirm that planning permission has now been given?

**HON C BELTRAN:**

It is a Government project and therefore it does not require planning permission.

**ORAL**

**NO. 60 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRIMARY CARE CENTRE**

Can Government state how many local residents are currently registered with the Primary Care Centre under the Group Practice Medical Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 64 to 66, 72 and 73 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 61 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government state what was the total number of in-patient admissions and the average number of patients per day at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 62, 63, 69, 74 and 95 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 62 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – IN-PATIENT ADMISSIONS**

Can Government confirm the total number of in-patient admissions at St Bernard's Hospital for the year 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61, 63, 69, 74 and 95 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 63 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61, 62, 69, 74 and 95 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 64 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government confirm the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the year 2004, keeping to the format given in answer to Question 2200 and additionally giving details of other departments that were not shown there?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 60, 65, 66, 72 and 73 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 65 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GP ATTENDANCES**

Can Government confirm the number of GP Attendances at the Primary Care Centre for the year 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 60, 64 and 72 to 73 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 66 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – OUT-PATIENT ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of out-patient attendances at the Primary Care Centre, including the number of out-patients being attended to by District Nurses, Occupational Therapists and Physiotherapists during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 60, 64, 65 and 72 to 73 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 67 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRIVATE PATIENTS**

Can the Minister for Health state how many private patients were seen to or treated at St Bernard's Hospital (a) as out-patients and (b) as in-patients during the months of December 2004, January, February and March of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 68, 70 and 114 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 68 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NON-ENTITLED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm how many non-entitled patients have been admitted to St Bernard's Hospital during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 67, 70 and 114 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 69 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF BEDS**

Can Government confirm the total number of beds which there are at St Bernard's Hospital at Europort, also giving a breakdown of how many there are in each ward or unit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 74 and 95 to 99 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 70 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRIVATE BEDS**

Can Government state whether entitled and/or non-entitled patients can have access to a private bed in St Bernard's Hospital, and if so, what is the cost?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 67, 68 and 114 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 71 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can Government provide the latest waiting lists for public patients covering all specialities, giving a breakdown of each, for both out-patients and in-patients, which also includes those who require surgical interventions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 85 and 86 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 72 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF HOUSE CALLS**

Can Government state how many house-calls were attended to by Health Centre Doctors during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 60, 64 to 66 and 73 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 73 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GP ATTENDANCES**

Can Government state what was the total number of GP Attendances at the Primary Care Centre during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 60**

As the hon Member's Colleague, the Spokesperson for Health would be aware or should be aware, from the time that she was Minister for Health it has never been possible to ascertain the total number of local residents registered with the Group Practice Medical Scheme. While it is theoretically possible to give a breakdown it would involve a disproportionate amount of administrative effort to obtain these statistics.

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

The hon Member may note that in relation to Question No. 64 the figure for dermatology for October 2004 which was provided at the last meeting of the House was a cumulative total for the year to date and should have read 32 and not 185. The figure provided in relation to Question No. 65 for the months of June and September in respect of GP clinics, updates the figures given to the hon Member in answer to Question No. 1588 of 2004.

**Answer to Question 73 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 64**

DEPARTMENT	Jan-04	Feb-04	Mar-04	Apr-04	May-04	Jun-04	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	TOTAL
AUDIOLOGY	157	104	178	121	373	280	213	0	198	385	147	191	2,347
DIETICIAN	63	76	83	80	64	70	70	95	94	90	83	53	921
CLINIC SISTER	1140	1428	1577	1264	1243	1165	1247	1224	1597	2320	1637	1258	17,100
SCHOOL HEALTH	460	404	441	377	876	326	357	224	323	298	283	234	4,603
SPEECH & LANGUAGE	8	12	125	271	174	152	67	120	196	224	209	93	1,651
MENTAL WELFARE	272	283	267	238	286	292	277	259	257	206	170	154	2,961
GP CLINIC	7998	7397	9229	7355	8009	8158	8495	7795	9100	8276	8605	8259	98,676
HOUSE CALLS	655	363	564	478	613	442	565	378	549	433	523	635	6,198
DENTAL	1430	1587	1624	1358	1029	1629	1114	1073	1674	1352	1658	1052	16,580
CHILD WELFARE	820	792	849	735	775	812	648	636	807	774	793	648	9,089
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	774	627	340	197	270	356	259	255	348	332	338	406	4,502
DERMATOLOGIST	18	18	18	22	23	19	16	0	19	32	0	196	381
ORTHOPIST	90	79	121	80	87	145	110	64	122	114	121	115	1,248
OPTOMETRIST	165	157	102	170	123	115	162	83	105	121	86	120	1,509
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14050</b>	<b>13327</b>	<b>15518</b>	<b>12746</b>	<b>13945</b>	<b>13961</b>	<b>13600</b>	<b>12206</b>	<b>15389</b>	<b>14957</b>	<b>14653</b>	<b>13414</b>	<b>167766</b>

Cont.....

**Contd to Answer to Question 73 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 64**

**\* COMMUNITY**

DEPARTMENT	Jan-04	Feb-04	Mar-04	Apr-04	May-04	Jun-04	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	TOTAL
PHYSIO	83	75	102	81	93	95	105	161	153	196	183	149	1476
OT	156	274	351	286	285	224	313	264	247	310	244	165	3119
DISTRICT	4452	4509	4498	5040	4777	1943	4652	3506	4593	3808	3831	5003	50612
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4691</b>	<b>4858</b>	<b>4951</b>	<b>5407</b>	<b>5155</b>	<b>2262</b>	<b>5070</b>	<b>3931</b>	<b>4993</b>	<b>4314</b>	<b>4258</b>	<b>5317</b>	<b>55207</b>

Figures provided in answer to previous questions in respect of O/T have been for Paediatrics. The figure provided above are the total of adults and paediatrics combined.

**Answer to Question 65**

DEPARTMENT	Jan-04	Feb-04	Mar-04	Apr-04	May-04	Jun-04	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	TOTAL
GP CLINICS	7998	7397	9229	7355	8009	8158	8495	7795	9100	8276	8605	8259	98,676

Cont.....

**Contd to Answer to Question 73 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 66**

DEPARTMENT	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	TOTAL
AUDIOLOGY	191	154	155	171	671
DIETICIAN	53	45	64	75	237
CLINIC SISTER	1258	1302	1662	1722	5,944
SCHOOL HEALTH	234	286	327	260	1,107
SPEECH & LANGUAGE	93	181	228	107	609
MENTAL WELFARE	154	151	184	186	675
GP CLINIC	8259	7803	9513	8700	34,275
HOUSE CALLS	635	692	661	583	2,571
DENTAL	1052	1202	1307	1274	4,835
CHILD WELFARE	648	858	1037	763	3,306
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	406	240	593	724	1,963
DERMATOLOGIST	196	0	76	0	272
ORTHOPIST	115	S.B.H	S.B.H	S.B.H	115
OPTOMETRIST	120	S.B.H	S.B.H	S.B.H	120
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13414</b>	<b>12914</b>	<b>15807</b>	<b>14565</b>	<b>56,700</b>

S.B.H = These clinics are currently being held at St Bernard's Hospital.

**\* COMMUNITY**

PHYSIO	149	157	122	N.F.A	428
OT	38	185	222	191	636
DISTRICT	5003	3713	3671	4906	17293
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5190</b>	<b>4055</b>	<b>4015</b>	<b>5097</b>	<b>18,357</b>

**Answer to Question 72**

DEPARTMENT	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	TOTAL
HOUSE-CALLS	635	692	661	583	2,571

Calls received during working hours are recorded until 4pm. Night calls do not form part of these statistics

**Answer to Question 73**

DEPARTMENT	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05	TOTAL
GP CLINIC	8259	7803	9513	8700	34,275

**ORAL**

**NO. 74 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Long Stay Elderly Care Patients there were at St Bernard's Hospital during the months of December 2004, January, February and March 2005, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69 and 95 to 99 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 75 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government give a breakdown of the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items and the cost of the medicines covered by such prescriptions under the GPMS for the accounting periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 76 to 81 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 76 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government confirm how much has been paid to Pharmacists for periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/2005 as a result of the 15 per cent addition to the cost of medicines?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75 and 77 to 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 77 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government say what was the amount paid to Pharmacists for the periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004 and the comparable figure for the same periods in the previous year in respect of £1.80 per item prescription charged, regarding the medicines to which the sum applied?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75, 76 and 78 to 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 78 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PRESCRIPTIONS**

Can Government state the total number of prescriptions issued, the number of items, and the cost of the medicines covered by the GPMS Prescriptions for accounting periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/2005, in respect of which £2.50 per item was paid by patients to the dispensing Pharmacists?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75 to 77 and 79 to 81 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 79 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF ITEMS**

Can Government state the number of items that have been issued, that exceed the three items which pay a total of £7.50, for the accounting periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/05?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75 to 78, 80 and 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 80 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PRESCRIPTION CHARGES**

Can Government state how much extra revenue the Gibraltar Health Authority has raised for periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/05 as a result of their having increased prescription charges from £1.20 to £2.50?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 75 to 79 and 81 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 81 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAYMENTS TO PHARMACISTS**

Can Government state how much has been paid to the Pharmacists as dispensing fees for periods 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

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

The hon Member should note that the information supplied is only in respect of complete periods where all pharmacists have submitted their accounts.

**Answer to Question 81 of 2005****Answer to Question 75**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
Prescriptions	14074	14541	12103	12391	13384
Items	50922	52263	43174	44408	47603
Cost	£601655.25	£620615.84	£498142.67	£512459.67	£546556.60

**Answer to Question 76**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
PAID	£78476.77	£80949.89	£64975.13	£66842.57	£71289.99

**Answer to Question 77**

2004/05 PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
PAID	£91659.60	£94073.40	£49701.00	Nil	Nil

2003/04 PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
PAID	£84346.20	£84454.20	£84193.20	£32768.40	Nil

**Answer to Question 78**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
SCRIPTS	6410	6672	5372	5825	6075
ITEMS	12434	12768	10447	11080	11653

When there are more than three items in a prescription it is not possible to establish which medicines attract the charge and therefore it is not possible to identify what the cost of such medicines are.

**Answer to Question 79**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
NO OF ITEMS	3981	4266	3328	3545	3642

**Answer to Question 80**

When the prescription charges were amended, the Government made all medicines free for pensioners and additionally, after charging only for the first three items on the prescription, supplies all further medicines completely free of charge.

It is not possible to calculate the extra revenue raised within any degree of accuracy but it is estimated to be in the region of £32K for periods 7,8,9,10 and 11 of 2004/2005.

**Answer to Question 81**

PERIOD	7	8	9	10	11
DISPENSING FEES	£91659.60	£94073.40	£49701.00	-	-

**ORAL**

**NO. 82 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GYNAECOLOGY SURGERY**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether scheduled surgery has now commenced for specialities other than Gynaecology?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 83, 84, 103, 106, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 83 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GYNAECOLOGY SURGERY**

In connection with the third Review Team recommendation, which relates to scheduled surgery in the speciality of Gynaecology, can the Minister for Health now confirm how many patients have taken up the offer?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82, 84, 103, 106, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 84 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – GYNAECOLOGY SURGERY**

In view of the answer given by the Minister for Health in reply to Question 2241 of 2004, when he confirmed that scheduling surgery in Gynaecology began in October and that the pilot initiative will go live in the new year, can he now confirm whether this has been the case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82, 83, 103, 106, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 85 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELECTIVE SURGERY**

Can Government state how many persons there are presently waiting for elective surgery in each speciality?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 71 and 86 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 86 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF OPERATIONS**

Can Government confirm how many operations were performed in St Bernard's at Europort, for the months of February and March 2005, by specialities?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule which I hand over.

**Answer to Question 71**

The out-patient's public and private waiting times by specialities are as follows:

<b>Speciality</b>	<b>Public Clinic</b>	<b>Public Surgeon</b>
Otorhinolaryngology	Adults 6 weeks. Children 8 weeks.	Adults 24 months. Children 12 months.
General Surgery	20 weeks.	Up to 1 year depending on procedure.
General Medicine	7-9 weeks.	
Paediatrics	3 weeks.	
Ophthalmology	10 weeks.	Routine surgery 2 months. Cataract surgery 6 weeks.
Geriatrics	1 week.	
Pain Clinic	1 week.	
Psychiatry	1-3 weeks.	
Gynaecology	Urgent cases 1 day. 1 week for cases requiring attention soon. 4 weeks for routine cases.	1 week for urgent cases. 3 weeks for cases requiring attention soon. 12 weeks for routine surgery.
Orthopaedics	Urgent cases 1 day. 2 weeks for cases requiring attention soon. 7 months for routine cases.	Waiting time for surgery varies from 2 weeks depending on intervention.

There is no waiting time for emergencies.

Cont'd.....

**Cont'd Answer to Question 86 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 85**

<b>Otorhinolaryngology</b>	189
<b>General Surgery</b>	110
<b>Ophthalmology</b>	48
<b>Orthopaedics</b>	347
<b>Gynaecology &amp; Obstetrics</b>	76

(In the process of validation)

**Answer to Question 85**

February 2005 as from 12.2.2005

	<b>February</b>	<b>March</b>
<b>Ear, Nose and Throat</b>	5	12
<b>General Surgery</b>	9	58
<b>Gynaecology &amp; Obstetrics</b>	10	30
<b>Orthodontics</b>	3	23
<b>Orthopaedics</b>	9	29
<b>Plastic Surgery</b>	0	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>158</b>

**NO. 87 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DIALYSIS TREATMENT**

Can Government confirm whether patients requiring dialysis treatment will be transported by St John Ambulance to the Europort hospital, once the facilities there are fully operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The clinical needs for transportation to St Bernard's Hospital for dialysis will be assessed on a case by case basis in line with protocols currently being developed for the patient transfer service provided by St John Ambulance.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 87 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Is there any explanation the Government can offer as to why the dialysis unit is not functioning yet within the hospital, because we were assured in this House that as soon as the hospital was operational the dialysis unit would also be operational?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

This House was assured of nothing of the sort. This House was told that the dialysis unit would be opened as soon as it was ready. The explanation I can give the hon Member is that the main reason is that at a reasonably late stage there was a decision to change the initial location of the dialysis unit to a better location, one which will provide dialysis patients with a view of the harbour, remember these patients are in a chair for three hours sometimes two and three times a week, and the policy decision was made that it was a good idea to accept the inherent delay in the change of location and the consequent work that needed to be done in view of the benefits to the patient. That was the main reason.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I remember clearly that even though I was not shadowing the Minister for Health I did intervene personally and I asked that question so I would have to check Hansard to see if what I say is correct. I am pretty sure that the Minister did say that the dialysis machine would be operational when the new hospital opened or words to that effect.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

If I said that then that is absolutely correct that the dialysis unit would be open once the new hospital was open.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

The Minister was implying in terms of time of chronology that it would happen when the hospital was open.

**ORAL**

**NO. 88 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DIALYSIS TREATMENT**

Can Government confirm whether patients requiring dialysis treatment will be transported by St John's Ambulance service to the Europort hospital, once the facilities there are fully operational?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Same as Question No. 87 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 89 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MALAGA CLINIC**

Can the Minister for Health state how much money was spent by the Gibraltar Health Authority with regard to patients being sent to the Malaga Clinic for Scans in December of 2004, January, February and March of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 90 to 94 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 90 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ALGECIRAS CLINIC**

Can Government confirm how much has the Gibraltar Health Authority spent to date in sending patients to the Algeciras clinic for scans during the financial year 2004/05 with the comparable figures for the same period last year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 89 and 91 to 94 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 91 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many patients have been given a choice of being treated in Spain as opposed to the UK, as Sponsored Patients, and have elected to go to Spain during the months of November, December 2004, January, February and March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 89, 90 and 92 to 94 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 92 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm that a number of sponsored patients have been informed by the Gibraltar Health Authority that they are unable to provide them with the relevant allowances on time due to a shortage of funds?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 89 to 91, 93 and 94 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 93 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PATIENT REFERRALS**

Can the Government state from January 2005 to March 2005, what has now been the number of patient referrals to the UK and at what cost, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 89 to 92 and 94 of 2005.

**NO. 94 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – SPONSORED PATIENTS**

Can the Government state from January 2005 to end of March 2005 what has been the number of Sponsored Patients treated in the UK and at what cost, together with the comparable figures for the previous year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question 92**

At no point has the Gibraltar Health Authority informed sponsored patients that they are unable to provide them with the relevant allowances on time due to a shortage of funds.

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

**Answer to Question 94 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 89**

The amount paid to clinics in Malaga for Scans in December 2004, January, February and March of 2005 were as follows:-

December 2004	£881.01
January 2005	£851.24
February 2005	£429.75
March 2005	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£2162.00</b>

**Answer to Question 90**

The cost of scans in the Algeciras Clinic during the financial year 2004/05 with the comparable figures for the same period last year is as follows:-

2003-04	£221,173.09
2004-05	£207,532.88

**Answer to Question 91**

All patients are given the choice to be treated in Spain as opposed to the UK at the time of referral when considered appropriate by the referring Consultant. 152 patients out of 608 have elected to go to Spain during the months of November, December 2004, January, February, and March 2005.

**Answer to Question 93**

The number of patient referrals to the UK during financial year 04/05 was 1258 referrals. The cost identified to date is £2,656,028 (This figure is subject to change, as accounts have not yet been finalised).

The comparable figures for financial year 03/04 are 1164 referrals at a cost of £1,556,402. The quota system was still operating that year.

**Answer to Question 94**

The number of sponsored patients treated in the UK during financial year 04/05 was 753 patients. The cost identified to date is £2,656,028 (This figure is subject to change, as accounts have not yet been finalised)

The comparable figures for financial year 03/04 are 679 patients at a cost of £1,556,402. The quota system was still operating that year.

The figures provided for Question 93 and 94 are cumulative figures from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004. These will take account of any adjustments that have been made on the cost previously provided and which were identified as being subject to change. To produce the figures as requested will also entail having to produce three sets of figures and enter into a reconciliation process which would involve a disproportionate amount of administrative effort.

**ORAL**

**NO. 95 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can Government confirm the total number of patients who are presently occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital giving a breakdown by sex and age and in which ward or unit they are in?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69, 74 and 96 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 96 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF PATIENTS**

Can the Government state, in relation to the total number of patients presently occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital, how many of them are situated in each ward or unit, giving a breakdown by sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69, 74, 95 and 97 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 97 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state during the months of December 2004, January, February and March of 2005, of the beds occupied by Elderly persons who have been formally discharged from St Bernard's Hospital, how many fell into each of the 3 categories identified by the Government specifying sex and age:-

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

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69, 74, 95, 96 and 98 to 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 98 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – ELDERLY CARE PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Elderly Citizens are awaiting a place at Mount Alvernia, and how many of these are occupying a bed at St Bernard's Hospital as at the end of March 2005, giving a breakdown of sex and age?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 61 to 63, 69, 74, 95 to 97 and 99 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 99 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PSYCHO-GERIATRIC PATIENTS**

Can Government state how many Psycho-Geriatric patients have been admitted in KGV during the months of December 2004, January, February and March of 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the schedule which I hand over.

**Answer to Question 99 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 61**

	December 2004	January 2005	February 2005	March 2005
Admissions	395	369	338	459
Average	152	153	134	133

**Answer to Question 62**

The total number of inpatient admissions at St Bernard's Hospital for the year 2004 was 5925.

**Answer to Question 63**

	December 2004	January 2005	February 2005	March 2005
A & E Clinics	1658	1645	1569	1920
A & E Dressings	631	376	305	357
Clinics	1179	1229	304	1249
Orthoptist	115	63	0	0
Optometrist	120	94	28	62
Physiotherapy	522	448	434	450
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4225</b>	<b>3855</b>	<b>2640</b>	<b>4038</b>

**Answer to Question 69**

WARD	NO OF BEDS	BEDS IN USE
Emily McIntosh	11	11
Rainbow	21	21
Victoria McIntosh	30	30
John McIntosh	30	30
Dudley Toomey	30	30
Cap Murchison	30	30
James Giraldi	13	5
A & E	2	2
Day Surgery	8	8
Reserved Ward	30	0
Reserved Ward	10	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>167</b>

**Answer to Question 74**

AGE	DECEMBER 2004			JANUARY 2005		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
61-70	6	3	9	8	8	16
71-80	8	9	17	7	10	17
81-90	6	33	31	6	37	43
91+	4	9	13	5	9	14
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>90</b>

AGE	FEBRUARY 2005			MARCH 2005		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
61-70	12	8	20	8	6	14
71-80	9	12	21	5	13	18
81-90	8	34	42	4	9	13
91+	6	9	15	3	4	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>52</b>

Contd..

**Cont'd Answer to Question 99 of 2005**

**Answer to Questions 95 and 96**

	Male	Age Group	Female	Age Group	Total	
<b>Emily Mackintosh</b>	3	0 to 10	2	21 to 30	5	
			1	31 to 40	1	
<b>Rainbow</b>	2	0 to 10			2	
			1	11 to 20	1	2
<b>Victoria McIntosh</b>	1		1	21 to 30	1	
			1	41 to 50	1	
			3	51 to 60	3	
			2	61 to 70	2	
			4	71 to 80	4	
			9	81 to 90	10	
			8	91 +	8	
<b>John McIntosh</b>	1				1	
			1	41 to 50	1	
			1	51 to 60	2	3
					1	1
			3	71 to 80	2	5
			7	81 to 90	4	11
<b>Dudley Toomey</b>	2		2	30 to 40	2	
			2	41 to 50	0	2
			2	51 to 60	0	2
			1	61 to 70	2	3
			2	71 to 80	2	4
			4	81 to 90	2	6
			2	91 +	3	5
<b>Capt Murchison</b>	2		0		2	
			1	70 to 80	3	
			5	81 to 90	6	
			2	91 +	4	
<b>James Giraldi</b>	1		0		1	
			1	61 to 70	1	
			2	71 to 80	0	2
	1		0	81 to 90	1	

**Total No. of patients      111**

Cont....

**Cont'd Answer to Question 99 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 97**

DECEMBER 2004				JANUARY 2005		
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
61-70	0	1	1	0	1	1
71-80	1	2	3	2	3	5
81-90	3	2	5	2	3	5
91+	0	1	1	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>

FEBRUARY 2005				MARCH 2005		
AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
61-70	0	1	1	0	1	1
71-80	2	3	5	3	3	6
81-90	2	2	4	2	2	4
91+	0	1	1	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>

All elderly patients require some sort of support be it physical, emotional or social.

All patients who have been officially discharged are able to be looked after.

**Answer to Question 98**

A total of 48 persons were on the waiting list for admission to the John Mackintosh Homes as at 21 April, 2005. Of these, the following were in St Bernard's Hospital, classified by age and sex.

AGE	MALE	FEMALE
71 TO 80		1
81 TO 90	2	4
91 +	2	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>

**Answer to Question 99**

6 Psycho-geriatric patients have been admitted into KGV during this period.

**ORAL**

**NO. 100 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

In view of the statement made by the Minister for Health during the last meeting of the House on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2004, in answer to Question 2166 of 2004, can he now confirm whether he has read the report that was carried out by the City Fire Brigade dated 19 November 1998 in relation to the KGV Psychiatric Unit and, if so, is he satisfied that its recommendations were implemented?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question No. 101 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 101 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – KGV HOSPITAL**

Can the Minister for Health confirm whether he is satisfied that since 1998, after the review of the City Fire Brigade was carried out in relation to KGV Psychiatric Unit, the necessary installation of equipment for Fire Prevention, or the measures required for dealing with the onset of a fire have been adequate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

I have read the report of the City Fire Brigade dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 1998 captioned KGV Hospital. As the hon Member is aware, there was a recent incident at KGV which is the subject of a Coroner's investigation and the Government consider it inappropriate to comment on any matter related to the incident.

**ORAL**

**NO. 102 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MRSA INFECTION**

Can the Government confirm how many cases there have been of MRSA Infection within St Bernard's Hospital since 1996 to the present time and how many of them have been fatal?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Since 1996, 18 patients have been treated for MRSA acquired within St Bernard's Hospital. In one case MRSA was determined to be a contributing factor to the cause of death.

During the same period, 40 patients returned to Gibraltar with MRSA infections which were acquired while being treated in health facilities abroad. A further 59 patients were also treated for MRSA infections acquired from elsewhere.

According to The Director of Public Health, there has been no other death directly attributable to MRSA infection.

**ORAL**

**NO. 103 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT TEAM**

Can Government confirm whether they are expecting to receive any recommendations from the Clinical Governance Audit Team with regard to the KGV Psychiatric Unit?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 106, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 104 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CT SCAN**

Can Government state whether the CT Scan at St Bernard's Hospital is operational, and if not, when is it expected to be?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The CT Scanner was tested and fully commissioned prior to the opening of the hospital. It has been ready for regular use since 14<sup>th</sup> February 2005. The services will be initiated as soon as a suitably experienced radiologist has been recruited.

**ORAL**

**NO. 105 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – STRESS MACHINE**

Can the Minister for Health now confirm whether authorisation has been given by those who donated the treadmill, so that it can be upgraded and used for stress testing?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The position remains as stated in answer to Question No. 1539 of 2004.

**ORAL**

**NO. 106 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PAIN CLINIC**

Are Government now in a position to confirm the staff composition of the Pain Clinic, and if so, does it coincide with the recommendations of the Health Care Development Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 103, 122, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 107 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can the Government confirm what is the distribution of nurses by wards and departments at St Bernard's Hospital, Europort, specifying their grades?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 108 and 136 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 108 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CONTRACT NURSES**

Can the Government confirm how many contract nurses are employed by the Gibraltar Health Authority, at the end of March 2005, listing the speciality in which they are employed?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 107 and 136 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 109 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NEW POSTS**

Can Government confirm whether any new posts have been created within the Gibraltar Health Authority during the financial year 2004/05, and if so, can they give the grade and salary of such posts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 110, 116 and 117 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 110 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NEW POSTS**

Can Government confirm whether any new posts have been created within the Civil Service, which contribute to the running of the Europort hospital, and if so, can they give the grade and salary of such posts?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 109, 116 and 117 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 111 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government confirm whether they have now renewed those contracts which were due to expire before or in January 2005, for Medical Practitioners?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 112, 113 and 115 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 112 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government give details of any new arrangements or contracts they have entered into with Medical Practitioners of the Gibraltar Health Authority relating to Private Practice?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 111, 113 and 115 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 113 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Can Government confirm whether there have been any changes in the Job Descriptions of Medical Practitioners working within the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 111, 112 and 115 of 2005.

**NO. 114 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DENTAL OFFICERS**

Can Government confirm whether Dental Officers will be allowed to carry out Private Practice outside their normal working hours as employees of the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 67**

As from 1 December 2004, no private medicine is being practised within the GHA. Patients who are neither entitled to receive free treatment under the provisions of any legislation nor a reciprocal agreement which may be in force may be charged a fee payable to the GHA.

**Answer to Question No. 68**

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

**Answer to Question No. 70**

There are no designated private beds in St Bernard's Hospital

The charges to which the hon Member refers are set out in the Hospital Rules. These were last increased when the hon Lady was in office in 1989 and are now under review.

**Answer to Question No. 114**

Dental Officers may on receipt of permission from the Chief Executive carry out private practice outside the normal working hours outside the GHA premises.

Answer to Question 114 of 2005

**Answer to Question 68**

	<b>In-Patients</b>	<b>Out-Patients</b>
<b>December 2004</b>	2	3
<b>January 2005</b>	3	3
<b>February 2005</b>	5	1
<b>March 2005</b>	9	8

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 67, 68, 70 AND 114 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Will the Minister explain what he means when he says that there are fees specified and there are no private rooms designated within the new hospital?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

There are no private rooms and there are no private patients and there is no private practice, and I would take this opportunity to point out that this question has been asked twice in this meeting and the last meeting of the House, and if it is asked again the answer will remain the same. It is just to avoid confusion because if I am being asked to make a statement of policy, the policy that was taken was made at the last meeting and is made here again, that there is no private practice so there is no point in repeating the question as has been repeated on this occasion. I am just saying this for the benefit of the hon Member.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I am not talking about private practice, I am talking about private rooms.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I understand, if given time I will answer again. There are charges, there is a list of charges in the Hospital Rules which are applicable to people who are not entitled to receive free medicine, as may be an emergency case coming in from across the border, or an accident in Main Street or a tourist off a ship, and those are the fees that are applicable in the case of a non-entitled patient who is, for example, not a member of the GPMS. Those fees, as I said, were last reviewed back in the historic times and are currently being reviewed.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say whether in fact there have been any instances of dental officers being given permission by the Chief Executive to carry out private practice or not?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I would need notice of that question. Not that I am aware of, it has not crossed my desk and I have not been informed but I hesitate from saying no in case it has happened.

**NO. 115 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

In view of the answer given to Question 2146 of 2004, can Government confirm that it is their policy that before the GHA decides whether or not to extend the contracts for Medical Practitioners, their performance requires to be reviewed by external assessors?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 111**

Five General Practitioners contracts due to expire in January 2005 have been renewed.

**Answer to Question No. 112**

Consultant Medical staff and General Practitioners may provide private practice outside contracted hours and off GHA premises only on the permission of the Chief Executive.

**Answer to Question No. 113**

The job descriptions for the General Practitioners are under review in discussion with the GPs themselves.

**Answer to Question No. 115**

As stated in answer to Question No. 2146 of 2004, it is the GHA policy to review the performance of all officers prior to any contract extension. With respect to the clinical performance of General Practitioners at the GHA, these have all been reviewed by external assessors.

ORAL

**NO. 116 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – EXECUTIVE TEAM**

Can Government confirm whether the Administrative support for the new Executive Team of the Gibraltar Health Authority has now been finalised?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 109, 110 and 117 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 117 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – EXECUTIVE TEAM**

Can Government confirm whether the Administrative Support for the new Executive Team of the Gibraltar Health Authority will mean that new posts will be or have been created?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 110**

Although officers from other Government Departments have been seconded to the Gibraltar Health Authority, no new posts have been created within the Civil Service which contribute to the running of the Europort Hospital.

**Answer to Question Nos. 109, 116 and 117**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 117 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 109, 116 & 117**

The post of Chief Executive/Director of Finance was split up into two separate posts thus creating one extra post. This is reflected in the list of new posts created during the financial year 2004/2005 as detailed below:

No of Posts	Grade	Salary	Remarks
1	Chief Executive	£106,000	
1	Human Resources Director	£80,758	
1	Deputy Director of Operations	£53,128	
1	Patient Complaints Co-ordinator	£26,248	
3	Operating Department Practitioner	£19,093	
1	Orthopaedic Surgeon	£87,025	(being recruited)
1	General Surgeon	£101,480	(Arriving in May)
2	Consultant Anaesthetist	£87,025	(1 to be recruited)
1	TSSU/CSSD Manager	£22,247*	
7	TSSU/CSSD Technician	£13,483*	(2 to be recruited)
		£13,109*	
		£12,028*	
		£13,109*	
		£13,483*	
7	Receptionist (5 Whole Time Equivalents)	£11,871	
1	Catering Director	£27,718	
1	Senior House Officer	£86,886	
3	Executive Officer	£23,234	(1 to be transferred)
1	IT Support Assistant	£13,024	
5	Administrative Officer	£19,334	(4 to be transferred)
3	Personal Secretary (Executive Team Support)	£19,817	(1 to be transferred)
1	Consultant Paediatrician	£87,025	(Arriving in Sept)
1	Senior Radiographer I	£22,567 to £26,937**	(Arriving in May)
2	Senior Radiographer II	£19,002 to £24,192**	(1 arriving in May)
2	Biomedical Scientist	£16,323 to £19,860**	
1	JMISO	£11,323	
6	Staff Nurses (Critical Care ITU)	£16,548 to £22,247**	(4 arriving in May)
8	Staff Nurses (Day Surgery)	£16,548 to £22,247**	(being recruited)
1	Building Maintenance Officer-PTO	£16,672 to £28,002**	(being recruited)
5	Labourers	£12,396	(to be transferred)
6	Handyman/Craftsman	£15,481	(5 transferred from Community Project April 05)
11	Domestics P/T (5½ Whole Time Equivalents)	£12,396	(to be recruited)
1	IT Support Officer	£29,000	(Transferred from ETB)

\* Salary on a Personal to Holder basis

\*\* Salary dependent on years of experience

ORAL

**NO. 118 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – COMPLAINTS CO-ORDINATOR**

Can the Government state which is the grade and salary of the newly created post of Complaints Co-ordinator for the handling of official complaints within the Gibraltar Health Authority?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 119 to 121 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 119 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – COMPLAINTS CO-ORDINATOR**

Can the Government confirm how many complaints have been dealt with by the Complaints Co-ordinator, which have not been passed on to officially to the Independent Review Panel?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 118, 120 and 121 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 120 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how often the members of the new Independent Complaints Review Panel have now met to consider complaints from users of our Health Services?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 118, 119 and 121 of 2005.

**NO. 121 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL**

Can the Government confirm how many complaints have been lodged with the new Independent Review Panel since it started to function to the end of March 2005, from users of the Health Services, specifying the date of each complaint?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 118**

For pay purposes the Complaints Co-ordinator is analogued to the Higher Executive Officer pay scale and the salary is £26,248 per annum.

**Answer to Question No. 119**

As at 20<sup>th</sup> April 2005, 49 complaints have been handled exclusively by the Complaints Co-ordinator without request by the complainant for referral to the Independent Review Panel.

**Answer to Question Nos. 120 and 121**

To date only one complaint has been lodged with the Independent Review Panel. The panel is an independent body and the Government are therefore not aware of how often its members have met to consider this single complaint.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 118 TO 121 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could I ask the Minister who appoints the Independent Panel?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Under the Ordinance the Minister chooses a number of fit and proper persons the names of which are published in the Gazette and then as a case arises the Ombudsman picks from that, because the complaint is referred to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman picks from that panel which, if my memory serves me is 18 people, picks three people from that panel to serve on that particular complaint.

**ORAL**

**NO. 122 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – HEALTHCARE DEVELOPMENT TEAM**

Can Government state whether the review by the Health Care Development Team with regards to the Pathology Department and the Laboratory has been undertaken, and if so, can they state if any recommendations have been accepted?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 103, 106, 123, 128 and 135 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 123 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – DISTRICT COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Can the Government now confirm, in view of the replies given by the Minister for Health, in answer to Question 826 of 2004, 1589 of 2004, and 2217 of 2004, whether they intend to improve resources within the District Community Service as recommended by the Healthcare Development Team?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 103, 106, 122, 128 and 135 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 124 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CATERING SERVICE**

Can Government state whether they have employed any persons on fixed contract terms to manage the Catering Service provided to St Bernard's Hospital, either directly or through the use of a contracting company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 125 to 127 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 125 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – MEALS**

Can Government state whether they are aware that there are complaints from many patients in St Bernard's Hospital at the Europort Building, that the meals being delivered to them in trays, from the Kitchen which is now situated in the old wine factory area, are arriving cold?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 124, 126 and 127 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 126 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA - MEALS**

In view of the reply given to Question 2238 of 2004 by the Minister for Health, when he confirmed that a total of 13 catering staff were involved in the production of meals for St Bernard's Hospital and that the transport of such meals and domestic units would also be provided within the current staffing provision, whether any extra financial compensation is being paid to the staff for having to transport the meals from the old wine factory area to Europort?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 124, 125 and 127 of 2005.

**NO. 127 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA - MEALS**

Can Government state whether they intend to engage a private company to manage the production of meals which is being transported to St Bernard's Hospital from the old wine factory area?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 124**

Government can confirm that the post of Catering Director has been taken up on a GHA contract for two years.

**Answer to Question No. 125**

Government are aware that when the service first started there were some complaints of the meals arriving cold. Temperature and quality audits were put into place and remedial measures were taken immediately. This service is audited on a weekly basis.

**Answer to Question No. 126**

There is no extra financial compensation being paid to staff for transporting meals to the hospital.

**Answer to Question No. 127**

The production of meals is being carried out by GHA staff and the management of this service is also carried out by GHA staff.

ORAL

**NO. 128 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE AUDIT**

Can Government confirm how much is the expected total expenditure in respect of the Clinical Governance Audit they have commissioned for our health services, since the answer was not given by them in reply to question 877 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 82 to 84, 103, 106, 122, 123 and 135 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 129 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – STUDY LEAVE**

Can Government confirm what has been the expenditure for study leave, up to the end of March 2004/2005, which is included in sub-head 30, School of Health Studies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The total expenditure for study leave for staff attending courses overseas is £73,884.51. This is composed of £21,006.03 in Course fees and £43,398.97 in Subsistence and £9,479.51 in travel.

ORAL

**NO. 130 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – COST OF ACCOMMODATION**

Can Government now confirm what is the final figure for accommodation, under Sub-Head 22 in the financial year 2003/2004 and the forecast outturn for the financial year 2004/2005 of the Gibraltar Health Authority, replies to which have not been given to the same question in two previous meetings of the House, namely Question 814 of 2004, and 2160 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 131 and 132 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 131 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – RENTAL OF PRIVATE PROPERTIES**

Can the Government give the names of the owners of all the Private Properties the Gibraltar Health Authority has been renting from the beginning of 2003 to the present time?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 130 and 132 of 2005.

**NO. 132 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – RENTAL OF PRIVATE PROPERTIES**

Now that the Government have confirmed that the GHA have been renting properties in respect of which the lessor is in breach of the terms of the underlease, which prohibits renting, what action has been taken to rectify the situation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question No. 132**

The Government have not confirmed that the GHA have been renting properties in respect of which the lessor is in breach of the terms of the underlease. The GHA contracts with Estate Agents when renting private properties. Ensuring that the lessee is acting in compliance with the terms of the underlease is the responsibility of the lessor and not of the GHA.

**Answer to Question No. 131**

At the time contracts are signed, GHA has never obliged the Estate Agents to provide details of the names of the owners in respect of the private properties that they lease. On receipt of the hon Member's question, the GHA have requested this information from the estate agents concerned. They have provided it to the GHA but on a confidential basis. I am therefore unable to provide the information to the hon Member. With the exception of one estate agent who acts for himself but I can disclose that name because we have been given permission to say that Mr Momy Levy who owns a number of flats, has in the past hired flats to the GHA acting as his own estate agent and we have been authorised to release this information, but I am not authorised to release information on behalf of the other estate agents.

**Answer to Question No. 130**

The spend on accommodation under Subhead 22 in 2003/2004 and the forecast outturn for the financial year 2004/2005 are as follows:-

<b>2003/2004</b>	<b>2004/2005</b>
£329,969.03	£387,000

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 130 TO 132 OF 2005**

### **HON F R PICARDO:**

The clear reason for the question at No. 132 was that we had received in this House an answer to a question previously put by Miss Montegriffo where the Minister for Health disclosed that the Health Authority was renting a number of properties at Montagu Gardens, Harbour Views, one of the developments where I think all of us are aware there is a restriction on the under-lessee from renting. This really is what we are trying to determine to see whether the Government have been able to get to the bottom of whether those flats it was renting at Montagu Gardens or any of those other places were in fact being rented in breach of the leases granted by the Government in their incarnation as landlord, although of course I accept that the GHA is an independent statutory body, but the Chief Executive of the Gibraltar Health Authority, the Minister is a Member of the Government. Really what we are trying to do is get to the bottom of whether that is being dealt with.

### **HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I hear what the hon Member is saying but let us look at what has happened in relation to both questions. The last meeting of the House, the question did not ask for the name of the owners, the question was on the lines of what accommodation is GHA providing to staff nurses, to the Chief Executive, to a number of people specified by name. The question asked for addresses, not names of the owners of the property. I answered the question on the basis of providing the location and not the address because I thought it was inappropriate to say there is a doctor living at such an address, or a nurse living at such an address and link it to a name. So I answered the question in the last meeting of the House generically in saying we have rented flats in whatever it was, Montagu Gardens, Harbour Views or whatever. This led to the question being asked by the hon Member the under leases do not permit renting. She subsequently wrote to me, the Opposition Member spokesman for Health, she subsequently wrote to me and I replied to her on the lines I have replied today saying firstly that the houses were 100 per cent owned and there was no Government involvement in the under lease. Secondly, that as far as I was concerned, as I have said today, responsibility for ensuring that the terms of the under lease are complied with is a civic matter between the lessor, whether it be the developer or the management company and the owner of the property. The question today as opposed to the last time asks for the name of the owners of the property, it does not ask for the addresses. I am quite happy in relation to another question, I am quite happy to provide on the same generic basis, I am happy to provide not addresses but the Estates where GHA is renting property but I am specifically stopped by correspondence with the estate agents from releasing the names of the owners, but GHA has no difficulty in saying we are renting in Montagu Gardens or in Harbour Views.

### **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just say something. The political thrust of the hon Member's question is, are the Government renting property in estates where, are the Government or the GHA we are not to make defined distinction between the two. Is the GHA renting property in estates leased from the Crown the underlease of which contains prohibition against renting, implicit in the question is the insinuation if it were then there is

something quite odd about that because surely the Government have an interest in enforcing the Crown's covenants rather than in aiding and abetting in their breach and frustration. I think we may as well get to the root of the problem, it appears that the GHA has been doing that because it has not been taking care to check the underlease. Whether or not the Government should be allowing the GHA to rent on that basis is a question which will now be under review and I think the GHA are now on notice and perhaps they ought to be more careful in the flats that they rent. It is not usual for a short-term let to lead the rentor, the tenant, to check the root of title, the document of title, it is quite unusual, one would not expect the ordinary man in the street to go through all that trouble. Whether the Government and the GHA as institutions of state so to speak should go to that trouble is moot, at the end of the day now they are on notice they have a greater onus to form a view on that question. Of course whether the Government then choose to enforce their covenants, actually it may not even be the Government it may even be a company, whether some other legal entity linked or not linked to the Government decides to enforce its covenants under the lease is a wholly different question, but I accept the political thrust of the point being made and the insinuations underlying it, although they have not actually articulated it themselves.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

There are many dimensions to this issue of course because people who have bought in those estates have bought homes in those estates. One of the issues that the Chief Minister says is that it should not be incumbent on a party taking a lease to check the root of title, I agree with that. I think most people in Gibraltar, at least those of us who are politically aware, know that those estates were developed as homes, they were not put on the market so that people could buy them and then market them as rental properties and in fact, the very fact that the underleases prevent those properties from being rented should affect their value. They cannot be bought to rent and I think it is important that we should highlight this because of course there are many people in that estate, I am sure, who have not put their houses out to rent when perhaps they have wanted to move somewhere else, on the basis that the underlease does not allow them to do it. Obviously one of the reasons for that is to prevent speculation driving up the prices of property on those estates, although we can argue forever about why they are already as high as they are, but I am grateful for the indication that now that this has been highlighted the GHA is likely not to want to continue to lend itself to a breach of those leases.

**NO. 133 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – PATIENT CHAIRS**

Can Government confirm whether the ward chairs in St Bernard's Hospital at Europort have been or will be replaced due to their slippery condition which has already led to patients falling off them?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The patient chairs at St Bernard's Hospital are of two types. One type is the chairs transferred from the old hospital that are called Buxton chairs and these are more suitable for the more elderly patient.

The second type, the new patient chairs recently purchased, are the type most ergonomically and clinically suitable for an acute patient such as someone who is recovering from surgery. These were purchased as part of the procurement of the new hospital.

These new chairs purchased for the wards had been procured from Huntley Nesbitt Evans, a firm in the UK, who are the NHS approved supplier for patient chairs. These chairs are produced to ISO 9000 Standards and all of these products have been tested to ensure conformance with strength and stability standards BS 4875.

Following one reported incident in which a cushion moved from the seat of one of the new chairs while a patient was sitting on it, management has taken additional precautions and have made the decision to further anchor the cushions using Velcro strapping.

**NO. 134 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CAR PARKING**

Can Government confirm when the car parking spaces, which they have acquired from Europlaza, will be available for the public who need access to the Europort Hospital?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The GHA has not yet adopted any policy decision with regard to the use of car parking spaces in Europlaza.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 134 OF 2005**

**HON C A BRUZON:**

I was under the impression, I think by the answer given a few months ago, that in about a year's time parking spaces would be available in the Europlaza for use of the hospital.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

That is indeed correct. They will be available for the public. I may have misread the thrust of the question. The use by the public I took to mean the actual conditions whether it will be a public only car park or whether it will also be for members of staff. That finer detail has not yet been established as policy but whether it will be available for the public the answer is clearly yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The question is not that unless they are looking at different Order Papers, the question is when will they become available?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

Yes, that has also been answered previously. It is outside the control of the Government or of GHA. The Government have purchased the floor space but until the building is finished, the developer hands over the building, they cannot be acquired. On present forecasts, depending on who one asks, they vary from the end of the year to the middle of next year so I cannot with any authority say when but indeed it was said last time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The hon Gentleman may scoff but this is a large investment by the GHA, the fact that the Government's forward planning in relation to the hospital was not sufficiently precise to ensure that parking was going to be available means that people now have to pay exorbitant amounts at Safeways if they want to use the parking closest to the hospital, and all we are doing is try to determine whether the development which is going to provide the parking is going apace and the Government expectation is that the parking is going to be provided at least in the first half of next year. Developments slip as we know, they are often delivered late, we are just trying to determine whether at the moment it is still the first half of next year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not accept the premise of the hon Member's supplementary question. The Government do not accept that the question now under discussion has anything to do with bad, good, indifferent forward planning.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

It still leaves the people who want to park.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

But that is a different issue. The Government have moved St Bernard's Hospital from an old building which did not enjoy any parking facilities and which had much less street parking available around it in the public highways than this one does, to a building which also does not have, it has more subterranean parking than St Bernard's had by the way, and which is located in an area where the street parking availability, however insufficient it may be, is less acute than it was in the old St Bernard's Hospital. So the existing situation, however unsatisfactory it might be, is already an improvement on where we came from when the hospital was situated in Castle Road. So it has nothing to do with forward planning, it was always envisaged, known and anticipated that the only place in that area of Gibraltar where a car parking dedicated to the hospital, exclusively for the hospital, could be procured, given that a previous Government had alienated the site next to it for private development, was by acquiring a floor of that private development to provide a car park and it was always known that that development would not be ready in time for the new hospital. It was therefore always known that there would be a period whilst the new hospital was up and running and the new parking would not be available and therefore it is not a question of the quality of the forward planning. It was always in the plan that this situation would be so and of course, those who leased out, those

who sold then Safeways a large chunk of public land so that they could build a private car park for their private supermarket are not well placed to now complain to the Government that the Government are unable to deliver public parking in that private supermarket's car park. There is nothing that we can do about that. *[Interruption]* I am sorry, the hon Member in his supplementary question raised the question of people having to park and pay for parking in Safeways. I would not have raised this point if he had not raised it. He cannot point to what is now Morrisons supermarket as if it was something that the Government could do something about. The Government in fact are talking, and the hon Member has another question in the Order Paper, the Minister for Health is talking to Morrisons to see if they will play ball but at the end of the day that land was leased to them, it is therefore private property and it is up to them to decide who they allow to park, what hours and on what basis and it was not this Government that created that situation. So the hon Member might wish to criticise other aspects of the matter but he cannot attribute to this Government the fact that that piece of land is a private car park and not a public car park.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The hon Gentleman is keen to keep going back to things that happened 15 years ago in order to defend his actions less than five years ago to make a decision to put the hospital into an office block opposite a plot which had already been leased out to a supermarket and next to a plot that had at the same time as the building lease for Europort been granted, had also been leased out to other parties. The fact of the matter is that this is obviously the effects of putting a hospital into an office block and putting it into an office block where they put it. Of course, if we had developed a hospital from scratch on the green fields site, then that hospital could have had its own parking and we would not have been dependent on the Minister for Health having to go to Morrisons to ask them to be allowed to park at their parking cheaply in the future. These are the consequences of decisions badly taken.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well no, I think we are in serious danger of re-opening old, political debate here but of course the hon Member's point is almost totally academic because of course, for him to debate the merits or demerits of the choice of location given that in that particular Election Campaign it is clear that they had no intention whatsoever of building a new hospital anywhere and therefore the parking situation would have continued to be indefinitely, as it was during the eight years that they were in Government, as bad and as unavailable and as acute as it has historically been at St Bernard's, and that it was only when they realised that our manifesto contained a promise for a new hospital that they rushed to the printers and inserted a sheet of paper, on different gloss paper, to insert the hospital. So that is the first starting position. If we are here debating whether the parking available for the new hospital is adequate or inadequate, the first thing that we should recognise is that we are only debating that at all because this party was elected into Government. Had this party not been elected into Government there would not have been a new hospital and therefore there would not have been a debate about whether the parking around it was adequate or inadequate. Secondly, what we are debating is the fact that for a period of time which stretches from pre-eight months until the Europlaza building has been completed, the parking situation around the new hospital will not be as it is intended to be permanently. So the very worst that the hon Member can say is that how terribly inconvenient that the enjoyment of this new hospital insofar as parking is

concerned, is not going to be as good as it could have been from day one because we are going to have to wait about 12 months before we can enjoy the car park. Well we think that that is a small price to pay frankly for the splendid hospital. Almost everybody in Gibraltar except the Opposition Members are willing to acknowledge the splendour of the new hospital. I think frankly, their unwillingness to even acknowledge that, even to say well yes it is a smashing hospital, we of course would have built it somewhere else and we would have built a smashing hospital somewhere else too but their continued unwillingness to demonstrate any degree of recognition of the quality of the hospital that has been built, I think speaks for itself. Frankly, if we have to wait another 12 months before we have a further enhancement of our hospital facilities, over and above the huge enhancements that the new hospital itself provides, and that is wait until the construction of the building next door is done so that we can have hospital parking, the answer to his supplementary question is, he will recall that he ended his statements with the words '*are they not*', therefore the answer to the supplementary question is no.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In that case the question must be this because the Chief Minister has for the first time I think in many years of understanding the legal rules about what somebody does or does not know, made the great mistake of purporting to know what the intentions of others were. Of course there was an intention to develop a hospital on the green fields site, whatever he may say, he will at least accept that he is not able to determine what the intention of another person is. That is a basic legal rule.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We can analyse the circumstantial evidence.

**NO. 135 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – CLINICAL GOVERNANCE TEAM**

What was the unforeseen work undertaken by the Clinical Governance Team for the GHA which have required additional funds of £350,000 and £200,000 beyond the £400,000 shown in Head 7 – A, sub-head 4 in the Estimates of Expenditure approved by the House for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answers to Question Nos. 82, 83 and 84**

The pilot initiative for scheduling of Gynaecology is proceeding as outlined in my answer to Question No. 2241 of 2004 and in my letter to the hon Member dated 24 February 2005.

The first stage is the development of new theatre schedules to increase the theatre capacity of Gynaecology. This has already taken place with extra sessions being given for Caesarean sections and Day case procedures. The primary aim of this is to reduce the waiting list, which is an essential prerequisite for a scheduled service. This will be developed further with the recruitment of extra theatre staff in the next few weeks and so bringing about a further increase in theatre sessions for all specialties.

The centralisation of waiting lists has also commenced with the appointment of a waiting list manager who is currently centralising all waiting lists including gynaecology.

Finally, the third component an improved bed management system is now clearly evident with structures and processes developed to improve bed availability and therefore maximising that bed availability.

**Answer to Question 103**

The Healthcare Development Team report on Clinical Services has not yet been received. Recommendations regarding KGV would be part of the Psychiatric Services Section.

**Answer to Question 106**

The pain clinic staffing has recently been enhanced by the addition of a new consultant anaesthetist with extensive experience in pain management. The staff composition of the Pain Clinic is as given in answer to Question 835/2004. The position in relation to the Healthcare Development Team recommendations remains as given in answer to Question 1548/2004.

**Answer to Question 122**

The Clinical Report on Laboratory Services is part of the Clinical Services Report which has not yet been presented to the Government.

**Answer to Question 123**

The situation remains as given in answers to Question Nos. 826, 1589 and 2217 of 2004.

**Answer to Question 128**

The total payments made to date to the NHS Modernisation Agency in respect of the Gibraltar Healthcare Development Programme which the hon Member refers to as the Clinical Governance Audit was £1,431,187.85.

**Answer to Question 135**

The additional funds of £350,000 and £200,000 respectively in Head 7-A Subhead 4 in the Estimates of Expenditure for the Financial Year 2004/2005 were required because the Clinical Governance Team were required to provide additional services including transitional management services.

ORAL

**NO. 136 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

(On behalf of the Hon Miss M I Montegriffo)

**GHA – NUMBER OF NURSES**

Can Government confirm how many nurses there are in post as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005, giving a breakdown by grade?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

The statistical information requested by the hon Member is contained in the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 136 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 107**

St Bernard's Hospital

Ward/ Dept	CN/SR	SN	SEN	EN	Aux N	N Asst
Dudley Toomey	1	8.5		7.5		13
Captain Murchison	2	7		7		10
Rainbow	1	8	1	5	2	
Maternity	1 + (1 ag)	9.5				3.5
A&E	1 + (1 ag)	10.5		9		
Victoria McIntosh	2 + (1 ag)	6		8		11.5
John McIntosh	2	7.5		8		11.5
CCU	2	13		9		
Operating Theatre	1	5	0	1 (3 ODP's)		1
Ophthalmic Dept	1	2	0			0.5
Blood Dept		1.5				
Clinics		1	1	8		
Palliative Care		1				
Infection Control	1					
Cardiac Rehab		1				
Night Duty Senior cover	4					
Nurse Convenor						1

Cont...

**Cont'd Answer to Question 136 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 108**

DIRECTOR OF PATIENT & NURSING SERVICES	1
CLINICAL NURSE MANAGER-Maternity	1
EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	1
NURSE LECTURER	1
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	2
STAFF NURSES	16
REGISTERED SICK CHILDREN'S NURSE	5
REGISTERED MENTAL NURSE	4
THEATRE NURSES	2
STAFF MIDWIVES	9
OPERATING DEPARTMENT PRACTITIONERS	3
ENROLLED NURSES	4

**Answer to Question 136**

DIRECTOR OF PATIENT & NURSING SERVICES	1
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF NURSING SERVICES	1
CLINICAL NURSE MANAGERS	6
EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	1
SENIOR NURSE TUTOR	1t
NURSE LECTURER	1
NURSE PRACTITIONERS	2
CHARGE NURSE/NURSING SISTER	28
REGISTERED GENERAL NURSES	102½
STAFF MIDWIVES	11
OPERATING DEPARTMENT PRACTITIONERS	3
TSSU/CSSD MANAGER	1
TSSU/CSSD TECHNICIANS	5
SENIOR ENROLLED NURSES	5
ENROLLED NURSES	81
NURSING AUXILIARIES	10
NURSING ASSISTANTS	89½

ORAL

NO. 137 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

How many persons have enrolled for the 2005 intake of the School of Nurses for the two year enrolled nurse course?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 138 to 143 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 138 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Who is the external examiner who validates the assessment made by the School of Nursing Examiner when marking the final papers for the enrolled nurse qualification?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137 and 139 to 143 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 139 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

What is the cost per student for the training provided to complete the enrolled nurse qualification?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137, 138 and 140 to 143 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 140 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Is the enrolled nurse qualification gained in the School of Nursing recognised as a qualification in the European Union?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137 to 139 and 141 to 143 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 141 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Did all the persons who applied to join the enrolled nurse training course commencing this year have the minimum qualification required for acceptance and if not, how many did?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH

Answered together with Question Nos. 137 to 140 and 142 to 143 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 142 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Have persons commencing enrolled nurse training this year been told whether they will be offered employment by the GHA on successful completion of the course in two year's time?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

Answered together with Question Nos. 137 to 141 and 143 of 2005.

**NO. 143 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GHA – SCHOOL OF NURSING**

What remuneration is paid to pupil nurses undertaking enrolled nurse training, and student nurses undertaking staff nurse training?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH**

**Answer to Question Nos. 137 and 141**

A total of 13 candidates have applied for the 2005 intake for the two year enrolled nurse course. Of these nine have the qualifications required.

**Answer to Question No. 138**

The external examiner who validates the assessment made by the examiner of the School of Health Studies when marking the enrolled nurse qualification, is Mrs Stephanie Aitken, Senior Nurse Lecturer at Kingston University.

**Answer to Question No. 139**

The cost per student for the enrolled nurse qualification is £11,070 per student over the two year course, of which £10,962 is in respect of the bursary payments and £108 in respect of the external examiners fees and expenses.

**Answer to Question No. 140**

The enrolled nurse qualification is adapted for local needs and is not a qualification which would be recognised in the European Union.

**Answer to Question No. 142**

As at this date there has not been a 2005 intake and therefore the premise of Question No. 142 does not exist.

**Answer to Question No. 143**

The bursary paid to each of the students is £5,481 per annum and is paid monthly.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 137 TO 143 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In answer to the question on the cost, the Minister has said that £108 is the external cost and the balance is the bursary payment, I think he said? So there is no other cost in the training then?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are costs but they are borne under the cost structure of the Health Authority. There is a cost in running the School of Nursing.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but I have not asked whether they are borne, I am asking what is the cost per person. That is to say, if there is a budget then presumably the cost per person depends on how many people one has got training at any one time. Like in any other institution.

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

The question has been interpreted on what is the cost of running the course additional to any other existing course. That is why we have not included the pay of the lecturers who are employed anyway, it is all done by locally employed people so the additional costs to GHA are the bursary and the cost of the examination fees. If the hon Member would like a wider answer to the question, I am happy to provide that if he would indicate how wide he wants it costed but maybe he could write to me and give that indication.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the question is absolutely clear. It is the cost per student for the training provided to complete the enrolled nurse qualification and therefore it is the cost for the training provided. The Minister has given me the answer that the figure of £11,000 is predominantly the cost of the bursary which is in fact already covered by Question No. 143 on the remuneration paid to the nurses. That is a different question, one is what the nurses are getting paid and the other is what is the actual cost irrespective of to whom it is charged of providing the local training?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is clear that the answer does not include in-house costs of the GHA because presumably, I am now speculating, but presumably the people that are delivering this

course are also doing other things. They may even be training nurses other than enrolled nurses. It is therefore very difficult to attribute when in-house resources are being used to deliver training, it is actually quite difficult and those people are doing other things as well, it is actually quite difficult to decide what proportion of those internal costs that one has to carry anyway, whether delivering this enrolled nursing training or not, how much is attributed (a) to the enrolled nurse course; and (b) per head. I suppose it is possible to attribute on a notional basis to the enrolled nurses course but it would be in a sense, a deceptive answer in a sense because it would suggest that if the courses were not being delivered that cost would not be incurred and that would not be true. Therefore it is not a cost attached to the training because even if that training was not delivered, the cost would not be avoided the cost would still be incurred by the GHA and therefore query whether it is the cost of delivering the course. Of course there might even be management time involved in delivering in-house training, electricity costs, library, where does one stop at notionally attributing internal costs that are part of the normal operating cost infrastructure to a particular function of the Health Authority, in this case delivering training. It is possible to do it, it is not done on that basis and certainly the answer to the question is not given on that basis.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So are the Government saying then that in the budget of the School of Nursing there is not an identifiable amount which is due to the running of courses for enrolled nurses and which would not be there otherwise?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Except these items.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is the position then?

**HON LT-COL E M BRITTO:**

I do not want the hon Member to leave with any confusion in his mind. I mentioned two figures, £10,962 in answer to Question No. 139 plus £108 in respect of fees. Then in answer to Question No. 143 I mentioned £5,481 but that is a per annum figure. If he multiplies £5,481 by a two year course it comes to £10,962. So all I have given him is the cost of the payments to the students plus the cost of the examination. If the course had not taken place, those costs would not have been incurred.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am aware of the answer that he has given to me, this is why I pointed out to the Minister that he has given me the same answer to two different questions, except that he has told me what the cost is in two years in answer to Question No. 139 and what the cost is in one year in answer to Question No. 143. I am able to multiply one figure by two to arrive at the other one so clearly what I am trying to establish, which I

think he has confirmed, is that in terms of the budget of the School of Nursing if tomorrow there was no intake of enrolled nurses the budget would remain unchanged. That is the position.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, except for these items. Except for these points.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes but that is not part of the budget of the School of Nursing. These payments are the payments that people live in terms of their salary as it were, as students.

**NO. 144 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CALPE TENANTS ASSOCIATION**

What action do Government envisage they will take pursuant to meetings held with the Minister for the Environment by the Calpe Tenants Association?

**ANSWER**

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

I recently met with the Calpe Tenants Association and received their representations on the continuing problem of apes roaming in this area and foraging for food within the bin enclosure areas. It was explained to the tenants, and they agreed, that to a large extent this problem was due to some residents, albeit a minority, insisting on feeding the apes and it was this that principally attracted them to that area. It is true in addition that the refuse bins provide the apes with a further rich source of food and it is this combination that has resulted in the apes frequenting the site. The Department concerned has been studying the problem for some time and various options have been considered. Two recommendations have been made namely, the first one is to alter the design of the refuse enclosures so as to make it virtually impossible for the apes to enter. This approach has worked in other areas where similar problems have been experienced in the past. The second recommendation is to ensure that there is a stricter enforcement of the law in relation to the feeding of the apes. It is considered that the adoption of these measures will have the desired effect without there being a need to resort to other measures.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 144 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that answer. This weekend in particular was a very bad one, there was a very large amount of mess that anybody driving down from the Upper Rock would have seen. I actually had a conversation with one of the gentlemen from Master Cleaners who was there to clean up, who was pointing out to me that all sorts of home material is strewn all over the place, sanitary towels in the middle of the road, we have tourists in that area, forget the tourists, the people who live there, the children who live there, I want to address the two points to which the hon Gentleman has referred me to which is the question of redesigning first of all the refuse enclosures. I am very grateful for that. That in fact was.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

One has to understand what that involves. That involves the location.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, in fact that is one of the issues which I raised in an earlier question that we should redesign the refuse enclosures so that the apes would not be able to get access to them, as I remember saying in this House has been successful in other estates. I am grateful that that is now being looked at. The one issue that does concern me is the second point, this question of the stricter enforcement of the laws. We were all very pleased to see, I think during the last legislature, that there were amendments to the legislation in order to enable stricter enforcement of the laws against those who were feeding the apes. I can confirm to the Chief Minister that I make sure that I do not feed them from my kitchen at all, although they have been known to wander into my kitchen and feed themselves. It is that bad. Perhaps my kitchen should be redesigned so that nobody can get into it, but the legislation is now in place and was put in place in the last legislature. We saw the commencement of the stricter enforcement and then nothing has happened since. I dare say that if anybody were seen to be feeding the apes, even by a neighbour let alone a police officer, they are likely to have themselves lynched because the problem is getting fairly drastic. So can I please ask the hon Gentleman to press the accelerator on this one because really we are going to find ourselves in a situation where either a child is attacked, or an elderly person falls down and because of the muck on the road they are not going to need to go to the hospital to catch MRSA, they are going to catch it on the streets.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is not a question of accelerating, the funds have already been provided prove that that is now going to go ahead. There is an element, one contributing factor to the problem which is not reflected in this answer, and that is the fact of the size of the ape population which continues to grow and I think that ultimately simply putting cages around the central refuse collection point outside the hon Member's windows is not going to resolve the problem, because as the ape population continues to grow and they wander further down into town they will just find other central collection points until they find the central collection point outside my window in Irish Town. So I think we need to tackle, this is a growing issue, it is a growing problem and it has got to be done on three fronts. Law enforcement of the feeding, physically encaging them to discourage them, and even if it does not discourage them from coming to town it will certainly mean that they will not be able to cause the mess of disrupting the rubbish itself, and also I think it is now time to seriously and with a sense of courageous purpose to address the question of the ape population. The hon Member may have seen in the press recently, an initiative that is being pursued to see if some of them can be re-exported from whence it is said they originally came.

ORAL

**NO. 145 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Will the Government state what the cost has been of establishing the website [www.gibraltairquality.gi](http://www.gibraltairquality.gi) which will provide information as to the air quality readings picked up by the Air Quality Monitoring Station?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 146 to 148 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 146 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Will the Government confirm to the House the cost of establishing air quality monitoring stations in compliance with EU obligations?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 145 and 147 to 148 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 147 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

What was the cost to the Government of the advice received from expert consultants Netcen in the United Kingdom in respect of the installation of the air quality monitoring stations, and would the Government agree to provide the Opposition with the text of any reports or advice received in writing from Netcen Consultants in the UK, in respect of the installation of the air quality monitoring stations?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 145, 146 and 148 of 2005.

**NO. 148 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

What are the terms of the agreement entered into between Government and the Environmental Agency for the procurement of the equipment and associated infra structure for the installation of the air quality monitoring stations?

**ANSWER**

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

The cost to Government of the Netcen report was £18,600. Government are not in agreement to releasing this report.

The cost of establishing the air quality monitoring stations will be approximately £143,810. I say approximately because there are still some minor costs to be invoiced and that is not the exact cost.

Government have entered into an agreement with the Environmental Agency Limited for the purchase, the installation, commissioning and subsequent operation of the two automatic monitoring stations. This is a three year agreement covering all aspects of the project with the total cost over the three years being £411,150. The cost of the establishment of the website and the running of the same is included in this sum.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 145 TO 148 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister confirm that the £411,000 was for the total period of three years, that is the contract price?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful. That is not inclusive of the hardware, the £143,000?

**HON F VINET:**

Right.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just say that it is a pleasure to be able to ask questions in this House about the running and the cost of installing these monitoring stations and not to have to ask when it is going to happen, so I think that both sides of the House will welcome that. I went on to the Netcen website and saw, the Gibraltar Air Quality website, and saw a lot of the readings which are there which are the expected readings. I did not see readings as to particulate matter although I understand that readings are being taken as to particulate matter in the air. Does the Minister know when those are going to become available because obviously those are the ones that will reveal whether there is the presence of any carcinogens, the PM<sub>10</sub> that we have discussed before in this House, in the areas where air quality is being monitored?

**HON F VINET:**

There are two types of readings taken not just by the two automatic stations but indeed other non-automatic data being collected around the Rock. Some of that data is collated in real time automatically and that is posted on the website as and when it is collected. There are those other data which is collected after a few weeks which is then assessed post collection, and perhaps that is the data the hon Member is referring to.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As I understand it Netcen is receiving the data collected in Gibraltar in its headquarters in Oxfordshire and is then interpreting that data in the way that we see on the website. What is the Environmental Agency's role? Is it the hands-on Gibraltar role of changing the tubes et cetera, managing the monitoring stations themselves and maintenance of the monitoring stations themselves or is that part of the role that Netcen is going to carry out in terms of long-term maintenance of the equipment?

**HON F VINET:**

The Environmental Agency is principally concerned with the physical maintenance although the Agency itself will also, in conjunction with Netcen of the UK, monitor the results. The strict maintenance of the data and the website is carried out by Netcen in the UK.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What about the maintenance of the stations themselves, is that the Environmental Agency?

**HON F VINET:**

There is some work, principally calibration work, carried out by the Agency but always done under the auspices of Netcen.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What then is the cost of Netcen going forward, say for the period of three years that is the period of the Environmental Agency's contract?

**HON F VINET:**

The possibility exists that at some point in the future it will not be necessary to engage the services of a UK, rather outside consultant, because that is procedure that will be assessed locally but that is not the case at present.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are the £18,000 that we have paid Netcen our total cost of Netcen to date or have we got to pay them more for maintaining the website et cetera?

**HON F VINET:**

I am not aware of those details at this present time.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that because the contract with Netcen is now with the Environmental Agency, or is it still with the Government?

**HON F VINET:**

The Agency.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it therefore fair to interpret the £411,000 that we are paying the Agency to be inclusive of any costs that Netcen may put up?

**HON F VINET:**

Yes that is the logical deduction.

**NO. 149 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENT – AIR QUALITY MONITORING**

Given the Government's stated commitment to improve air quality in compliance with their legal obligation, what are the Government doing to ensure the quality of air in the area of Winston Churchill Avenue and Devil's Tower Road is monitored in order to determine whether or not the concerns raised in the reports previously made available to the Minister for the Environment are justified?

**ANSWER**

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

Government are indeed committed to improving air quality in compliance with their legal obligations. However, we do not know to which "reports" this question refers given that we have no knowledge of any reports which refer specifically to Winston Churchill Avenue and Devil's Tower Road.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 149 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

We have had debates in this House, in fact the Chief Minister himself has involved himself in those debates, where we were dealing with the report made available to the Hon Mr Britto whilst he was Minister for the Environment about the likelihood, and I remember we had a debate about that issue, the likelihood that the PM<sub>10</sub> might be exceeded in some areas of Gibraltar, and those areas of Gibraltar were identified as being in the northern area and I think they actually identified by name Devil's Tower Road. I do not have the report with me but we have had debates, as Hansard will reflect, to that effect. Now in fact I can recall that the last time that we had this debate was when we were debating where the air quality monitoring station should be and I was concerned that they were going to be in the south district when in fact the report seemed to indicate that the problems were in the northern areas. In the information that has been made available publicly and which the Minister has referred to today about the air quality monitoring stations, he has also told me that data is being collected in other places in Gibraltar. Can he tell me whether those places in Gibraltar are the places which are referred to in those reports, may be likely to show a higher PM<sub>10</sub> indication than it would be safe?

**HON F VINET:**

If the hon Member accesses the website he will see that the data link is divided into automatic and non-automatic data. Under the latter that data is being collected in a number of various locations around Gibraltar. In relation to the two sites, Devil's Tower Road and Winston Churchill Avenue, Glacis Road for example, King's Lines, Laguna Estate, Devil's Tower Road, Catalan Bay Road and George Don House have these facilities. There are in fact photographs and maps available on the website. Because these are non-automatic readers they are not yet available on the website itself but the data is being collated at present.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that data going to continue to be collected or because it is non-automatic is that going to be a mobile data collection which goes to different places, or are we going to have a reliable continuous source of data in relation to those areas?

**HON F VINET:**

It is envisaged that those sites will remain in place throughout the three year programme.

**NO. 150 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ROCK APES**

Can Government say whether the plan to return excess Rock apes from Gibraltar to Morocco is a project which will proceed and if so on what timescale?

**ANSWER**

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

Contact has been made with the Moroccan authorities as part of an EU INTERREG project which is in progress. The request to return Rock apes to Morocco is currently being considered by these authorities and a reply is awaited. Clearly we are not in a position to give a time scale as this matter is still under consideration by the Moroccan authorities.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 150 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In the past we have debated in this House, I think before the Minister was here certainly, the policy of the Government in relation to the apes. Is it that the Government are now considering changing the policy from actually culling the apes, or killing them depending on which side of the argument one is on, or to now exporting them if this turns out to be a feasible proposition?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think the hon Member should regard them as alternatives, well should regard them as mutually exclusive alternatives. He also knows that exporting them has always been the Government's preference, he knows that a few years ago we went to considerable expense of chartering an aircraft to fly a contingent of apes to a zoo in Germany or somewhere in that area. So exportation is the preference over culling but the hon Member also knows that zoos are fewer and further between than they used to be around the world and that it is becoming increasingly difficult to find zoos that will take animals in. Therefore if exportation fails to solve the problem then other means of doing it will have to be considered and certainly culling is not excluded by the Government. We will avoid culling if possible and I do not know whether there are other techniques, I do not profess any degree of expertise in this matter, I do not know if birth control techniques are available or not in the animal kingdom, I suppose they are but certainly culling is a last resort but is not excluded as a matter of policy.

**NO. 151 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**UPPER ROCK – FIRE BREAKS**

Can Government state when was the last occasion that the fire-breaks in the Upper Rock Nature Reserve were cleared?

**ANSWER**

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

The fire-breaks in the Upper Rock were last cleared in early summer 2004.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 151 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say who was responsible for clearing the fire-breaks early last summer and how much they were paid?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Master Service Ltd were contracted to carry out the clearing of the fire-breaks in the Upper Rock. I am not aware of the cost involved but I can try and find out and let the hon Member know. I could give a guess but I would like to confirm that because it is not something that I have at my fingertips.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say how long they were engaged in this exercise? The fire-breaks do not show any sign of them having been cleared let me say.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

My understanding is that there is a specific time of the year when fire-breaks works have to be undertaken. The hon Member is correct it happens prior to the summer months. I think it is probably around the month of June when the work is undertaken but that is done in conjunction with the City Fire Brigade who have an input into the recommendations and the timing of this. It cannot be done at any time of the year because of vegetation growth et cetera.

**NO. 152 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DIVING IN GIBRALTAR WATERS**

Do Government have any plans to regulate diving in Gibraltar waters by:

- (a) Businesses
- (b) Individuals?

**ANSWER**

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

Government presently have no such plans.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 152 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government aware of the existing state of affairs whereby the diving businesses that are not based in Gibraltar come in through the border, take up the diving sites which have been nurtured and created, the artificial reefs, by the local diving fraternity and that local businesses are unable to deliver the diving service to clients because the posts are taken up by divers that come to Gibraltar from abroad? Are Government aware of that state of affairs?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well the Government are aware of what they read in the newspapers but no one has asked us, that I am aware of, no one has proposed that the Government formally regulate. The state of affairs that the hon Member describes in his question would not require the regulation of the diving industry. There are already in Gibraltar in place laws that prevent businesses from being carried out in Gibraltar without due registration in various places, the Employment Service, the Social Security Office, the Income Tax Office, and if the hon Member is making the point that there are businesses occupying sites in Gibraltar for diving. In other words, diving tour operators or diving excursion or extreme sport companies, are carrying on business in Gibraltar then there are already a whole range of laws that would disentitle them to do that without going through the process of establishing themselves as a business in Gibraltar. So, I have no personal notice I have read some letters in the Chronicle and indeed I received a letter myself a few days ago when the Mancomunidad de

Municipios put out a press release on a basis that frankly we do not comprehend before the Government had put out a statement correcting that press release, I had in the intervening period been written to by somebody making the same point as is the premise of the hon Member's question, but he was concerned that the Government were going to enter into an agreement to allow this to happen, which the Government statement made clear was not the case. If on the other hand the hon Member is saying that foreign companies are carrying on business in Gibraltar, then there are procedures, rules and laws that they have to comply with, otherwise those laws could and should be enforced against them, as indeed they are enforced against anybody else. Not limited to diving by the way.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Certainly the information which the Opposition have is that not only is this going on on a regular basis but those laws are not being enforced, and that often in fact it is even hotels up the Coast that organise diving trips to Gibraltar, drive in with a large van with the name of such and such diving school or diving business on the actual van through the border, proceed to Camp Bay which is one of the examples which I was given where eight divers get out and proceed to dive in these reefs which I understand are somewhere near Camp Bay, which were cultivated or established by the local diving businesses. When they go there with their own clients they find that these prime diving spots are already taken by foreign businesses. The point is that although I understand what the Chief Minister is saying that there are laws already in place, the point which has been made to us is that those laws are clearly not being enforced because otherwise this would not be happening on such a regular basis. Secondly, in relation to the Mancomunidad point, can the Government confirm, I understand there was a statement put out by the Mancomunidad but I happened to hear myself an interview with the President of the Mancomunidad I think it was by the Cadena Ser perhaps on the day that they brought out the statement, and he certainly seemed to be under the impression that although the Chief Minister says there is no agreement to regulate this that this is an issue which was on the agenda for the next round of talks, whatever that may have been, that is what I heard him say myself on the radio. Can the Government clarify both of these issues? One is why the law is not being enforced and secondly whether this issue will be on the agenda of the talks or not, even though no agreement as such is currently in place?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, dealing with the last question first I think the Government statement is pretty clear, self-explanatory and takes no prisoners so I think the hon Member has the answer to his question. The Government have, let us be clear, dealing with his first point, the Government have no policy to exclude from access to our leisure facilities residents of Spain, any more than we expect them to exclude us from their leisure facilities. So any demand for action based on not allowing people from Spain access to our leisure facilities is not going to be accommodated by the Government. That is not the question that I was addressing when he asked his first supplementary which related to businesses coming in and I am therefore drawing the distinction now so that we are clear between individuals coming over, just as he and I might go over to Spain to lie on one of their beaches or go on one of their aqua parks or whatever, and residents of Spain coming to Gibraltar to swim on our beaches or to snorkel

underneath the surface of our territorial waters. If on the other hand a Spanish company were carrying on business in Gibraltar on a commercial basis then there are rules and laws relating to the carrying on of business, commercial activity in Gibraltar which need to be complied with and diving businesses are not exempt from those. That is the distinction that I will make and law enforcement is not a matter for Ministers but certainly to the extent that some of these things are administrative like tax, social security, Employment Regulations, those I will certainly make sure that there is not, I mean there is plenty of non-compliance of those things by businesses in Gibraltar but certainly there is no reason, and it is certainly not Government policy, that Spanish diving companies should be somehow not policed. They are subject to being policed and should be policed in the same way and to the same extent as any other non-resident company doing business in Gibraltar and indeed to the same extent as any Gibraltar company doing business in Gibraltar which may be not complying with the same rules.

That said, if despite all these things there were some on-going difficulty of access to a scarce resource, because of course I have drawn the comparison of us not interfering with their access to our leisure facilities just as we do not expect them to restrict us, but of course that is a bit of a generalisation then there are differences of scale. When a resource is scarce and the demand for access to it is greater than the ability of the resource to satisfy that demand, there may be a case for regulation. Not because they are Spanish or Portuguese or German or French but because there needs to be orderly access to a scarce space-limited facility or amenity in this case. I suppose that if this problem reached the stage where for those reasons of orderly access to a limited amenity it became desirable to convert it into a regulated activity, the Government would have no objection in principle to considering a form of regulation, as it has now done for the Port for example, indeed as we do for financial services and other areas of economic activity which for one reason or another policy makers decide and law makers decide should be a regulated activity. So I am not saying that the Government under any circumstances will not regulate this activity and I hope that my rather lengthy answer has clarified the various dimensions of this sometimes confused public debate.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am grateful to the Chief Minister for the answer which he has given but I think the question of the distinction which he rightly draws between businesses and individuals is actually a distinction we draw ourselves in the actual question before the House, that is why we were dividing the question into two. Secondly, the Chief Minister also suggested that it is not the policy of the Government to exclude residents of Spain from our leisure facilities any more than they exclude us. The point we have made here is that the local diving companies have actually made the point to us. That is precisely what is happening, that they are not allowed to do in Spain what Spanish based businesses are doing in Gibraltar, and one of them quoted an incident where they had taken out a marine biologist who was actually Spanish out into some part of Spain and the Civil Guard launch approached them, threatened to arrest the Gibraltarian divers and to confiscate the boat and the diving material and it was only because the Spanish marine biologist pleaded with the Civil Guards not to proceed with the arrest and said *'look I am Spanish as well'* that kind of argument, that actually they were allowed to return to Gibraltar and they were not arrested. I think that is part of the problem, that Spanish diving businesses are doing in Gibraltar waters what Gibraltarian diving businesses cannot do in Spanish waters, and that was part of the concern which has been expressed to the Opposition.

## **HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes but there are important facts to clarify even in that supplementary that the hon Member has put. If the hon Member were to say to me 'look, Spanish law discriminates against Gibraltarians, let us discriminate against Spain'. No, that is not what the hon Member is saying. What the hon Member is saying is that the laws of Gibraltar are different to what they are in Spain and that the Spanish law bites on Gibraltarians in a more aggressive manner than Gibraltar law, which is different, bites on Spaniards and others. Of course Spanish law bites to the same extent on Gibraltarians as on anybody else. It is not that we are being discriminated against. If in Spain there are procedures, or restriction, or rules, or licensing requirements, or perhaps absolute prohibitions about doing things then we like everybody else, including Spanish residents in Spain, we all have to comply with the same requirements. We may be less familiar with what those requirements are bureaucratically and in substance and therefore it might be in practice harder for us to sort of duck and dive through all the various hoops and loops than for their own residents who may be familiar. The point is this, in both places the legislature makes the law and establishes the requirements. In both places the law has got to be enforced on a non-discriminatory basis. Therefore if the hon Member says to me 'we cannot do in Spain what Spanish people are able to do here', that is not necessarily the product of discrimination, it may simply be that our legal systems are different, that our laws are different. Our laws provide one thing for everybody in Gibraltar, Spaniards included, and their law provides something different for everybody, Gibraltarians and Spaniards included, so we come back to the same point. We have a system that also does not permit non-resident businesses, well any business, from doing commercial activities in Gibraltar without, I do not know whether it is an activity that requires a trade licence but it certainly requires a number of other things. If it should be as therefore important and necessary for Spanish businesses to comply with those requirements of Gibraltar law as it is for our companies to comply with whatever may be the requirements of Spanish law, of which I am entirely unfamiliar, and therefore it just comes down to the degree of enforcement in both places. The hon Member may simply be saying that the Spaniards enforce their laws aggressively and we do not enforce our laws at all and that might be a problem. That certainly can be looked at but the Government do not see this in terms of reciprocity or keeping people in or keeping people out. The law should be clear, it should be fair, it should be non-discriminatory and it should be enforced by whoever's job it is to enforce it. Certainly it is not something of which the Government approve, and I want to make this perfectly clear to him, that Gibraltarian businesses should be unfairly competed against by businesses not established in Gibraltar and which do not have to incur the same degree of administrative procedure, costs, tax, social insurance et cetera as Gibraltar businesses, whether it is in diving or anything else, have to comply with. So it is a question of whether we can collectively decide that a law should be different. If we ever do decide to go down a regulation system then there would be laws that will regulate and then our laws may become closer to what the laws may be in Spain who presumably regulate these things much more strictly. I certainly know they regulate fishing much more strictly than we do so this might be something else that they regulate. So I hope that this answers the hon Member's questions.

**NO. 153 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHARTER**

When will the Government finalise work on the Environmental Charter they have repeatedly promised?

**ANSWER**

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

I cannot give a precise date on the completion of the Charter but a draft proposal for the formal consultation groups and schedule of events has been devised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 153 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In fact therefore, the position has not altered from when this question was put to the Minister last year and he did indicate then that he expected that the project would have been completed during the course of the last calendar year. Has there been an obstacle in the way of the development of this Charter?

**HON F VINET:**

No, there has been work undertaken internally within the Department and the Ministry, there has been some informal consultation with certain parties and I can tell the Opposition Member that the formal consultation process will start very shortly.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Which are the parties that the Government are recognising as the consultation environmental group parties that they are dealing with? Who are the consultations going out to?

**HON F VINET:**

The parties have not been informed officially and therefore it would be improper to reveal details in this House.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is fascinating because the Minister has just told me that they have already completed the informal consultation process and that they are simply about to commence the formal consultation process, so who pray will the hon Gentleman tell us he has completed his informal consultation with, if they do not yet know that he has done this?

**HON F VINET:**

The informal consultation process I said had taken place with some parties who may or may not form part of the ones taking part in the formal consultation process.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Who have the informal consultation processes involved? We have been told it has happened, I am sure it is no problem.

**HON F VINET:**

Principally there have been informal discussions taking place with GONHS.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No other parties external to the Environmental Ministry?

**HON F VINET:**

No.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Does the Minister expect that the parties that will be formally consulted, although for the reasons that he has just told us he will not tell us yet, are they going to be more than just GONHS or will it simply be GONHS?

**HON F VINET:**

What I can say is that the list is very extensive and it is not just limited to GONHS.

**NO. 154 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

What action are Government taking to ensure that the grit mountain in the area of Cammell Laird is not causing environmental pollution to residents in the area of the south district?

**ANSWER**

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

Government are pressing Cammell Laird to remove the accumulation of the remaining grit as soon as possible. The Company is exploring several different avenues for the disposal of this grit and Government are hopeful that the matter will be resolved soon.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 154 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are the Government concerned that the residue which makes up the mountain could be dangerous to the public?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well it depends what is meant by 'dangerous to the public'. The existence of any deposit of any substance is worse than there being no deposit of the substance at all.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it an environmental hazard?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, our information is that it was being dealt with in a way that would ensure it would not be an environmental hazard, it was being dampened so that particles would not become airborne. Let me say that much as one very recent new daily publication has tried to pretend that the mountain has disappeared because the hon Member put down this question, I hope the hon Member is at least aware of the fact that this

exercise cannot be mounted and executed in three days and he knows that we have been saying in this House for many, many months that this process of the removal of this mountain, which actually has been very difficult to resolve, because there are very strict European Union rules about the cross-border movement of materials of this sort, the cost of removal of this mountain has been very substantial and certainly, we are engineering systems to ensure that it does not re-accumulate. In other words, having removed the mountain that we do not now start with another mountain which we do not remove until it has reached the same height as this one. In other words, that there has got to be a systematic way for the periodic exportation from Gibraltar of this basically residual product from grit blasting and things of that sort in the ship repair yard and that it has got to be routine. It cannot be something that is allowed to accumulate and we are confident that that is now how it is going to happen. So the answer to the hon Member's question is that we are as satisfied as we can be on the basis of what we have been told by the people concerned, that in fact there has not been any risk to public health but certainly it would have been desirable for the mountain not to have been there in the first place, that is clear.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister has referred to the fact that it is not good to have material of that sort accumulating and I think that we can all agree on that. What material was it, does the Chief Minister or the Minister for the Environment, can they tell us what the composition of that grit mountain was which required the difficult transportation process et cetera?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As far as I am aware it is the residual product of blasting ships to scale down the hulls and the paint and all that and it all becomes sort of composite mixture of many things. There is an element of content in the grit mountain which is covered by EU directives on cross-border movement of materials containing that substance. So it is not that the whole mountain is made of one thing, some of it is covered by this restrictive material.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is right, it is a composite and part of the composite is dangerous to health and it is covered by EU directives because it is dangerous to health. Can the Government tell us whether in fact they have carried out themselves, or through the Environmental Agency, any inspections of the grit mountain, because I know that the Chief Minister has told us that to an extent his reliance is on what he has been told by Cammell Laird?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not said reliant on what we have been told by Cammell Laird, I have said reliant on what we have been told by the people concerned, which he should not interpret to being just Cammell Laird and I want the hon Member to know, I could have arisen to deal with it as a point of order, the hon Member cannot ask me a supplementary, listen to me tell him what I have told him about the extent, if any, to which this is a potential danger to public health and then summarise my answer for

the purposes of effect in a way which is totally different to what he has heard me say. So the words 'this is a serious danger to public health and that can be deduced from the fact that it is covered by a directive' are his words and he may not after today impute those words to me or to the Government.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What I had asked the Chief Minister was whether the Government either through the Environmental Agency or themselves had carried out any inspections of the grit mountain or whether they were relying on Cammell Laird. Perhaps I should have said or whether they were relying on the people concerned. So my question stands, have the Government carried out any inspection themselves or through the Environmental Agency and who are the people concerned?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The people concerned are the Environmental Agency and Cammell Laird, and my understanding is that the Environmental Agency has been monitoring this thing, it has not just been left to Cammell Laird.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Do the Government have the information that the Environmental Agency has determined from its inspections? Have the Government any reports as to the Environmental Agency's inspections of this grit?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether it has. If the Environmental Agency has submitted specific reports to the Government then the Government have them. If they have done reports but they have not submitted them to the Government then I suppose the Government can get them. The answer to his question is that I do not know.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I understand because the Chief Minister is not the Minister for the Environment but perhaps the Minister for the Environment has such reports.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This goes back long before the present Minister for the Environment took office and actually is dealt with more in the context of the ship repair yard which comes under the responsibility of the Minister for the Port, who happens not to be in the House which is why I am dealing with this as best I can. Although it is an environmental issue it is actually part of Port activities and therefore covered by....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that. One of the things that the Chief Minister said in his first answer dealing with the substance of the issue was that the cost of moving the grit had been very substantial. Does the Chief Minister know and can he tell the House what the cost actually was, and if he does not know exactly what it was, what it was in the region of and who has been responsible for the payment? Has it been Cammell Laird or have the Government in some way been required to by some legal obligation, or assisted by dint of wanting to get rid of the grit as soon as possible in meeting the cost?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

From memory I think the cost is in the order of £500,000 and it has been paid for by the Government on the grounds that Gibraltar hosts a ship repair yard and it is the Government's responsibility ultimately to dispose of waste generated by, we could sort of impose an environmental levy of some sort on Cammell Laird but in order to procure the removal of the mountain it has been removed at Government expense.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that going to be the situation going forward in respect of the removal of this high pollutant material?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the Government finances the removal of all waste materials from Gibraltar whether it is industrial waste, domestic waste, all waste that is not permanently disposed of in Gibraltar is either disposed of in Gibraltar, if it is for example when we had an incinerator by Government expense, or exported from Gibraltar for disposal by others at Government expense. So in that sense this is not an exception. The plan for dealing with this going forward is wrapped up in the Urban Waste Water Treatment Plant which is in the pipeline because that also will produce a large amount of residue, in that case called fly ash I understand or fly ash slag or something like that. So there will be on-going requirements for the disposal of materials generated by Gibraltar which EU directives somehow impact on the method of handling and disposal. This is the first example on this scale and the Urban Waste Water Treatment Plant when it comes on stream will generate it and solutions are being sought for how most economically to deal with these disposal issues going forward into the future. I cannot tell him what those solutions might be but they are being looked into.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

As a final supplementary can I ask the Chief Minister perhaps not in this House but in correspondence to let me know, I am sure that this is not a confidential issue, but to let me know because neither he nor I are scientific men, exactly what part of the composite of this grit mountain was regulated by EU directives and had to be removed in keeping with the obligations set out in that directive?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If he will write to me I will certainly answer his letter.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask, is this the first time that the Government have paid for the removal of the grit since the operation started?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well I think it is the first time the grit has been removed since the operation started.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, and is it that the company was unwilling to remove it at their own expense and that is why it is accumulated?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well let me qualify my answer. Certainly it is the first time it has been removed since the applicable EU directive came into force and therefore it is the first time that removal was an issue. In other words, it could not just be disposed of with the rest of the yard's rubbish.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Which they were not doing anyway. They were not disposing of it with the rest of the yard's rubbish because they were actually mounting it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

How it has been disposed of before the European Union came into force, I could not say to the hon Member. I said this is the first time that grit has ever been removed, that is what I said two minutes ago and I have asked for the opportunity to correct that answer. Certainly it is the first time that it has been removed since that directive came into operation. Yes, Cammell Laird take the view that they cannot afford to remove it and we have looked at their accounts and satisfied ourselves that indeed they could not afford to remove this from the yard. The Government therefore accepted the removal as with all other industrial refuse from Gibraltar.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Did this happen in the last financial year or since the 1<sup>st</sup> April in the current financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know whether the payments have been made or not yet been made.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. So what is it that Cammell Laird organises the removal and then bills the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes that is why I hesitated before to say that it has been removed by the Government and changed that at Government expense because I think that Cammell Laird are doing the practicalities of it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How has the payment been arrived at? Is it on the basis of tonnage of grit or is there a written agreement between Cammell Laird and the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Work like that is a cost. In other words, one has got to find some one to accept it abroad, I am not sure whether this is going to the UK or to Bulgaria or Rumania or somewhere like that. One has got to find a facility that will accept the refuse, they charge for that so there is an element of cost, then one has to transport the stuff to whoever one has contracted with to take it off one's hands and then one has to load the ship here and unload the ship at the other end. So those are the elements of cost. One has got to load the ship, charter the ship, unload the ship and then pay the person at the other end to take it off one's hands. Those are the elements of costs, it is not an agreement between the Government and Cammell Laird, it is basically the Government funding all those arrangements as they have been entered into.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Just one final point. The Chief Minister used the word 'ship', is it definitely going by ship or is it being shipped in another way by lorry to Bulgaria or wherever, it is going by vessel?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell the hon Member, when last I saw this matter the proposal was to export it by ship. I have not since heard any different but it is not impossible, I cannot tell him where it is going, who has agreed to take it off. If it is in Spain I suppose it will go by lorry. If it is anywhere else I suppose it will go by ship. I do not know whether the plans that have actually been implemented are the ones that I was last appraised of.

**NO. 155 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES**

Can Government explain the increase in number of 609 in the number of commercial vehicles with current licences as at 31 December 2003 compares to 31 December 2002?

**ANSWER**

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

The increase in the figures between 2002 and 2003 is mostly accounted for by an increase in the number of vehicles which were imported into bond and registered as self-drive vehicles and which were subsequently re-exported.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 155 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So how does that compare with the numbers that are shown in Table 69 where the number that have been licensed as new registration is 308 in the year? The figure that I am quoting is from Table 70 of the Abstract of Statistics which is the licences that are current for commercial vehicles and that has gone up from 1,367 to 1,976 which gives us an increase of 609 at the year end. My question is how does that relate to the numbers that were registered during the year which is 318? I have difficulty in reconciling how the number at the end of the year can be more than the numbers at the beginning of the year plus the numbers that were registered during the year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have the tables in front of me. There were a total of 597 in 2003, is that the year that we are looking at?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of the 1,976 commercial registrations, 597 were self-drive vehicles which were re-exported. Now is the hon Member saying that the figures registered at the end of the year, the increase is smaller than that would suggest? I am not following the analysis that he is making.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I am saying is that the figures registered at the end of the year exceed the figures registered at the beginning of the year by 609, so that would suggest that if the numbers at the end of the year were still here, if some were registered and then removed and disappeared from the figure one would expect in fact that that would leave a net figure of 609. So the answer that I have been given does not seem to provide the explanation of the 609, but in any case I am asking how is it that in the previous table, Table 69, which gives the registrations that took place during the year, the figure is 318.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The 609 is the amount of the increase not the amount of vehicles registered in total. It is the increase in the amount of vehicles registered. I have not got the table in front of me that the hon Member has got, that is the problem.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is correct, my question is this. Given that the net result of vehicles being registered and vehicles being removed is an increase of 609 in the remaining numbers registered at the end of the year.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Which was 1,976.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Which was 1,976 as opposed to 1,367, how is it then that the numbers of new registrations during the year which by definition ought to be more than 609 since some were removed, was 318? Is it that the 318 is the figure that is incorrect?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is the hon Member certain that he is looking at the figure of 318 and that that is the figure for new commercial registrations?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is correct, it is in the column of commercial motor vehicles 318, new added during the year.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I would need notice of the question. If the figures are the ones that, and I have only got some of those things in front of me, but if I am telling him which is correct that the number of commercial vehicles has increased by 609, which is the clarification he sought, and yet he is looking at something there which suggests that new registrations, new commercial registrations were only 318, then subject to checking for any other explanation the only logical explanation would be that they were not all new. I cannot think of any other unless there is an error in the statistics.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

My understanding of this table published by the Government is that it is not a question of new vehicles but new registrations. Even if it is an old vehicle, if it is newly registered it appears here as a new registration in that year. If it comes from somewhere else with a different number plate when it is converted to a Gibraltar number plate it is a new registration.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I beg his pardon. I had assumed that when he said new he was reading from a column registration of new vehicles.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, new registrations of vehicles.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Then in that case my speculation would not apply. I will have that checked out and give him an answer this afternoon.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The information the Chief Minister provided in the initial answer was that they were vehicles which were imported during the year and re-exported but were registered. Now, would those vehicles appear as new registrations or not? The ones that he mentioned which would not be at the end of the year because they have left before the end of the year but would those be reflected in statistics on new registrations?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well on the basis of the information and the explanation that I have been given, the answer would be yes because I am told that they are imported and registered as self-drive vehicles. So it is not that they are just imported, held in bond unregistered and then re-exported, these things are actually registered. So the answer to that question is yes.

-----

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I told the hon Member this morning that I would come back to him on Question No. 155 in relation to the apparent discrepancy between the figure in Table 69 for new registrations of 318 in 2003 and this figure of an increase of 609 in Table 70. The explanation lies, it is just that I did not have the Abstract this morning so I could not see what Tables 69 and 70 actually said. Table 69 is new registrations of vehicles. In other words, log books issued, whereas Table 70 is licences current. That is to say, road taxes paid up. One is the registration of vehicles in the vehicle registration, in other words the log book, not being a driver I do not suppose he knows about log books. One is when one registers ones car when one buys it, in other words registration of ownership of the car, that is Table 69. Table 70 is licences which is road tax discs paid. Now what happens apparently is that people do not always renew their road tax on time, especially in respect of commercial vehicles, some which are laid up, some of which are garaged, some of which are just paid late. Therefore, the figure of 609 road tax increases consists of the 318 of the new vehicles plus the renewals from previous years that had not been renewed on time. In other words, were renewed late in that year and which therefore inflate that year's figures of road tax. So the 318 are included in the 609 but do not account for the 609 because there are things other than new registrations of vehicles in the 609 figure.

ORAL

NO. 156 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**COST OF REPAVING LOBBY**

Can Government give the final cost of repaving the lobby of the House of Assembly?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

The final cost of repaving the lobby of the House of Assembly has been £20,142.90.

ORAL

NO. 157 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Can Government say whether the section of Irish Town from John Mackintosh Square to the corner of the Police Station has been handed back to the Government by the contractor and if so on what date?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question Nos. 158 and 159 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 158 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Can Government say on what date was John Mackintosh Square handed back to the Government by the contractor?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question Nos. 157 and 159 of 2005.

**NO. 159 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Are Government now in a position to say whether any penalties have been applied to the contractor in respect of the John Mackintosh Square beautification?

**ANSWER**

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

The section of Irish Town from John Mackintosh Square to the corner of the Police Station was handed back to Government by the contractor on 15 April 2005. The Square itself was handed back to Government on the 25 June 2004 when a substantial completion certificate was issued.

In accordance with the terms and conditions of the contractor for John Mackintosh Square no penalties are due to be levied against the contractor.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 157 TO 159 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 159, the Minister said that there are no penalties due. I remember raising this issue in the House in the past and there was obviously general consensus that the project had been delayed from what was originally envisaged as the completion date, and that maybe penalties may arise. Can the Minister explain why it is that there have been none?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

These construction contracts provide for two things. They provide for extensions of time, they provide for penalties rather when the contractor takes longer than he is allowed to take under the contract, but they also have clauses that allow for extension of time to the contractor on the happening of certain events which are thought by JCT and the designers of these models not to be the contractor's fault. Therefore when deciding whether liquidated damages are incurred or not it is not just a question of seeing whether the contract has taken longer than it was originally scheduled to take, it is a question of seeing whether it has taken longer than the original period as extended by the correct application of the clause that entitles the contractor to extensions of time. In this particular contract the project manager has assessed that all the delay has been for reasons which do not entitle the Government

to liquidate the damages. In other words, it is for reasons which entitle the contractor to an extension of time. There are various types of things, some of it may be when the client asks them to do extra work or when the client changes the instructions that are given, or inclement weather or force majeure, a list of things and I could not tell him which they are in this case.

ORAL

**NO. 160 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Who is responsible for giving permission for loading and unloading by commercial goods vehicles in John Mackintosh Square and Irish Town while beautification works are in progress?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question No. 161 of 2005.

**NO. 161 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**JOHN MACKINTOSH SQUARE**

Can Government say what the position is in respect to loading and unloading by commercial goods vehicles in the part of Irish Town adjacent to John Mackintosh Square and in the Square itself?

**ANSWER**

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

The works both at John Mackintosh Square and the section of Irish Town from the Square to Cloister Ramp have now been completed. The Department of Transport has never issued permits for loading and unloading in this particular area whilst the beautification works were in progress.

As a consequence of these works, a new unloading bay will be created at Line Wall Road, immediately to the north of the junction of Line Wall Road with Cloister Ramp. This general area will therefore be serviced from either this new bay, or the existing loading bay adjacent to Amar's Bakery as well as from Main Street itself.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 160 AND 161 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister may have noticed if he walks through Irish Town, which I do every day, that it is actually physically impossible now to enter Irish Town from the north because there are these metal pillars that have been placed there and goods vehicles or other vehicles cannot get into the Square. I take his point about the loading bay in Line Wall Road but there used to be one loading bay in that section of Irish Town itself which would service the businesses in that area and there are also several other loading bays in Cloister Ramp itself, which those have now become Police bays. My understanding is that at the moment goods vehicles can only load or unload up to 10.00 o'clock in the morning, and whilst that may be convenient to businesses who receive deliveries and they can actually schedule a time at which to receive the delivery, for example bars and restaurants which may receive deliveries of food which they then sell to clients, there are other businesses in the area and I am speaking for other businesses as well not just the one in which I am involved. Let me declare an interest in that for I am speaking for other businesses as well, who actually not just receive deliveries but also have to make them, which is different. Whereas one can plan when one receives it and can schedule it for 9.00 to 10.00 in the morning it would be fine, one may have to make deliveries at a particular time

and perhaps one is delivering a large piece of equipment. There is no facility at the moment, I understand, for that to happen except to request some kind of emergency pass which they make available for that particular moment and that particular time, if one can get hold of the person that issues them. So I say this in order to ask the Government, which I suppose is my supplementary, whether Government would look at the question of loading and unloading in the Square and in that section of Irish Town again?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government understand that pedestrianisation policies have a cost, a price, some people get a huge benefit and other people pay a price in terms of less convenience, no longer being able to drive one's car to the front door not just one's business, one's home indeed, and that that is inconvenient for the people that it affects. We believe that pedestrianisation is a worthwhile contributor to the quality of life in the centre of our town and that it is worth accepting these inconveniences that go along with it. The loading and unloading bay, and I accept his point that people think of loading bays as it being only for acceptance of deliveries, but whereas the businesses located within and who in itself is a provider, they may have to unload. Of course one can continue to use the loading bay which is just moving round the corner to the Line Wall Road side of the junction between Cloister Ramp and Line Wall Road, that loading bay remains available and I am sure that the hon Member's company and its neighbours will not find it too inconvenient to wheel a barrow up the Cloister Ramp to insert the goods into the back of the van. The only other alternative is really to destroy the whole contractorisation because we would not be willing to do anything there that we were not willing to do in other pedestrianised zones and if every business in the pedestrianised zone is going to be allowed to breach pedestrianisation when it is making outward delivery as opposed to inward acceptances of delivery, the whole pedestrianisation concept I think would be substantially compromised. So we had not thought of this as being an area actually that had too many businesses, obviously we were aware that the hon Member has his party headquarters there and that the Panorama has its offices there, but what I can promise is that we have not pedestrianised for any of those reasons, that I can promise him. There is not a huge amount of commercial activity in that little stretch. The judgement was made that it could be serviced from either Main Street or from Line Wall Road loading bays. Of course, yes, the Panorama is now in Irish Town, further down Irish Town in our ex party offices.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I just, because this is a point that was made to me by another of the businesses involved which is also in the Square, that is that there are some types of service industries who actually do not make deliveries but nonetheless seem to have these passes to pass through Irish Town. I do not know whether the telephone company might be a case in point.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the only ones that have, to my knowledge, and I have to say the extent to which it is necessary. Let me just answer the question first and then comment on it. I think it is limited to people like the utility providers and the security companies, on the grounds that it is a breach of security to park one's cash delivery vehicle 300

yards up the road and then walk down the road clutching a bag of pound notes or whatever. So I think the security companies have got. The point that I have often made there is whether their use of those passes should be limited to when they are making deliveries in those areas, as opposed to saying 'well, I have got a pass to drive through Irish Town. I will use it on my way to somewhere else that they could have reached by another route. My personal view, although I am not involved in the administration of it, is that people who have passes to exempt them from pedestrianisation should only be allowed to breach the pedestrianisation when their destination is in the pedestrianisation zone and they have no alternative means of access to their destination. That is my personal view but it may not necessarily be how it is working which may explain why he sees vans going up and down perhaps more frequently than they should. Indeed I have noticed that he is speaking only for Irish Town that they do not even respect the direction of traffic. I mean I often see them sort of speeding up Irish Town north to south instead of south to north. I never quite understood why that is necessary, unless it was during the works.

**NO. 162 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**NUMBER OF PARKING TICKETS**

Can Government state how many parking tickets were issued and how many vehicles were clamped in the year 2004, giving a breakdown of locally registered vehicles and foreign registered vehicles for each category?

**ANSWER**

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

A total of 15,570 fixed penalty tickets were issued in 2004, of which 14,384 were issued to locally registered vehicles and 1,186 were issued to foreign registered vehicles.

With regard to clamping, 777 were locally registered and 133 were foreign registered making a total of 910.

**NO. 163 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**NUMBER OF PARKING TICKETS**

Can Government state the total amount collected in respect of parking tickets in the years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004, giving a breakdown of locally registered vehicles and foreign registered vehicles?

**ANSWER**

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

This information is only available at the Magistrates' Court. However, the system is currently pending computerisation and therefore the information is not readily available. Notwithstanding, a manual exercise can provide the information requested, but it would take several weeks to compile it.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 163 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Does the Minister undertake to provide me with this information as soon as it is available?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think the answer is no. I do not think it is appropriate for the Government to dedicate several weeks of administrative effort to compile information which is not readily available. Another thing is that the computerisation may be able to be done in a way that when the information is inputted it can then be extracted and then the information can certainly be provided. But the Magistrates' Court staff do not have sufficient spare capacity and time on their hands to spend several weeks putting this information together.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can the Minister then give me an approximate date by which the system will be computerised?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is a programme, a Government department computerisation programme and I cannot from memory tell him where this particular part of the department fits into it. I cannot tell him but we can find that out to see if it is programmed for any time soon, or whether it is one of these medium-term things on the wish list. I can find that out.

ORAL

NO. 164 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ELECTRICITY – POWER FAILURES**

Can Government state the number of power cuts that affected whole districts in the year 2004, their duration, the areas affected and the reason why they occurred?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question No. 165 of 2005.

**NO. 165 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ELECTRICITY – POWER FAILURES**

Can Government state the number of power cuts that affected whole districts in the quarter ended 31 March 2005, their duration, the areas affected and the reason why they occurred?

**ANSWER**

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

The number of power failures that have taken place in the year 2004 and which have affected whole districts have been 20. The number of power failures that have taken place in the quarter ended 31 March 2005 and which have affected whole districts have been 10. As the hon Member can appreciate the statistical information requested in relation to such incidents is extensive and is therefore set out in the written schedules that I hand to him.

**Answer to Question 165**  
**Answer to Question 164**

Incident No	Date	Duration	Areas affected	Reason
1	24 1 04 18.40hrs	12 to 15 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 10,12,14,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS tripped manually. Excessive fuel Leak
2	23 2 04 00.40hrs	19 to 20 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 10,12,14,17,18	ISGS generator No.14 fault
3	14 3 04 01.38hrs	6 to 13 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Generator set No.1 at WPS tripped manually. Exciter rectifier burnt.
4	7 4 04 12.46hrs	8 to 12 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Generator set No 1 at WPS master trip activated suspected fault over-speed circuit
5	7 4 04	4 mins	Two districts supplied from WPS 11,14	Fault in generator set no 5 at OESCO. Oil pipe leak. Feeders tripped manually.
6	8 4 04 09.55hrs	5 to 10 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Fault in generator set no 5 at OESCO. Overload protection.
7	9 4 04 15.56hrs	6 to 11 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Generator set no 5 at WPS master trip activated. Heavy fuel leak
8	20 4 04 09.58hrs	6 to 14 mins	Six districts supplied from WPS 10,12,14,15,17,18	Generator set no 1 at WPS master trip activated suspected fault over-speed circuit
9	6 5 04 19.50hrs	7 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	MOD Interconnector tripped due to fault at ISGS Power Station
10	9 5 04 09.08hrs	2hrs 29mins	One district supplied from KBDC 7	HV Feeder cable fault to S28 Governor's Parade substation
11	15 5 04 07.49hrs	4 to 8 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	OESCO no 4 generator tripped due to human error
12	17 5 04 08.15hrs	7 mins	One district supplied from WPS 15	OESCO no 6 generator emergency shutdown. District tripped manually
13	13 7 04 01.17hrs	7 to 12 mins	Six districts supplied from WPS 12,13,14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Lub oil trip elec fault
14	14 7 04	5 to 8 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 12,14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Lub oil trip elec fault
15	29 7 04 02.07hrs	12 to 17 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	ISGS generator no 14 fault
16	6 9 04 16.18hrs	8 to 14 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	OESCO no 1 generator trip due to electrical fault (failed diode)
17	20 9 04 18.04hrs	5 to 8 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	OESCO no 4 generator trip due to electrical fault (main bearing temp. sensor failed).
18	21 10 04 10.44hrs	3 mins	One district supplied from WPS 18	Feeder tripped following electrical works on the emergency lighting. Under investigation.
19	19 11 04 07.23hrs	7 to 10 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Lub oil trip elec fault
20	23 12 04 10.42hrs	5 to 9 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Turbocharger "A" bank breakdown

Contd.....

**Contd Answer to Question 165**  
**Answer to Question 165**

Incident No	Date	Duration	Areas affected	Reason
1	8 1 05 13.15hrs	8 to 10 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	Generator set no 2 at WPS Alternator's neutral bars earth fault due to vibrations
2	22 1 05 11.30hrs	18 to 20 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	OESCO no 6 generator tripped on load. Electrical fault.
3	25 1 05 22.24hrs	7 to 9 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 14,15,17,18	OESCO no 6 generator taken off load by mistake Operator error
4	3 1 05 01.12hrs	9 to 13 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 10,13,15,18	Falling Frequency Protection System tripped feeders as a result of load surge when closing JBDC interconnector
5	3 2 05 03.25hrs	5 to 7 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 10,13,15,18	Falling Frequency protection System tripped feeders as a result of surge when closing S10 Bayside
6	6 3 05 18.21hrs	1hr 24 mins to 1hr 52mins	Eleven districts supplied from KBDC & JBDC 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,19,20	Translay Relays operated at WPS disconnecting the two Interconnectors WPS to OBDC
7	18 3 05 23.55hrs	6 to 20 mins	Four districts supplied from WPS 10,13,14,15,18 and oen from KBDC 9	Generator set no 3 at WPS tripped due to faulty exhaust valve link pin
8	19 3 05 23.24hrs	1 to 3hrs	District 2 St Bernard's Hosp restored after 1 min All districts fed from OBDC and JBDC affected by up to 3 hrs	Fault in Interconnector no 1 OBDC - OESCO
9	19 3 05 01.00hrs	4 to 7 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 10,13,14,15,18	Fault in Interconnector no 1 OBDC - OESCO. FFP activated.
10	19 3 05 01.13hrs	7 to 10 mins	Five districts supplied from WPS 10,13,14,15,18	Fault in Interconnector No 1 OBDC - OESCO. FFP activated

ORAL

**NO. 166 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DUDLEY WARD TUNNEL**

Can Government provide an update on the situation regarding the re-opening of Dudley Ward Tunnel for vehicular traffic?

**ANSWER**

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

There is no change since the hon Member last enquired.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 166 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

In perusing the Government's Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, under Head 103, can the Government say whether works are likely to start in this financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

ORAL

NO. 167 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**CEMETERY**

Can Government state whether outline proposals for the project to enhance the state of the Cemetery have been agreed by the Government?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Various proposals are currently being considered by Government. I can say that the Cemetery will be the subject of a far more extensive address at the Budget session.

ORAL

NO. 168 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT**

Can Government state what progress has been made with the tender of the Sewage Treatment Plant?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

A Technical Advisor for this project has now been selected and we are in the final stages of concluding the appointment.

ORAL

NO. 169 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**MOTOR VEHICLE LICENSING DEPARTMENT**

Can Government state whether the dispute involving Examiners at the Motor Vehicle Licensing Department has now been resolved?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

The situation remains as in reply to Question Nos. 2095 and 2096 of 2004. The Driving and Vehicle Examiners have submitted a claim which Government continue to consider not to be reasonable or justified and it has therefore not been met.

ORAL

NO. 170 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state how many paying passengers were transported by GBCL in the financial year 2004/2005, giving a breakdown by level of fare charged and total value collected per level of fare?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question No. 171 of 2005.

**NO. 171 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**BUS SERVICE**

Can Government state the number of employees working for the GBCL as at close of business on the 31 March 2005, their grades and provide a breakdown of the annual salaries paid to these grades?

**ANSWER**

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

The extensive factual and statistical information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedules that I hand over.

The question refers to annual salaries relating to these grades, can I just clarify that the salaries as they appear in the reply are in fact the basic salaries and of course subject to further increases.

**Answer to Question 171**

**Answer to Question 170**

**SUMS COLLECTED IN STERLING**

<b>CLASS</b>	<b>REVENUE</b>	<b>COUNT</b>
Adult Single	£237,399.60	404,182
Adult Return	£153,456.60	171,064
Child Single	£31,029.70	78,047
Child Return	£10,292.20	17,174
Adult Day Pass	£12,390.50	8,243
Child Day Pass	£1,174.40	1,176
Tourist Day Pass	£1,318.50	863
Senior Citizen Single	£44,477.30	148,242
Senior Citizen Return	£28,725.00	57,446
Senior Citizen Day Pass	£2,985.80	3,728
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£523,249.60</b>	<b>890,165</b>

**SUMS COLLECTED IN EUROS**

<b>CLASS</b>	<b>REVENUE</b>	<b>COUNT</b>
Adult Single	£101,987.00	169,001
Adult Return	£98,460.02	107,755
Child Single	£2,743.92	6,602
Child Return	£1,985.07	3,232
Adult Day Pass	£5,777.18	3,772
Child Day Pass	£411.20	414
Tourist Day Pass	£1,329.00	868
Senior Citizen Single	£7,157.59	23,321
Senior Citizen Return	£8,388.50	16,776
Senior Citizen Day Pass	£401.84	499
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£228,641.32</b>	<b>332,240</b>

Cont.....

**Contd Answer to Question 171**

**Answer to Question 171**

**EMPLOYEES OF THE GIBRALTAR BUS COMPANY**

<b>Annual salary</b>	<b>Job description</b>
£35,000	Director
£35,000	Director
£20,000	Garage/Supt.
£20,000	Marketing
£15000	Bus/Inspector
£15000	Bus/Inspector
£15000	Bus/Inspector
£14,350	Chargehand/Driver
£14,350	Chargehand/Driver
£14,350	Chargehand/Driver
£13,050	Panel/Beater Painter
£13,050	Driver

Cont.....

**Contd Answer to Question 171**

£13,050	Driver
£12,272	Office/Administrator
£12,272	Office/Administrator
£12,324	General/Operative
£8,352	Labourer

Up-dated 6/4/05

ORAL

NO. 172 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's public highways that they resurfaced during the quarter ended 31 December 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question Nos. 173 and 174 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 173 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's public highways that they resurfaced during the quarter ended 31 March 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question Nos. 172 and 174 of 2005.

**NO. 174 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ROAD WORKS**

Can Government state the areas of Gibraltar's public highways that they plan to resurface in the course of the financial year 2005/2006, providing a breakdown by quarter?

**ANSWER**

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

The Government are currently considering the works programme for the 2005-2006 Financial Year and are therefore unable to provide this information. In any case, the Government do not consider it appropriate to provide details of their road works plan. Individual schemes will be announced as and when they are to be executed.

With regard to the resurfacing works undertaken during the six months up to 31 March 2005, we can inform that as part of the City Centre Beautification projects, paving works were undertaken along Irish Town from John Mackintosh Square up to the junction with Market Lane. Cloister Ramp has also been resurfaced. The sections of road leading down to Catalan Bay Village from Sir Herbert Miles Road has also been resurfaced as part of the second phase of the Catalan Bay beautification works.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 172 TO 174 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I propose to take up issue with Question No. 174 at the Budget session.

**NO. 175 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GIBRALTAR INDUSTRIAL CLEANERS**

Can Government state the latest date by which they propose to fill the five vacancies at Gibraltar Industrial Cleaners?

**ANSWER**

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

The interviews for the vacancies have been held and the recommendations are being considered.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 175 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I think the Question asks for the latest date by which they would be filled. Can the Minister provide this?

**HON F VINET:**

I cannot give a definite date, it will happen once the recommendations are considered.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Is this likely to be in the short, medium or long term?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not know at what stage of the recruitment process, or the consideration process, or indeed where this matter lies, but given that it is recruitment of vacancies that have been advertised it has to be imminent. I cannot tell exactly if it is this week or next week or the week after but that sort of timescale.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Thank you very much. So the vacancies will be filled and a decision will be taken imminently.

ORAL

**NO. 176 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WEIGHT EXEMPTIONS**

Can Government state the number of times that weight exemptions for Europa Road were granted up to a weight of 16 tonnes, on material and plant that cannot be reduced in size or in weight and for ready-mixed concrete wagons, under Police escort in the years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question No. 177 of 2005.

**NO. 177 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**WEIGHT EXEMPTIONS**

Can Government state the number of times that Old Naval Hospital Road was used up to a permitted weight of 20 tonnes by ready-mixed concrete wagons to access the South District in the years 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 and also explain how they ensure that the maximum weight limit is adhered to?

**ANSWER**

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

The Department of Transport was only tasked with the issuing of such permits as from 2003, with this function having previously been undertaken by the Royal Gibraltar Police. Consequently, I am at present only able to provide the hon Member with such information for 2003 and 2004. The Government nevertheless remain willing to provide to the Opposition the outstanding information as soon as this is received from the Police who are presently compiling the data from their records. I should say, I am actually reading from a prepared reply, I am told the information might have arrived this afternoon at my office, in which case I will forward the same to the hon Member later this afternoon.

In 2003, four daily permits were issued for Europa Road and four daily permits for Old Naval Hospital Road.

In 2004, eight daily permits were issued for Europa Road and three daily permits for Old Naval Hospital Road.

Daily permits are issued for particular operations and this covers any number of vehicle movements on that specific day.

The enforcement of the conditions of the permit is undertaken by the Royal Gibraltar Police who also escort the individual vehicles to their destination.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 176 AND 177 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Could the Minister make clear that when he says three days it could mean three times, 200 days, 600 such trips or have I got that wrong?

**HON F VINET:**

No, the permits apply to each date. For example, in 2003 four daily permits issued for Europa Road but the holder of that permit can actually use the permit as many number of times as it is required during that particular day.

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Can he then provide me with the figure which I need, which is how many times was the road used by a cement wagon in a calendar year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I believe that it is impossible to tell because although some permits are issued for a trip, for example somebody says they need to get this lorry up to deliver this piece of equipment to this, that is one trip. When there is a building site for example, a contractor might get a permit for a whole day and I do not think any record is kept of how many times during that one day the permit is exercised.

ORAL

**NO. 178 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the percentage share of the electricity supplied to customers that was purchased from OESCO and MOD respectively in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 179 to 182 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 179 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state how many units of electricity were purchased from OESCO in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 178 and 180 to 182 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 180 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the number of units of electricity they propose to purchase from OESCO in the financial year 2005/2006?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 178, 179, 181 and 182 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 181 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state how many units of electricity were purchased from MOD in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 178 to 180 and 182 of 2005.

**NO. 182 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**PURCHASE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the number of units of electricity they propose to purchase from MOD in the financial year 2005/2006?

**ANSWER**

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

The total number of units purchased from MOD and OESCO during the financial year 2004/2005 was 3,875,432 which equates to 2.7 per cent, and 63,060,940 equating to 44.7 per cent respectively.

We are not at present in a position to provide the hon Member with information on the units of electricity we are likely to be purchasing from either OESCO or the MOD in the financial year 2005/2006.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 178 TO 182 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Again I will take the issue of those questions up at Budget time.

ORAL

NO. 183 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**SALE OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the amount of revenue raised from the sale of electricity in the financial year 2004/2005 and the amount billed in the same year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, ROADS AND UTILITIES

Answered together with Question Nos. 184 and 185 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 184 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the total number of electrical units distributed in the financial year 2004/2005 and provide a breakdown by Lighting, Power, Domestic, Commercial, KVAs and Special?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 183 and 185 of 2005.

**NO. 185 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY**

Can Government state the amount of revenue raised by the distribution of electricity in the financial year 2004/2005 and provide a breakdown by Lighting, Power, Domestic, Commercial, KVAs and Special?

**ANSWER**

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

The total revenue collected from the sale of electricity during the financial year 2004/2005 was £12,061,030.71. The amount billed during the same period amounted to £12,381,199.

The total number of electrical units and corresponding revenue raised in respect of each tariff during the financial year 2004/2005 is contained in the table that I forward to the hon Member.

Answer to Question 185

<b>Tariff No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>KWH (Units) Billed 4/2005</b>	<b>Amount £ Billed 4/2005</b>
T1	Lighting	498,022	65,750
T2	Power	329,996	38,927
T3	Domestic	51,300,308	5,081,388
T4	Commercial	66,206,735	5,950,689
T5	Industrial Maximum Demand (KVA's)	14,073,966	1,169,231
T6A	Off Peak (Special)	207,090	14,794
T6B	Off Peak (Special)	823,208	60,420

**NO. 186 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ELECTRICITY AND WATER COSTS**

Can Government state how they have calculated the average electricity and water consumption for a family of four?

**ANSWER**

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

The method used by Utility companies to calculate an average consumer is to divide the total number of units billed by the population serviced, thus producing a per capita figure. The calculated figure is then simply multiplied by four to determine what the average consumption would be for such a family size.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 186 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So they have taken the whole of the sale to residential premises and divided it what by the population to arrive at a figure per capita?

**HON F VINET:**

That is correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. Is that the methodology that has been used anywhere else to calculate the consumption of a family of four, to the Minister's knowledge?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This is the methodology that both the Electricity Department and AquaGib have separately used, say they have always used and say is the usual methodology. What I can tell the hon Member as a matter of interest is that when they put up these figures as to what was the consumption for a family of four, I personally went to the trouble of checking with a couple of families of four that I know and actually it was remarkably accurate. Now of course it all depends on personal lifestyle, there are

people who consume more electricity than others depending on personal lifestyle issues. It is not scientific but it certainly works statistically and when I have put those statistics to test by a member of staff in the office and somebody else outside, 'can I see your electricity and water bills?' and it is remarkably accurate. Now there will be people with a family of four who pay less than the average and there will be people that pay more.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But that is true of all averages, I just find it peculiar that for example on the basis of that system of calculation it would mean that households of four would pay four times what households of one would pay, well that is how it is being done is it not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But it does not follow.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So in practice it would be less for a family of four.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Absolutely, yes. It just seems a peculiar way of doing it precisely because there is an in-built error into a system that it pre-supposes that the size of the family is a multiple of the consumption of a single person household, and that cannot possibly be accurate.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, that is how it is done. No one pretends that it is scientific, nobody pretends that it provides an exact response but the margin of error, the structural error is for the benefit of the consumer because in effect it would mean that they would be less impacted by the increase because they do not have four times the base per consumer cost. If one is running a water heater for a family of one, it is still one water heater for a family of four, the cost is not times four. So if we are saying the impact of these rises for a family of four is 'x', it may actually be less than 'x' because in-built into that multiplication is a factor that will not actually materialise in practice. In other words, the cost is not four times as much for four people as it is for one person.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Minister say what is the population figure that was used to divide to produce the unit costs?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot tell him but I can say that there are detailed calculations which I have seen, both for electricity and for water, and which are in a file in my office somewhere which provide this information. I am just wondering whether I think some of the information may be available to the hon Members when they get the answer to the questions asked by the Hon Mr Randall on the yields implications. I can certainly let the hon Member know what is the working assumptions of population size and things like that for both electricity and water, I suppose they are the same.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well presumably they are the same unless there are people who have not got piped water supply but have electricity, yes. But would the Minister not agree that in fact the accuracy of that divisor is important in establishing how reliable the four times the figure?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course.

**NO. 187 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**WORKS ABOARD THE ROTTERDAM**

What steps have the Government taken since their last answer in this House to ensure that the works aboard the vessel Rotterdam are carried out in a manner that is safe and in keeping with the Factories Ordinance and the Asbestos at Work Regulations and that any asbestos removed from the vessel is disposed of or treated safely?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Since the last related answer in this House on this question, I think it was Question No. 2246 of 2004, the Health and Safety Inspectorate has continued its inspections and monitoring of the asbestos removal works aboard the vessel Rotterdam.

During this time, that is from December 2004 to date, three inspections have been conducted, on 9<sup>th</sup> February, 16<sup>th</sup> March and 1<sup>st</sup> April 2005.

The Health and Safety Inspectorate has accordingly been able to continue ensuring that the asbestos removal works and the storage of this asbestos have been undertaken in compliance with the relevant legislation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 187 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Are in fact these works on-going? Is the Minister aware whether the works are on-going or is the Rotterdam now a project that is not going anywhere?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well, for the hon Member's comfort and my own comfort to be honest, the removal works concluded on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005 and the asbestos which has been removed is now stored, as I say according to regulations, aboard the vessel until such time as it returns to its port of origin in Holland where the asbestos will be disposed of in some way or another.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

A new dimension emerges. When we have been talking about removal works for much of my questioning in relation to this issue I always assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that the asbestos was being removed from the vessel. In fact it is being removed from where it was on the vessel and stored on the vessel. It is not actually coming on shore or it is not being brought on shore for storage and disposal, it is remaining in the vessel is that right? No asbestos is being brought on shore from the vessel.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That is my understanding and it is implied in the way that I have answered the question, my department have answered the question that the asbestos bits and pieces have now been stored within the vessel and will be taken away, thank God.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it that once this work is completed on the ship of removing the asbestos, is that the end of the work and the vessel goes?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The vessel is undergoing a complete refit of which the asbestos removal is just one part.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So the asbestos is being taken off at this stage rather than towards the end of the work, why, is that because they cannot sort of leave it there until they finish all the other things?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know the logistics of the operations there but what I do know is that the work on the asbestos area has now been completed and the asbestos is within the vessel until the vessel is ready, after all the other works that the Chief Minister has just mentioned, and it goes away.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes exactly, my understanding, which I am almost certain is correct from things that I have been told in the past about this vessel, is that the asbestos is staying on board and sailing away with the vessel when the refit is finished which I think is the point that the hon Member was just making.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, I appreciate that was the original answer, what I am asking is if the removal of the asbestos is something ancillary to what is being done, why do we need to have the asbestos taken at the beginning and have it sitting there?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member appears to believe that the asbestos is cargo or something on the vessel. The asbestos is found in all the things that they rip off to refit. So for example, if this was the ship's ballroom or the ship's dining room and they were refitting it, there may be asbestos in the panels so when they talk about removing asbestos they mean removing lagging and pipes, it is part of the junk that is generated when one strips things away that one is replacing as part of the refit.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I know that the Government do not answer for Cammell Laird but just from the point of view of trying to elicit as much information as possible for the sake of public peace of mind, are the works as far as the Government are aware on-going for the refit of this vessel, or is there any truth to remarks that have come to the Opposition's attention that in fact the refit is no longer going ahead, the company that commissioned it having been put into the Dutch equivalent of liquidation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not accept the premise of the hon Member's supplementary which I think is false. There is no aspect of what the work being done on the Rotterdam that gives any cause for concern for people and therefore to premise his question by saying 'in order to put peoples' minds at rest', peoples' minds need not be other than at rest however long the ship because the work is being done safely. Now that said, the longer it is here with work being done the better because it is providing employment and economic activity in the yard whilst that is happening. I have to say I have recently had meetings with the directors of Cammell Laird on other things and they have not indicated to me what he claims to have heard, and that is that their client has gone belly up or the Dutch equivalent, we have not heard that. It would be a pity if it is the case because this is a valuable piece of work and the value of this sort of work for a yard like Cammell Laird is that it provides greater degrees of stability of employment because it is a long-term contract, which means that it irons out volatility whereas otherwise it is just ships coming and going and there is a lot of idle time to staff, casual workers then get sent home, whereas the availability of this sort of work on the yard has the advantage of providing a greater degree of stability. It would be a great pity if what the hon Member appears to have heard were to be true.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have to say, although obviously the Chief Minister does not share the premise of my question, I think that his Minister and I certainly share certain concerns about at least the asbestos aspects of this work which we are both happy to have seen resolved in a manner that is not going to see the asbestos brought on shore, but I will leave it at that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Asbestos is only dangerous if not handled or not handled properly. People sort of demonise this substance, there are many more dangerous substances around than asbestos. It is dangerous if disturbed and ignored or dismantled and not properly handled. Properly handled by specialist asbestos contractors, as the Government engage when we do work or discover asbestos, there is no danger for anybody not even for the work force actually doing the handling and the removal of the asbestos. So why the hon Member feels quite so threatened, asbestos is one of these words like the other one, the big 'c' word. It is not dangerous when properly handled.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not as cool a customer as the Chief Minister.

**NO. 188 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NEW ENTRANTS**

In what industry are the two Moroccan national 'new entrants' to the local labour market registered for the month of March 2005?

Perhaps this is a good place to inform the House that the statistic to which I am referring is elicited in respect of statistics provided by the Minister for Employment in writing to me under an arrangement which I think is probably more appropriate if he explains to the House.

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

In those statistics which I provided there was another table on work permits and there we can find the information on these two Moroccans, new entrants through work permits in the labour market registered in the month of March. One is in sales and the other is engaged in personal services.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 188 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister has not taken up my invitation to explain to the House the arrangements. I do not know whether he wants to do that or whether I should myself?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes well I simply repeat what the hon Member has said. We made an arrangement to provide written information on these matters of statistics which normally come here orally before the House and which I think is better dealt with outside the House in written communications so that then we can follow up with questions in this House.

ORAL

**NO. 189 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – NEW ENTRANTS**

Can Government state how many Gibraltarians employed in the months from January to March 2005 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by sex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is now provided in a schedule.

**Answer to Question 189/2005**

Number of Gibraltarians who were employed in the months of January to March 2005, who were new entrants to the local labour market:

	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>January 2005</b>	11	10	21
<b>February 2005</b>	14	23	37
<b>March 2005</b>	8	9	17

**NO. 190 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT REGULATION (OFFENCES) ORDINANCE**

Do the statistics for March 2005 provided in answer to Opposition questions in respect of fixed penalty notices imposed under the Employment Regulation (Offences) Ordinance include fixed penalties imposed on the MOD after inspections carried out at its installations at The Tower?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The simple answer is no.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 190 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister in that case tell the House how many fixed penalty notices were imposed on the MOD when inspections were carried out at its installations at the Tower after the end of March?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Let us get some points of fact clear. The inspection carried out on the MOD took place not at its installations at The Tower but actually in North Front and it took place in April not March, so therefore the statistics for March do not include any reference to fixed penalty notices in MOD. There was an inspection, as I say, carried out in April in North Front and the question related to the findings of that inspection, the question of the possibility of any fixed penalties, is being considered at present.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Minister will correct me if I am wrong and it appears from his answer that that may be the case, but I recall that press reports at the time indicated that certain irregularities had been found in the way that the MOD was carrying out its employment of sub-contracting activity. I believe the reference was to 'had led' but then one cannot believe everything one reads in the papers, or might lead I thought as a result of the Minister's answer now, to fixed penalty notices. Is that the case,

has there been another instance with which perhaps I am confusing this instance where a fixed penalty notice has been imposed on the MOD?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, there was only one incident of a worker, not as reported, the media rather got things wrong. It was a detached worker and therefore under the responsibility of the local employer, MOD, to have that employee registered accordingly. As I say non-registration is liable to a fixed penalty and this is being considered.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can the Minister tell us who it is that is considering whether or not to impose that penalty?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It has been referred to the Attorney General and generally, collectively considered by Government.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is it habitually the Attorney General that determines whether or not fixed penalties should be imposed or is it on the spot the inspector who decides, much like a traffic warden makes a decision to impose a fixed penalty and then if the employer or the driver wants to challenge that, he challenges that judicially?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No it is not generally referred to the Attorney General, it is the inspector who determines whether or not but because there are complications here in terms of a detached worker working for a firm which is sub-contracted by the MOD, we felt it is wiser to actually consider the legal implications.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the Minister then telling this House that if there is an infraction of the law, if the Attorney General advises that in fact the law was broken, then there will be a fixed penalty?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Can I just before answering that say to the hon Member that the comparison with the traffic warden is not quite the same. The traffic warden walks around, sees a car parked on a double yellow line and there and then slaps on a ticket. The Employment legislation is not enforced on that basis. They normally go back to their office, consider the facts, in other words, fixed penalty notices under the Employment Ordinance are not slapped in the shock there and then when discovered, unlike a

traffic warden. The answer is subject to (a) legal advice – there are considerations about whether the Crown is subject to a fixed penalty notice. There are all sorts of legal considerations of that sort. If nevertheless, all the legal advice right down the line were that there has been an infringement, then the position of the Government is that the MOD should be dealt with like any other employer. That is to say that whatever degree of first warning is given to all employers should not be denied to the MOD just because they are the MOD. On the other hand, if in the circumstances of this case it would not be the practice to give a first warning to a private sector employer, then nor should a first warning be given to the MOD. In other words, the MOD should be treated the same as everybody else provided the law permits it, no worse and no better.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Of course it is the Crown that is considering these issues and the Crown that may be subject to it, is it that the MOD, because of course the Crown is divisible, is it that the MOD is making representations in its defence or is it simply that the Government are taking advice themselves as to whether there is in fact an infringement, and then will determine how to act given the other considerations that the Chief Minister has put to the House?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the MOD has not made any representations as to whether the legislation should or should not be enforced against it. I understand that as a matter of internal business of its own, that the MOD was surprised that our inspectors were able to gain access quite so easily on to their estate but they are not exempt from the law, their estate is not exempt from the law but that is not making representations about whether the Government or the Employment Service should or should not issue.

ORAL

NO. 191 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**EMPLOYMENT – NON-EEC NATIONALS**

Can Government state how many non-EEC nationals in the months of January to March 2005 were new entrants to the local labour market giving a breakdown by nationality and job title?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

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

**Answer to Question No. 191 of 2005**

January 2005	Bahamian		Brazilian		American		Israeli		Indian		Japanese		Romanian		Russian		Serbian		Turkish		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Manag.									2						1						
Prof.		1																			
Ass. Prof						1															
Admin																					
Skilled																					
Personal Svs																					
Sales											1										
Plant																					
Element																					

February 2005	Indian		Polish		Turkish	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Manag.						
Prof.						
Ass. Prof		1				
Admin						
Skilled						
Personal Svs						
Sales						1
Plant						
Element						

March	USA		Bulgarian		Canadian		Hungarian		Indian		Israeli		Polish		Romanian		Turkish		Moroccan		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Manag.																					
Prof.	1																				
Ass. Prof				1																	
Admin																					
Skilled																					
Personal Svs	1					2															
Sales																					
Plant																					
Element																					

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 191 OF 2005**

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

It is on the table on work permits issued.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes that is it. I think that we have had confusion because the question has been answered under a different heading and under a different question. The question that has been answered is 'can Government state the number of work permits issued in the months since the last answer, giving a breakdown by occupation, sex and nationality?', which is a general question. This one is confined to non-EU nationals so I think we need to square those two answers but I am obliged to the Minister.

**NO. 192 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**EMPLOYMENT – UNEMPLOYED GIBRALTARIANS**

Can Government give a breakdown of male and female unemployed Gibraltarians aged 18 and over in the months of January to March 2005 receiving :

- a) Unemployment Benefit;
- b) Social Assistance;
- c) no payments giving a further breakdown of sex in each age group?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The information relates to another Ministry but the statistical information he seeks is now provided in the schedule which I hand over.

Answer to Question 192 of 2005

**A. UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT**

<b>2005</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>18/25</b>	<b>25+</b>
<b>January</b>	37	33	70	19	51
<b>February</b>	33	28	61	17	44
<b>March</b>	38	37	75	18	57

**B. SOCIAL ASSISTANCE**

<b>2005</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>18/25</b>	<b>25+</b>
<b>January</b>	88	50	138	31	107
<b>February</b>	82	55	137	25	112
<b>March</b>	86	57	143	29	114

**C. NO PAYMENTS**

<b>2005</b>	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>18/25</b>	<b>25+</b>
<b>January</b>	48	47	95	40	55
<b>February</b>	60	31	91	31	60
<b>March</b>	59	17	76	23	53

ORAL

**NO. 193 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EMPLOYMENT SURVEY REPORT**

Can Government state when they expect to be able to provide the Employment Survey Report for October 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

We have referred this question to the Statistics Office which produces the Employment Survey Report, and they have assured us that the October 2004 Employment Survey Report will be laid before the House during this current meeting.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 193 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

If there is any delay would the Minister be in a position to provide it when we come to debating the Estimates so that at least if we are going to be quoting figures both sides have the same figures available.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I will try my best to ensure that.

**NO. 194 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BISHOP FITZGERALD SCHOOL**

Can Government state what works are currently being carried out in Bishop Fitzgerald School?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

We are constructing a much needed toilet block which also includes a store and a changing room for the cleaners and for the lunch supervisors.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 194 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Is this to cater for the large roll of children that Bishop Fitzgerald currently has?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Well, it is related to it in that we were short of toilets, this has been discussed in the House before, for the complement of pupils in the school and this has been now remedied with the construction of the toilets.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Although it is the subject that I have put the question to but is it not a bit short-sighted to have engaged in these extra costs to this school which will later on not be necessary in the sense that there will be another school built nearby in order to decrease the volume of that school itself?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, it is not short-sighted at all. This was an urgent matter, if we had not built the toilet blocks we would be getting stick for not having built them, necessary toilet blocks and the future school in the Mid-Town Project is still ahead and therefore, this was very necessary as the hon Member knows because he has asked questions about it before.

ORAL

NO. 195 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state what was the total cost of the annexed building in St Paul’s School?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Answered together with Question Nos. 196 to 199 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 196 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government confirm that the standard of construction of the newly built annex at St Paul’s School is adequate?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Answered together with Question Nos. 195 and 197 to 199 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 197 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state what instructions have been given to the head teacher of St Paul's in relation to the newly constructed annex?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 195, 197 and 198 to 199 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 198 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government confirm whether their Support Services Department supervised the construction of the building at St Paul’s School at any stage?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 195 to 197 and 199 of 2005.

**NO. 199 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ST PAUL’S SCHOOL**

Can Government state how many times the Government safety inspectors assessed the newly built annex at St Paul’s during the construction period?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The total cost of the St Paul’s School annex is £1,321,386.01. The expenditure was incurred over a span of two financial years, 2004/2005, the total expenditure was £958,346.55, and 2003/2004 the previous year the cost was £363,039.46. In other words a total of £1,321,386.01.

The Government can confirm that the standard of construction of the newly built annex at St Paul’s School is excellent and much more than adequate. The Government have not issued any specific instructions to the Head teacher of St Paul’s First School in relation to the newly constructed annex, apart from asking her and encouraging her to make full use of the excellent facilities which have been provided.

Technical Support Department did not supervise the construction of the new building at St Paul’s School at any stage. GJBS commissioned a private firm, Andrews, Kent and Stone, to design the building because the TSD could not prepare the drawings within the time span requested, and Andrews, Kent and Stone thereby supervised the works all along on behalf of the constructors GJBS.

The Government Health and Safety Inspector visited the school annex three times whilst construction was under way.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 195 TO 199 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister confirm that there have been problems with the roof of the annex?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There were snagging problems, as usual in every construction, not quite the roof as the hon Member suggests, I think it was one of the tiles in the false ceiling that came unstuck and was stuck back again.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Did that affect the running of the school as in they were using it and then suddenly they were told not to use it for safety reasons?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Not to my knowledge. I am not sure of the details but it may have been that while the tile had fallen the children were stopped from crossing that area, but I am not sure exactly what measures, Head teachers and teachers are responsible to know exactly what appropriate measures were taken in that situation.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Will the Minister confirm how long this problem to put right will take or is it already completed?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I can confirm that the solution to the problem has been completed.

**HON S E LINARES:**

So there is no longer any building works being carried out at St Paul's at this moment in time?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I cannot give him details, there may be other minor adjustments as I say as part of the snagging problem but certainly with regard to the specific issue of the ceiling of the roof, I can tell him that to my knowledge that has been solved.

**NO. 200 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – HEALTH AND SAFETY**

Can Government state at what stage the Department of Education's written policy on Health and Safety is at present?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Following an extensive period may I say of consultation involving all the schools and the College and the Union, the NASWUT, the Department has now requested, rightly I think, the experts of the Technical Services Department and the Government Health and Safety Inspectorate to comment, to make an input into this draft document which the Department has produced, therefore we are waiting for their recommendations as experts before the draft is finalised and the policy document may now be submitted before the Government for final approval.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 200 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The last time I asked the question the answer was exactly the same, that they were doing a consultation process. Can the Minister say how long that consultation process will take?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

If I recall, the answer was not the same, I had no reference then to the fact that the Technical Services Department and the Health and Safety Inspectorate should make an input as experts into this document, and that is exactly the process which is going on at the moment. There is no intended delay if that is the insinuation, providing guidance and proper instruments for the schools on health and safety. We are also quite conscious and conscientious about health and safety in the schools, it is just a question of doing things properly. There is always this urge on the part of the hon Member to rush things and demand datelines and all that. Well, I have told him before on things like this I am not going to be rushed.

**HON S E LINARES:**

I am not rushing, he has been in Government for eight years nearly, let us carry on there is no rush whatsoever. As an intended delay, I never said there was intended delay, the delay is already there. The Minister has been in Government eight years and nothing has happened. What I am saying is, how long will this consultation period take? How many times has the Minister consulted the NASWUT? How many meetings have the Department of Education had with the NASWUT in relation to the health and safety issue policy? How many times have the Department of Education consulted with the NASWUT in relation to the health and safety policy?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not know how many times, I know they do consult as necessary and conscientiously and wisely.

**NO. 201 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – ASBESTOS**

Can Government state how many inspections have taken place in the year 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 to identify whether there is any asbestos in school buildings by the Government's Health and Safety Officers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Two inspections have taken place to identify whether there was any asbestos in school buildings. Bishop Fitzgerald School was inspected in the year 2003/2004 and St Joseph's Middle School during 2004/2005. In both cases the inspection was carried out in response to requests from contractors when the presence of asbestos was being suspected.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 201 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

The Minister has stated that there have been two inspections, I presume one of them was in Bishop Fitzgerald and the other one was the St Joseph's one which he has just mentioned. Have any other schools, because I have mentioned all schools, in school buildings in general, all Government schools, have any other Government school apart from these two been inspected by the Health and Safety Inspectors?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, the inspections are carried out when there is a likelihood or a suspicion that asbestos may be present in one of the schools. The hon Member will probably note that the two schools I have mentioned are old military constructions and therefore it was indicative that there might be asbestos. Other schools are of later construction and there is absolutely no likelihood that they have any asbestos in that structure.

ORAL

**NO. 202 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on computers in schools in the last financial year giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 203 to 205 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 203 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on computers in the Department of Education in the last financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Answered together with Question Nos. 202 and 204 to 205 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 204 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on computers in Bleak House in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 202, 203 and 205 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 205 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**EDUCATION – COMPUTERS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on computers in the Gibraltar College of Further Education in the last financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

The statistical information is provided in the attached.

**Answer to Question 205 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 202**

The total expenditure for computers in schools during 2004/05 was £58,651.95 and the breakdown is as follows:

<b>SCHOOL</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
Bishop Fitzgerald Middle	£8,650.00
St Paul's First	£4,035.50
Bayside	£11,714.75
Sacred Heart Middle	£1,960.00
St Mary's First	£192.00
St Anne's Middle	£2,679.00
St Joseph's Middle	£13,322.70
Governor's Meadow First	£2,796.00
St Bernard's First	£2,000.00
Westside	£11,302.00

**Answer to Question 203**

The expenditure for computers for the Main Office of the Education & Training Department was £590.

**Answer to Question 204**

£1,340 was the expenditure incurred during 2004/05 in respect of computers for Bleak House.

**Answer to Question 205**

The expenditure for computers for the Gibraltar College of Further Education during 2004/05 was £14,260.

ORAL

**NO. 206 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MAINTENANCE IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on maintenance in schools in the last financial year giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 207 and 208 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 207 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MAINTENANCE IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on maintenance in the Gibraltar College of Further Education in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Answered together with Question Nos. 206 and 208 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 208 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**EDUCATION – MAINTENANCE IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how much has been spent on maintenance in Bleak House in the last financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

The statistical information is passed on to the hon Member in a schedule.

**Answer to Question 208 of 2005**

**Answer to Question 206**

The total expenditure for maintenance in schools for 2004/05 is £379,821.85.  
The breakdown is as follows:-

SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Bayside	£29,162.22
Westside	£27,170.91
St Joseph's Middle	£37,420.73
Sacred Heart Middle	£10,421.50
St Anne's Middle	£22,078.28
Bishop Fitzgerald Middle	£82,643.03
Hebrew	£1,526.00
St Martin's Special	£94,031.02
St Mary's First	£7,587.77
St Bernard's First	£7,116.02
St Joseph's First	£14,376.22
Notre Dame First	£18,005.26
St Paul's First	£9,706.95
Governor's Meadow	£18,575.94

**Answer to Question 207**

The amount of £16,396.52 was spent on maintenance at the Gibraltar College of Further Education during 2004/05.

**Answer to Question 208**

The amount of £1,456.50 was spent on maintenance at Bleak House during 2004/05.

**NO. 209 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – CATERING COURSES**

Can Government state whether any changes have been made to Catering Courses at Bleak House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Catering courses have in the past been delivered at Bleak House Training Institute as modular components pertaining to the School of Tourism Course. These modules were accredited by City and Guilds International and were set as a Level 1 qualification and certificates of unit credits were awarded.

There have been changes. The present trainees enrolled in the School of Tourism courses now follow a Level 2 BTEC first certificate, which as the hon Member may know is the equivalent of a GCSE, in travel and tourism. This Level 2 course prepares trainees towards an administrative role as well as a catering skill within travel and tourism related topics, and the changes have been brought about based upon the advice that we have been receiving from prospective employers in Gibraltar's tourism industry and the travel market.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 209 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

So that means that the industry must be satisfied for these students for later on to get employment, must be satisfied with Level 2. Are they satisfied that if they reach Level 2 they are more employable, let us put it that way, into the industry than ... Put it this way, do they accept Level 2 as a way in which they can employ candidates?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, well I think that is implied in what I have just said, that we have acted on the advice of the industry and thereby obviously implying that they think that by training our students to Level 2, their chances and their skills in that area have been enhanced.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Do the Government envisage if there is more prospect of them doing Level 3 and maybe going on? As in, for example, a student might get to Level 2 but has not got employment and wants to carry on studying or doing these modular courses onto Level 3, is there any prospect of the Bleak House doing these courses?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There is no provision at present for these courses to reach Level 3, but certainly the door is open for further improvements and we continually monitor the success or otherwise of our training courses.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Has any course that was previously being run been discontinued?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Not quite discontinued, I think the previous courses which were more focussed on catering skills, have now been subsumed into these Level 2 courses which have a wider curriculum stretching into other aspects of tourism and travel. So it is not a question of discontinuing but rather of updating and upgrading courses provided.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Will the people who were able to take the previous courses also be able to take these ones or are there different requirements, entry requirements or anything like that?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

No, I am sure that people who have taken the Level 1 before and now feel that they could still have the opportunity to go into Level 2, they would be very welcome to apply, there would be no impediment on their being taken on for that level, the new courses.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am not talking about the Level 1 going onto the Level 2, presumably there are still Level 1 courses that new entrants can take that are no different from the ones that were there before, or if they are different, is the fact that they are different mean that the potential market is less? The potential market of students has that been altered in any way? Are the changes limiting the people that are able to apply and take the courses?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

This falls within the laws of the market, some firms will obviously not require a Level 2 qualification and would welcome a Level 1 student in the previous courses for their purposes, which as I say were more focussed on catering. It depends, I cannot be absolutely exact in my forecasting of what the labour market will tell.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, I am afraid the question I am trying to establish is whether in fact the changes that have taken place, not in moving from Level 1 to Level 2, have any of the Level 1 courses been changed in any way?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

I do not quite understand what the hon Member is getting at. The situation is as follows. Before we were providing for students who entered the Bleak House Institute of Training School of Tourism, a Level 1 course with a set curriculum which as I say was more focussed on catering skills. Now we have scrapped that course, although I said it has been subsumed because some of the skills and some of the substance of that course is now taken up in a Level 2 course, which is a BTEC certificated course, which has a curriculum wider than the original one, because that is what the industry has been asking for.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But then it is not a question of going from Level 1 to Level 2. I mean, people go straight into Level 2 without doing Level 1, is that the case?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

That is so. They do not have to go through a Level 1 course, they go into a Level 2 course but of course there will be elements of what used to be Level 1 subsumed into the Level 2.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Therefore are there people who were eligible to do the Level 1 still eligible to do the Level 2?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Indeed they are. I answered that question that if they apply now for the Level 2 course they would be very welcome.

**NO. 210 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – VOCATIONAL TRAINING SCHEME**

Can Government state how many students are currently enrolled in the Vocational Training Scheme?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There are currently 176 students enrolled in the Vocational Training Scheme.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 210 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Government state at what stage they are each at, as in are the 176 in the first stage, second stage or third stage of the Vocational training?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

There are 17 in intake 5, which is the latest intake, there are 145 still from previous intakes still completing their three year stint in the vocational training scheme, the required training on ESF requirements is three years, and there are 14 who are not under the ESF scheme but subsidised by Government.

**NO. 211 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GASA SWIMMING POOL**

Can the Minister for Education state whether the payments made to GASA for children to attend vital swimming lessons will come from the schools capitation budget?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

Payments made to GASA for children to attend swimming sessions at the swim hall as part of their curriculum requirements will not be paid from the schools capitation budgets, nor indeed have they ever been.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 211 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government state from what funds these payments are made?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Yes, they are funded from Examination Expenses.

ORAL

**NO. 212 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – BULLYING IN SCHOOLS**

Can Government state how many incidents of bullying have been reported to headteachers in 2000/2001, 2001/2002, 2002/2003, 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 to date giving a breakdown by school?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The statistical information requested is on the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 212**

<b>School</b>	<b>2001/02</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>2003/04</b>	<b>2004/05</b>
Gibraltar College	-	-	1	-
Bayside	4	6	5	7
Westside	No records available	No records available	3	1
Bishop Fitzgerald	"	6	5	3
Sacred Heart	4	5	7	5
St Anne's	5	4	4	4
St Joseph's Middle	7	2	6	4
Governor's Meadow	1	1	1	2
Notre Dame	-	-	2	3
St Bernard's	3	4	4	3
St Joseph's First	1	1	7	4
St Mary's	1	1	2	2
St Paul's	-	-	-	-
Hebrew Primary	-	-	-	-
St Martin's	-	-	-	-

**NO. 213 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – GRADUATES EMPLOYED**

Can the Minister for Education state whether through the Employment Service he has been able to obtain information on graduate employment as he mentioned in answer to Question 649 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

I can confirm that it is now possible, as it was suggested in Question No. 649 of 2004, to match those individuals who graduated in 2003 or any subsequent year for that matter, against employment records held by the Employment Service in order to establish how many went on to obtain employment in Gibraltar. The data computer programme that yields this information has now been updated to yield this information and I will be pleased, I cannot provide it here now, to provide the information the hon Member seeks within a matter of the next two weeks.

**NO. 214 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – POST-16 COMMITTEE**

Can the Minister for Education state whether the Post 16 committee set up by him has met since the publication of the Tomlinson Report and/or after the UK Governments response to the said report?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The Post 16 committee has not met since the publication of the Tomlinson Report because it has been agreed generally to wait for the final outcome in the UK of the wide-ranging review which is taking place there of all the issues involved.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 214 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

As stated in the question, the UK Government have already given a response albeit not a very, very thorough report, as in specific to each recommendation in the Report but in general they know what they want to do and what they do not want to do. My question is, would it not be sensible if the Post 16 committee would meet to at least discuss the response of the UK Government to that Report. The Minister I have asked this question in the House on previous occasions and the answer is 'yes we are waiting for things to happen in the UK'. But things are happening in the UK, the UK Government have already responded to the Tomlinson Report. One example is that they are going to stay with the A Levels rather than have the international type of baccalaureate tests that was recommended by the Tomlinson Report, and I think it is important for the Minister who set up this committee, rightly so I must say it is right to do that, that he set up this committee in order to look at what we call now 14-19 education. Unfortunately we cannot here in Gibraltar just sit and wait to look and see what happens in the UK, what we have got to do is be pro-active and see how the Government have responded, what were the recommendations. If they have not even met after the Tomlinson Report was published, how can the committee have a view of the Tomlinson Report in itself? So can the Minister, may I say, urge his committee to at least meet and discuss these issues?

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

The Minister does not agree with the assessment and judgement of the Opposition Member and to say that we are sitting and waiting is not correct. The advisers, the experts are very much into what is happening in the UK, the situation is still very fluid, when he says that the UK Government have responded he is referring to the White Paper which has been issued by the Government in response to the Tomlinson Report. It is still very much a discussion paper, we still do not know where things are going, even the NASUWT officers in the UK have told us that and they too themselves are waiting to see what the outcome eventually is going to be that is put before Parliament, and then will become curricular legislation. So by all means there are always informal discussions between the advisers and the officers in the Department and the teachers, and the Head teachers on these issues but the fact that there is a working group is not a sacred institution that has to meet. If they do, it is just going to be a bit of a talking shop about nebulous developments and in any case the advisers are preparing a paper, guidelines, compiling all that is happening in the UK, the Tomlinson Report, the adviser recommendations of the Tomlinson Report, the White Paper, which very often needs to be actually reduced for the sake of teachers who have plenty on their plate rather than just go into a huge, big report. That is the situation as we see it. That is our assessment and that is the way we are moving.

**NO. 215 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – SUPPLY TEACHERS & LEARNING SUPPORT ASSISTANTS**

Can Government confirm whether teachers and learning support assistants are now being given a contract as opposed to them being employed on a permanent supply basis which does not entitle them to the same rights as any other Government employee?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

The supply teachers and learning support assistants have not been as yet provided with contracts. They are still being employed on a supply basis.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 215 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Does the Minister know if there is any indication as to when, or have they brought out any vacancies for contracts or have they tendered out for contracts, or have they not moved at all on any of these issues? An issue which might I add is important to the person who is on a permanent supply, for obvious reasons like we have had debates before of young people coming over from the UK, getting a permanent supply for a year, wanting to get a mortgage from the bank, the bank not giving them a mortgage because they have not got full time work, all these issues are issues that affect these people. Do the Government have, again and I insist on timetables, because it seems as if there is no urgency on any of the matters that I have asked, time does not pass for them, so may I ask does the Minister have again a timetable or at least a time limit as to when these will come out?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, because the Government do not accept the premise of his question which the Government believe is entirely incorrect. The position has not changed since the last time he asked this question. Supply teachers are exactly what the name suggests, people who are called in to cover situations which are temporary. Now the temporary situation may be of shorter or longer duration but it is still temporary as opposed to permanent and one cannot make somebody permanent and pensionable unless the job that they are doing is going to be permanently required. The hon Member has got to distinguish between the concept of supply and the concept of permanence and

temporariness. When teachers do jobs for which there is no permanent requirement, permanent does not mean that it has lasted two years, it could have lasted two years because that is the length of the temporary need, indeed the temporary need could be five years and sometimes is. When we employ, for example, classroom aides to deliver a one to one service to a disabled child, that post is required for the years that that child is in the Middle School for example. That is a temporary requirement. It may be a temporary requirement which is three or four or five years long but it is not a permanent requirement and the Government do not make people permanent and pensionable unless there is a permanent requirement. That said, we have had debates in this House in the past about the terms and conditions that attach to supply workers or people who are not on permanent and pensionable terms, when they have been engaged for some time.

Can I just remind the hon Member that he raises these points as if somehow all of these things had started to happen, the concept of supply workers in very lengthy posts or in time, as if all of these things started in May 1996 and these things never happened before. Can I remind the hon Member that the only Government that have taken a view of a number of supply workers on two occasions and said 'these supply workers and classroom aides deserve to be made permanent and pensionable' have been this Government. It was never done before. So when the hon Member demands timetables, could he at least recognise that the principle of looking to see whether people who have been on supply terms or different terms should be made permanent and pensionable, is something that we have started and we have done for the first time and the previous Governments did not do. So the situation may still not be as perfect as he would like it to be, assuming that we can agree on the definition of perfection, but he should at least recognise that we are the first to have made a serious go. Of course we cannot do this every day, it takes time to assess whether there is a permanent establishment need for particular posts and where I have agreed with him in the past is that whilst somebody is on an extended engagement on supply terms, there ought to be some provision to give him leave entitlement and things of that sort. That is where I have agreed with him in the past as opposed to making permanent and pensionable. Now, it is true that that area, which is where I have agreed with him in the past, appears not to have progressed since last we discussed it, and therefore to the extent that his questions relate to that area where the Government have a degree of agreement on this position, his pressing of the Government in my view has a greater degree of justification than all the areas where we simply disagree with the premise of his question. I think there is a case. Whether we make people permanent and pensionable or not, even if we do not make people permanent and pensionable, to say 'well look if somebody is on supply terms and has been on supply terms for a continuous period of for example 12 months, and that person carries on then there ought to be some provision'. Counter argument apparently, is that the rate of pay for supply workers compensates for the fact that these are the terms, so that has got to be looked at too and a fair conclusion come to.

#### **HON S E LINARES:**

It is incredible to hear what I am hearing today. The AACR used to have contract teachers years ago, where we used to have teachers coming from the UK on contracts because we did not have the local expertise at the time, and that used to be an issue. So the Chief Minister cannot say that his Government is the only Government that is looking into it because he has not done it yet. The supply workers, and he did agree with me that these are not supply workers, it is a contradiction in terms to have a permanent supply, a supply is a teacher who is

sitting at home, so that the Chief Minister understands the difference between a supply teacher and a teacher who has a long or medium-term time to do certain things. A supply teacher is a teacher that is sitting at home in case another teacher gets ill, and I think the Regulations are that they have to be three consecutive days ill and on the fourth day the school is given a supply teacher to cover for the illness or the time period, that is, two weeks, five weeks, two months, even maternity which is 14 weeks to cover for that period, and one gets a supply in. What one cannot do and what the Chief Minister has said, if there are learning support assistants or teachers that have a specific job, for example, a learning support assistant might have a job for five years because there is a child that needs. I understand that I am being pressed to ask the question but I am afraid that the Chief Minister has diatribed for about 10 minutes on the concept of supply. Now, what I am saying is that a supply teacher is there waiting to be called in to cover up. What he is talking about, what he is calling supply is a learning support assistant who has a child who has a problem for five years and needs a learning support assistant to sit beside the child helping to support the teacher. That person will be employed for five years and therefore a contract is needed for five years so that they can get, what one cannot do is get from the supply pool, have that person there for five years, one knows that one has them for five years so why not give them a contract? There is the question. The question was very, very specific and he was the one who has gone on to explain all the things and I am trying to tell him that what he has explained is completely irrelevant, and now I am being irrelevant to the question but I am just answering the Chief Minister. So all I am saying is, and I appreciate that he has admitted that his Government have not moved on this, that is all I needed to know. That is all I needed to know.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not agree with the hon Member. He seems to think that the only use that has historically been made of supply workers in Gibraltar is that they are required to sit at home by the telephone and if a permanent member of staff telephones.....

**HON S E LINARES:**

No, they are not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that is one of the uses of supply workers and indeed it may be the use for which the system was invented but what I am telling the hon Member is that the system has historically been used to cover the sort of situations that he thinks is now too long to be carried out by supply workers and should be carried out by contract workers. When we arrived in office in May 1996, there was a veritable army of people on permanent supply terms.....

**HON S E LINARES:**

No.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What does he mean no? How would he know what we found on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996?

**HON S E LINARES:**

We have had this argument before, he is repeating again.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If the hon Member does not want to hear what I have got to say it can only be because he thinks that what I am going to say does not suit him. He cannot censor what I say in this House or what I do not say in this House. When we arrived in office on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996, as he has interrupted me I have got to start again so I am going to say something twice for better effect. When we arrived in office on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996 we found a veritable army of people in precisely the situation that the hon Member has just described and suggested is an improper use of supply workers, and on not one but on two occasions, we have approved converting a list of them, their circumstances, the job that they were doing, how long they had been doing it, assessed on an individual case by case basis and we had to make a number of them, I cannot now remember the exact figure, about 15 in one sitting that I can remember, were made permanent and pensionable. What I am saying to the hon Member is that this is a problem that we inherited and that unlike previous Governments, which was a phrase that I used to avoid saying unlike the previous Government, I was just trying to be a little bit less political, since he contradicts me by reference to the AACR, we set about trying to do something about it. Have we finished? No. There will always be cases, there will always be at any period of time people whom if one evaluates their case may deserve to be made permanent and pensionable just as the 15 that we evaluated and then another batch that I cannot remember the size of were evaluated. That is converting supply workers to permanent and pensionable, which I accept is not what the original question relates to. Yes, but then he has made remarks in supplementaries, I understand that the original question does not relate to the making of people permanent and pensionable but it relates to whether people who are on supply terms should have a contract or not. That issue, in respect of some of which aspects I agree with the hon Member, is not as simple and straightforward as he thinks because there are now rules and EU directives about how long one can continuously renew peoples' contracts for before their employment becomes indefinite.

So, there are factors to be taken into account of whether one is not making them permanent and pensionable by the back door. It is not as simple as simply saying to supply workers 'because you have been here so long, here is a contract'. It is not that simple because as he knows, because I think we passed the legislation together here in this House, there are rules about the number of times that one can repeatedly renew a contract without doing that. These things have got to be taken into account as well, I would rather approach the issue not by means of whether there is a contract or not, but rather by what are the terms of the supply scheme so to speak. So that if somebody has been on supply for a continuous period full-day, has worked in effect a full year just the same number of hours as a permanent teacher, and assuming that the rate of pay, which I do not understand is the case, but if the rate of pay does not compensate them then the scheme might say that for every 12 months of supply work that one does, one is entitled to so many days of paid leave. To introduce that sort of scheme, in other words, to make sure that extended supply

work is not done on unreasonable terms as to leave entitlement and things of that sort, one does not have to give them a contract. All that one has to do is modify the terms of the supply workers scheme and that is the way forward that I would prefer rather than the giving of a contract, which does have potentially serious on-going implications for the tax payer. Now, I admit, to the extent that when we last debated this at some past meeting in the House, I expressed the same views as I am expressing today about lack of leave entitlement, that has not yet been converted into action. To that extent I agree with his questions.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Just to put the record straight, his Government might have put some permanent or supply teachers in 1996 when he went in on a permanent and pensionable.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

When we came in.

**HON S E LINARES:**

When he came in, this is what I am saying. What I am saying is that when the Chief Minister came in he might have found one or two teachers that were on those terms, because I, as GTA President, when the previous Government was in power together we put teachers that were, and wrongly because at the time we realised that there were teachers who were eight and even 10, and 11 years if I remember correctly on the supply list.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That is what we found.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No, he did not find them because they were made permanent and pensionable before he came in. He might have found a few that were left because he got into power but what I can say as a GTA President I fought for those people to be made permanent and pensionable, and they were made permanent and pensionable. Well just to put the record straight.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, he may be talking about teachers.....

**HON S E LINARES:**

Yes teachers, I am only concerned about teachers. We are talking and debating teachers and before he mentioned workers and he might have been mistaken about

what a supply worker is and a supply teacher is. This is the difference, teachers and workers might be different in this sense.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the hon Member presumably, when he was President of the Gibraltar Teachers Association, represented not only teachers but also classroom aides.

**HON S E LINARES:**

No I did not.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well the question, his Question No. 215 does not relate just to teachers, it says 'and learning support assistants'. Learning support assistants are classroom aides for short and it is not true to say that when we arrived in office there were only two or three classroom aides because he had dealt with them all. His remark may or may not be true, I am not in a position to contradict him, his remarks may or may not be true about teachers, I am talking about the classroom complements of the Education Department, which means teachers, classroom aides, laboratory assistants, and a whole number of other sorts of people.

**NO. 216 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – MATERNITY LEAVE**

Can Government state if they have responded to the NASUWT's proposal on the teachers maternity leave entitlement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING**

There has been no response given as yet to the claim by NASUWT.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 216 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can the Minister state what the proposals are, what is the NASUWT proposing to Government on this issue?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Either the hon Member knows the answer to the question, in which case he should not ask it, or he does not know in which case his question is hypothetical. Is he saying that he does not know what the proposal is?

**HON S E LINARES:**

If the Chief Minister does not want to answer it, do not answer it. I am asking the question and therefore if he does not want to answer it do not answer it.

**HON DR B A LINARES:**

Teachers are now on maternity leave of 14 weeks excluding holidays and they are now claiming 18 weeks excluding holidays. That claim is now being discussed and analysed through the proper channels.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Do Government know how much it would be if it excluded holidays, the 18 weeks would be the maximum?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government are not willing to entertain any exchange across the floor of the House in what is an outstanding claim by a group of their employees, which is under consideration for subsequent negotiation. We are simply not willing to say anything further on the matter.

**NO. 217 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government confirm that they continue to use the East Side reclaimed area to dispose of construction rubble, and if so, how much longer do they anticipate that they will be able to continue using the site for this purpose?

**ANSWER**

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

Government are still using the East Side reclaimed area as a rubble tip. The site will be closed to tipping on or around 31 May 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 217 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Have the Government now decided on a site to replace this one and if so which one?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Government are currently considering various options and a decision should be taken shortly.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is the closure of that site related to the commencement of the bathing season or to the development which will occur on that site?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, it is in relation to the actual development.

**NO. 218 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CAMMELL LAIRD**

Are Government satisfied that Gibraltarians are not being discriminated against by Cammell Laird in favour of cheaper labour given the trend that of the numbers of casual workers employed by Cammell Laird the number of Gibraltarians usually amounts to less than half?

**ANSWER**

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

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 218 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well, that short and bland answer really flies in the face of the fact that the statistics provided by the Ministry for Employment tends to show that trend continuing. Now it may be that the Minister believes that a simple yes is enough to answer the question. Even if that were technically the case is he saying to this House that he has absolutely no concerns whatsoever that every time that Cammell Laird, and we look at the Cammell Laird statistics, it is less than half the number of Gibraltarians that are being employed and if that is the case, why is he satisfied, what work is he doing to satisfy himself that this is not an issue of preferring cheaper labour?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The supplementary question there seems to try and create an alarming situation, not by far the case. I think if one looks at the statistical element of it the hon Member is probably right when he says that less than 50 per cent of the casual labour are Gibraltarians, but if he actually looks at the statistics of registered vacancies for casual labour, and one looks at February for example, there were six vacancies out of which two were Gibraltarians. In the month of March there were two and one was Gibraltarian. I mean we are talking of extremely small numbers all the time so I do not think it is something to be alarmed about.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, that is if we look at the statistics for February and for March, but the Minister has pointedly refused, or has pointedly decided not to refer to the statistics for January. The statistics for January is 32 jobs of which only 14 are Gibraltarian. That means that we lost a large number of jobs there. I do not want to be accused of being xenophobic for defending the fact that we should, I think in this House, be interested as much as possible in ensuring that Gibraltarians who are unemployed and I have a ream of statistics of Gibraltarians unemployed, are getting the jobs that are going. Not every Gibraltarian is going to want to be employed in the shipping industry and we must want a diverse job market of Gibraltarians but surely in January, was the Minister not concerned to see 15, 16, 17 jobs going to non-Gibraltarians in that industry?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the Government do not micro-manage the recruitment policies and practices of individual companies on a week by week or month by month basis. The thrust of the hon Member's questions relate to discrimination. For example, the hon Member does not know what the nature of the skills required from the particular workers in any given month were and whether they were available in Gibraltar by Gibraltarians available or not. He assumes that everyone that is employed that is not Gibraltarian has been preferred over a Gibraltarian candidate, equally qualified, equally available and equally willing, which is what it would require to be the case for him to be justified to use the phrase "discrimination". That is the reason why the Government do not agree with his assessment. If he is asking the Government whether the Government would prefer companies established in Gibraltar to maximise the opportunities that it gives to resident workers, I do not use the phrase Gibraltarians, resident workers before importing workers from any other country, the answer to that is yes. The Government hugely prefer that to be the case.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I was not asking the Chief Minister to micro-manage the job market. That is what he would rather I was asking him so that he could get up and give the answer that he has given. I have asked in my supplementary whether the Minister, whether the Government were concerned at the numbers, that is what my supplementary was about and that is what I have not got an answer to, and I will use the words Gibraltarians and I will put my supplementary again. Are the Government not concerned at least that in the month of January 18 jobs went to non-Gibraltarians? I will use the word Gibraltarian and am not afraid of using the word Gibraltarian because actually that is what the statistic is about, Gibraltarians and non-Gibraltarians rather than residents and non residents. So will the Government answer the question, are they or are they not concerned?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer to the question is that the Government are not concerned because we are not aware of the existence of any of the criteria that would justify and sustain concern. The Government would only be concerned if the facts were, which have not been established and which the hon Member speculates about and assumes, that all of these non-Gibraltarians that were employed were preferred over and above. In

other words, that whereas there were Gibraltarians ready, willing and able to do whatever it is that these particular workers were contracted to do, the company nevertheless preferred to go to Bulgaria, or to Spain, or to Germany, well unlikely to be the case to Germany but to some other source of lower cost labour and import them because they are cheaper. The Government would be concerned if that were the case but the hon Member is not entitled to assume that that is the case. The hon Member will remember at the time that we were passing rules, I do not remember if it was the time of the legislation on accession states or whether it was in answer to a question, that he cross-examined the Government about our decision, which we exercised differently to the United Kingdom, not to extend voluntary labour access rights to transitional Member States from Eastern Europe. In other words, the United Kingdom said to all these European States, 'even though you are not entitled, even though your nationals are not entitled to access to freedom of movement rights until the end of the transition period in three, or four or five or six years time, we the United Kingdom are nevertheless going to open our labour markets out to you as of today voluntarily'. Some other Member States did the same, other Member States chose not to and Gibraltar chose not to even though the UK had chosen to do. So the hon Member, and indeed I seem to recall that he was mildly critical of that because at the time he was asking.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

With respect, I want to allow the Chief Minister to continue with the substance of his answer because I think it is important, but I was not critical of the decision being taken. What I was trying to do was get to the bottom of the legality of how it had been done at the time, but he must not read into that, he often accuses me of making the mistake of assuming things, he must not assume that we were against what was being done. We were simply trying to get to the bottom, the process of cross-examination that he himself has referred to, how it was done.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So by that action of choosing to exercise a different option by the UK, not to extend prematurely transitional access rights to workers from transitional countries, the Government have demonstrated their wish and determination to protect the local labour market in circumstances where it is legally possible to do so. If the hon Member's questions are related to engaging Spanish labour, then he must know that there is very little that the Government can do legally to curtail the use by Gibraltar based companies of labour from another European Union Member State. For the hon Member to suggest, I mean I have not assessed the figures and do not know what the nationalities were of these non-Gibraltarian labourers, to the extent that they were from other EU Member States, the Government really are very hard put to have any lawful device available to them, as he well knows, to influence that situation. Therefore he should not ask questions which may inadvertently lead listeners to believe that there are things that the Government could do with Cammell Laird in respect of EU casual labour which they are simply choosing not to do. As he well knows that is not correct.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

This morning we were talking about Cammell Laird and this afternoon we are talking about Cammell Laird again. In the answer this afternoon the Chief Minister tells me

that he does not micro-manage the market, that he does not know what these other nationalities are et cetera. Yet this morning when he was telling us about the £500,000 that the Government have taken upon themselves to pay in respect of the disposal of that grit mountain, he told us that he looked at the balance sheet of Cammell Laird and determined that they were unable to pay those amounts. Well if the Chief Minister is telling us that he is looking at the balance sheet of this company, then he cannot tell us that he is not involved in the micro-management of issues such as this. Now the statistics which have been made available, do not reflect whether the total of 32 of which 14 are Gibraltarian is made up of non-EU nationals or of EU nationals. I am not asking the Chief Minister whether or not his Government can do anything to prevent EU nationals from getting employment in Gibraltar because I know the answer to that as he himself knows the answer to that, and I would not want listeners to go down the route of thinking that the Opposition is proposing something which it knows is not legally possible. But my question was a very simple one. Are the Government concerned that of the numbers employed by Cammell Laird in each month in January, February and March, and I accept that February and March as the Minister for Trade and Industry has referred us to are very small figures, but January is a much larger figure of 32, are the Government concerned that Gibraltarians are being discriminated against? Now that might not be a question which might attract as much debate in respect of a company that is not receiving in effect a £500,000 subsidy, as we were told this morning that Cammell Laird is. Will the Government simply address that point? Stop obfuscating trying to avoid the issue, and tell us are the Government concerned?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, for the third time, I do not know whether the hon Member's definition of obfuscation is not to say something three times as opposed to just once. I think I have already said twice, and am therefore now going to tell him a third time, the Government are not concerned that Gibraltarians are being discriminated against because the Government have no evidence that Gibraltarians are being discriminated against, and nor does he. Cammell Laird are not receiving a subsidy of £500,000, I went to a considerable amount of trouble to explain to him this morning that the Government were dealing with this in the same way as they dealt with the disposal of other refuse in or out of Gibraltar, and because this was a single activity. *[Interruption]* The hon Member says that that is not true, I remember explaining to him at considerable length how the Government disposed of everybody's refuse when we had an incinerator and now dispose of everybody's refuse at Government expense in Los Barrios or wherever it is that the tip is located.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So he sees the balance sheet of every company that has rubbish.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not know whether the hon Member heard the point that he made and whether he is particularly himself persuaded by it, that he should equate in terms of degrees of micro-management my interest in myself in the nationality of the six casual workers that were employed in favour of, non Gibraltarian casual workers, that that is the same degree of micro-management as receiving a request for £500,000 of public expenditure and satisfying myself that it is not expenditure that the

Government should make the company pay, one of the factors of which necessarily has to be, even if there are maybe other factors, whether it is an expense that the company can afford, because if the company cannot afford to do it even if the Government decide that it is something that the company should pay and not the Government because it does not fall into the right, there is no point because the mountain is not going to disappear. So the first question is can the company afford it because if a company cannot afford it, there is no point the Government deciding it should be the company that pays and not the Government unless we are happy to see the mountain stay there. So, I do not know on what basis he says that clearly the fact that I go to the trouble of establishing the question of affordability by the company for what is £500,000 of public funds, therefore proves that I micro-manage to the extent that I concern myself about the details that we are discussing in employment is in my view, I do not suppose he would agree, a huge non sequitur. It is just complete lack of logic on the hon Member's part. Obfuscation. I mean presumably he does not disagree with my definition of discrimination. For there to be discrimination against Gibraltarians there would have to be Gibraltarian workers ready, able and willing to do work and notwithstanding that Cammell Laird should say no. Even though here is a qualified Gibraltarian ready to work, employable et cetera, et cetera I nevertheless prefer to go to Bulgaria to employ somebody because it is cheaper, that is what I understand by discrimination, to save money. I did not understand him to be sort of imputing discrimination on racial grounds simply to save money and the Government do not have any evidence that that is so. If the Government did have evidence that that is so, if anybody complained to the Government 'look I applied for a job in Cammell Laird to stack up boxes', presumably one does not need a sort of degree from Oxford or Cambridge to do, 'and I was nevertheless told that I could not be employed and instead they brought somebody in from Bulgaria', the Government would certainly be interested, would certainly be concerned and would engage with Cammell Laird and try and exercise whatever proper influence were possible to get Cammell Laird to localise their recruitment as much as possible. I do not know whether the hon Member thinks that that is clear or obfuscatory as an answer. I would invite him to take the view that it is quite clear.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well, the issue that I take up is this. The only persons who have the necessary information to take this into its logical conclusion are the Minister for Employment and the Chief Minister, because they are the ones who have the register that tells them how many Gibraltarians there are unemployed and what the qualifications of those Gibraltarians are and how many of those Gibraltarians turn up to see whether they can get a job at the Job Centre, at the ETB. They also know what vacancies are open by Cammell Laird and whether those vacancies relate to those people who are seeking employment. Therefore, if the Chief Minister had told this House 'I have looked at that information, I have looked at the Gibraltarians that there are with qualifications looking for employment who fit the criteria of the vacancy opened by Cammell Laird, and I have seen that they do not' then I would accept his answers. But he has the information, he does not tell us that he has looked at it, in fact the way that he has answered this question is blithely to say 'I am not concerned', and in fact his other Minister told us that he was not concerned because the numbers were too small. So I think what I would do is this, challenge the Government to come back with the figures to show that of those who were not Gibraltarians who were employed in the months of January, February and March, for those that were not Gibraltarians with those necessary qualifications on the books of the ETB seeking employment, then I too might lose my concerns. Would the Government agree to do so?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is assuming a huge amount. First of all he is assuming that there were Gibraltarian applicants for the posts, then he is assuming that the ETB system of vacancy advertising, notification, that nobody in the Job Club has done their work. In the Job Club yes, and in the Employment Service generally have done their work. There are systems in place to maximise to the greatest possible lawful extent the access to jobs in Gibraltar by Gibraltarians, and that is not administered by the Minister for this or the Minister for that. It is administered by public administration officials. Why does the hon Member assume, (a) that there were Gibraltarians for these jobs; and (b) that the Employment Service failed properly to administer the system, which incidentally they put in place, in order to do the most that they thought they could do at the time to protect the priority of access to the extent that it was lawfully possible for Gibraltarians. He assumes all of that and as a result of assuming all of that comes to the conclusion that there is discrimination against Gibraltarians, and because I do not immediately rush to assume all the things that he has rushed to assume, he puts into my mouth the words that I am not concerned. I repeat my answer. I am not concerned because there is no evidence of any of the things that would concern me. That is the answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister has moved the goal post now. He has moved the goal post because now in effect what he is saying is 'we are doing the exercise of looking at what Gibraltarians are on the list of unemployed, what qualifications they have, what it is that Cammell Laird, and I assume therefore other employers, are seeking and when they do not employ Gibraltarians we try and ensure that there was not a Gibraltarian who had those qualifications, or that there was not a job gone to an EU national where there is nothing we can do'. That must be what he is saying if he is talking about the systems that are in place that already do that, which I have asked him and the Minister for Employment to do. What is very clear is this, the Government have seen the statistics for January, February and March in respect of employment at Cammell Laird, and are not concerned by them. The Opposition have seen the statistics for January, February and March and are concerned by them. I think that says a lot for our disparate attitudes to trying to do everything possible to ensure that it is the local jobs that are taken up first.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member may think that that is what it means. I do not think anybody listening to this debate can possibly have arrived at the same conclusion. The hon Member has come to his conclusion based on a number of assumptions which he has no right to assume. What I have said is.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have the right to assume whatever I like. I may or may not be right in my assumptions but I have the right to assume it. Enough rights are being trampled over without even the right to assume being trampled upon.

**MR SPEAKER:**

I am inclined to bring this line of questioning to an end. The way I understand it, the question was 'are the Government concerned at discrimination against Gibraltarians?'. The Chief Minister has answered it in his way and I think we have just got to move on.

**NO. 219 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**NURSERY – FLEET PAVILLION**

Can Government state what alternative premises will be allocated to the private nursery situated at the Fleet Pavilion site once construction of this site takes place?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No alternative premises have yet been allocated, or rather the premises that will be allocated have not yet been identified, but of course options are under consideration and of course there will be a mutually agreed relocation before they are required to vacate the site, in a way that will not disrupt the continuity of their nursery.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 219 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

Can Government state whether the costs of the re-allocation will be paid by Government or probably the developer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is too early to say that because the relocation may not be permanent it may be temporary, because one of the options under consideration is that the nursery may be capable of being relocated on the site as part of the new school complex, or attached to the new school complex. So the relocation may be permanent or it may be temporary and the extent of the cost that arises and who should pay for it then depends on which option is chosen.

**HON S E LINARES:**

Have the owners of the nursery agreed to move? Are they in a positive mood to move?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

We do not expect them to stand in the way of a development which is so hugely in the public interest.

ORAL

**NO. 220 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**LIND HOUSE**

Can Government say whether Lind House has any heritage constraint which requires the existing structure to be retained and refurbished as opposed to being demolished?

**ANSWER**

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

That is a matter of opinion. It is actually academic because the technical advise is that the condition of the house is such that it should be demolished and DPC have in fact issued a demolition permit.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 220 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Did the tender specify the existing structure had to be retained in this particular case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No.

ORAL

NO. 221 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**WESTERN BEACH**

Can Government say whether they have any plans for the development of Western Beach and if so what are they?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Government have been studying the possibility of reclaiming land from the sea in the area north of the runway by Western Beach.

The proposed use of the land would be mainly for commercial and industrial activity.

**NO. 222 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADEWINDS DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say whether any entity has objected to the height of the Tradewinds development?

**ANSWER**

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

No objections have been received from the public.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 222 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are there organisations or entities, like for example the CAA or the MOD or the RAF which perhaps might not be considered the public, being part of the official sector, that have raised such objections or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the MOD would actually have intervened if the height of the building had been any higher than 45 metres. This is not the case so therefore there is no concern.

ORAL

NO. 223 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

How many meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have taken place since 18 November 2004 and on what dates?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Ten meetings of the Development and Planning Commission have been held since 18 November 2004, on the following dates:

7 December 2004  
17 December 2004  
12 January 2005  
1 February 2005  
10 February 2005  
24 February 2005  
3 March 2005  
18 March 2005  
29 March 2005  
14 April 2005

ORAL

**NO. 224 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – GRAND MAGAZINE, ROSIA**

Can Government say whether the application for planning permission in respect of the proposed development at Grand Magazine and Rosia is still being considered by the Development and Planning Commission?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 232, 234 to 243 and 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 225 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – NORTH GORGE**

Has the tender for the re-development of North Gorge now been awarded and if so to whom, in what amount, and can Government say whether this was the highest bidder?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 226 to 229 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 226 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**DPC - BUENA VISTA BARRACKS**

How many tenders have been received for the re-development of Buena Vista Barracks and part of North Gorge?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 225 and 227 to 229 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 227 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – EUROPORT AVENUE**

How many tenders were received for the re-development of the plot of land at Europort Avenue between the GASA swimming pool and the desalination plant, who was the successful tenderer, in what amount, and was this the highest bid?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 225, 226 to 228 and 229 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 228 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – EX MOT TEST CENTRE**

How many tenders were received for the re-development of the ex MOT test centre at North Mole Road, who was the successful tenderer, in what amount, and was this the highest bid?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 225 to 227 and 229 of 2005.

**NO. 229 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – LATHBURY BARRACKS**

How many tenders have been submitted to the Government for the re-development of the ex Junior Ranks Club Building at Lathbury Barracks, who was the successful tenderer and what was the amount bid?

**ANSWER**

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

**Answer to Question No. 225**

The tender closes on 27 May 2005 so therefore the tender has not been awarded.

**Answer to Question No. 226**

Again the tender closes on 27 May 2005 so therefore has not been awarded.

**Answer to Question No. 227**

Four tenders were received. The tender was not awarded as the level of premium offered did not justify the allocation of this plot, the redevelopment of which would be more beneficial as part of a more holistic approach in the overall future development of the area.

**Answer to Question No. 228**

Nine tenders were received. The tender was awarded to Longhorn Properties Limited in the sum of £1,457,000.

**Answer to Question No. 229**

Seven tenders were received. The tender was awarded to Sharrock Shand Holdings Limited in the sum of £1,255,000.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 225 TO 229 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 228 which was the one of the ex MOT Test Centre, the Minister I think has not given me the full answer. We know it was nine tenderers, we know who got the tender and the amount but was this the highest bid?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes it was.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 229 can I ask the Minister whether the bid by Sharrock Shand was actually the highest bid?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes that was the highest tender as well.

**NO. 230 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NORTHERN DEFENCES**

On what date did Government commence refurbishment of the Northern Defences tunnels, what did this refurbishment entail and can Government supply the cost with a breakdown?

**ANSWER**

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

The Government are not carrying out a refurbishment of the tunnels in the Northern Defences, which contain very many tunnels at different levels. It might be desirable to do this in due course but the great number of tunnels involved and the high cost of making tunnels safe means that the Government do not have this project in their list of future works in the short or medium term.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 230 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Did the Government refurbish part of these tunnels a few years ago?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, I think the hon Member is referring to the World War II tunnels and the middle galleries.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to those tunnels, my understanding is that after this refurbishment was carried out there was considerable vandalism in the tunnels and in the area, I do not know whether we are speaking of the same ones. Can the Minister say what the position is now, do Government still intend to open the tunnels, to refurbish them and open them to the public or what is the position?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think the hon Member should understand that what we refurbished was the World War II tunnels and the middle galleries and that is what he should be referring to and not the Northern Defence tunnel. The works which took place about a year and a half, two years ago was the Phase I of this. There needs to be a Phase II which will take place as soon as the Government feel they are in a position to continue to do so. In the meantime, there is a project to be able to open the tunnels as they are to offer specialised tours of the tunnels in the interim period whilst the Phase II can be undertaken, which would then enable the fully fledged opening of the tourist site.

**NO. 231 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**RAGGED STAFF TUNNELS**

Can Government say whether they have any plans for the development of Ragged Staff Tunnels and state to what use the tunnels are currently being put?

**ANSWER**

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

The chambers inside the tunnels are currently used for temporary storage. The redevelopment of the tunnels and chambers is currently being discussed with a particular developer.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 231 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is that development of the tunnels and chambers in relation to restoring them and opening them to the public or is it for some other purpose?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the discussions that are being held are currently with the proposed developers of the underground car park at Grand Parade, and using the entrance and exit to those tunnels as the exit point to the underground car park. Obviously that will incorporate the use of some of the chambers there for storage purposes but this is part of the on-going negotiations with the developers of Grand Parade underground car park.

ORAL

NO. 232 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Has a planning application been made to the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the East Side Project and if so on what date?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 234 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

**NO. 233 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government confirm that they intend to relocate marine and waste collection from their present location on the site intended for the Eastside reclamation?

**ANSWER**

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

Yes. Various alternative construction tipping sites are being considered and studied.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 233 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My understanding of it, and certainly the approach that was made to the Opposition, this is actually on behalf of a constituent who has a business called Marine and Waste Collection on the area where the rubbish tip is. The question is this business was moved in there when, I believe, Sir Herbert Miles Road was being widened or something and they are still there. What we are trying to find out is, this person has been on that rubble tip now for many years, the business has been on the rubbish tip for many years and he wants to know whether he is going to be moved or not, and if so when?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

This question has been answered as if it were relating to the rubble tip, because the question that reached the Government simply says 'can Government confirm that they intend to relocate marine, with a small 'm', and waste collection, so we thought that it was a reference to an activity and not to a company. I do not know who the question relates to. I have seen a list of all the occupants and tenants and whether they are lessees or licensees in the context of relocation planning and I have not seen anybody by this name on any such list. So he must be known to Government by another name. So unless we can be told what the nature of the activity is it might give us a clue.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My understanding is that this is a portacabin which is near the road on the rubble tip and that there are things like excavators and skips and fork lift trucks et cetera. This person was moved there and then was told he was going to be moved somewhere else once the Sir Herbert Miles Road widening and beautification and all of that had been completed. This company, this business has been on the rubble tip for a number of years now, have obviously heard that the East Side reclamation is going to start or planning permission is going to be made for it, and is wondering what is going to happen to him, when is he going to be moved, so that was the purpose behind the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There are people who just established themselves there. I do not know whether this is the case of this individual or not. I think the moral of the story is that the hon Member should take a few more details from people who come knocking at their door asking for their help. If he wants to write to either me or the Minister for Trade and Industry setting out at least so that we can identify and let him know what the tenancy, if any, status is but as I say he is not on the list that is presently being used to manage the relocation exercise.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Certainly we have taken all the details that we can, the name, the business, the address, telephone number, and the type of business activity and the location where the portacabin is but I will certainly write to the Minister with that information and any other information I may be able to dig up, and would welcome a reply.

ORAL

**NO. 234 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – FUNICULAR PROJECT**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed funicular project, how many were favourable and how many were against the project?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232, 235 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 235 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**DPC – FUNICULAR PROJECT**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the project to construct a funicular and if so on what date?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232, 234 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 236 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – FUNICULAR PROJECT**

Can Government say what was the purpose of the preliminary discussions that they had with the persons promoting the funicular project from Casemates to Rock Gun, before any application for planning permission was made?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232, 234, 235, 237 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 237 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – FUNICULAR PROJECT**

Can Government say on what date additional information was supplied by 21<sup>st</sup> Century Rock Ltd to the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed funicular project, and tell the House why this additional information was required and what it consisted of?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232, 234 to 236, 238 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 238 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY WHARF**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed development by:

- a) Commercial Queensway Wharf Ltd and
- b) Queensway Wharf Ltd

in the area of the Cormorant site and MOD Medical Centre, how many were in favour of the project and how many opposed to it?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 237, 239 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 239 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY WHARF**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the proposed development by:

- a) Commercial Queensway Wharf Ltd and
- b) Queensway Wharf Ltd

at the area of the Cormorant site and MOD Medical Centre?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 238, 240 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 240 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY/NEW HARBOURS**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed development at CP 1544 Queensway adjoining New Harbours, how many were favourable and how many opposed the development?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 239, 241 to 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 241 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY/NEW HARBOURS**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the application made by Belmont Ltd for a proposed development at CP 1544 Queensway adjoining New Harbours and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 240, 242, 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 242 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

How many representations were received by the Development and Planning Commission in respect of the proposed development at the so-called mid-town project in Queensway, how many were favourable and how many were opposed to the development?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 241, 243, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 243 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Has planning permission been granted in respect of the application by Commercial Developments Investments Ltd in relation to the so-called mid-town project in Queensway and if so on what date?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 242, 248 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 244 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

What steps did Government take to establish whether any other developer would have offered them a better deal for the mid-town project before it was directly allocated to Commercial Developments Investments Ltd?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 245 to 247 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 245 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

What is the area in square metres of the mid-town project, with a breakdown of each of its component parts also in square metres?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 244, 246 and 247 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 246 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Can Government list the criteria that was used to reach a valuation of £10 million for a school, park, car park and leisure centre in exchange for the land in relation to the mid-town project?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 244, 245 and 247 of 2005.

**NO. 247 OF 2005****THE HON DR J J GARCIA****DPC – QUEENSWAY MID-TOWN PROJECT**

Can Government say whether the Ministry of Defence have expressed any concern at the planned height of the main tower of the mid-town project?

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

This premium was the result of a negotiation and not the application of any specific criteria. I would refer the hon Member to the press release issued by the Government on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2005, which stated that the premium paid for this site by Commercial Developments Investments Ltd was the highest premium rate ever paid to the Government for a project.

The area in square metres of the mid-town project, with a breakdown of each of its component parts also in square metres is as follows:-

<b>Area</b>	<b>M<sup>2</sup></b>
King's Bastion	4,290
King's Bastion Park	1,265
City Park	4,900
School	2,500
Royal Tower	1,200
Princess Gate	1,400
Retail in Nelson Square	4,000
Nelson Square	1,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20,555</b>

This agreement will deliver valuable amenities to Gibraltar and the Government, including a school, a public park and a leisure centre. An additional value to the Government is the fact that, inevitably, it would have cost considerably more for the Government themselves to build these facilities. Additionally, the Government would have been exposed to the risk of cost overruns instead of the developer. In addition, the development will provide public underground parking near the centre of town. The Government have frequently said that they would exceptionally make direct allocations where a project is particularly in the social and economic interests of Gibraltar.

The MOD, on behalf of the RAF have raised the issue of the height of the mid town tower and have asked that an aeronautical study be undertaken by the developers to demonstrate that it will have no impact on airfield safety and operations or otherwise.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 244 TO 247 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister referred me to the press release that they issued on 22<sup>nd</sup> February which conveniently I have here. I will take one issue at a time. In relation to the premium the Minister mentioned that this was the highest premium ever paid to a Government for a development in Gibraltar, but is it not the case that in terms of the actual height of the tower, it is also one of the tallest developments to go up in Gibraltar and that using the Government's own valuation criteria on the basis of density of construction, that is to say on floors of construction, it is logical that it should have been the highest. Our contention obviously as the Minister knows, and that was what the question he was answering, whether we felt the project had been undersold. Is it not the case, using the Government's own density valuation rather than our own valuation in terms of square metres and size of area of the project, that in fact the project has now been undersold by even more, using their own valuation?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, that is not the case. The premium rate payable on this development is the highest. Now of course the premium rate is per developable square metre. The developable square metre depends on how many square metres one is going to build, how many one builds is a product of height. What is being sold is the land and of course it is not all the land that is being sold, it is only the footprint on which the three middle bits, the historical King's Bastion where the leisure centre is going is not being sold, the bit where the park is going is not being sold, the bit where the school is going is not being sold so out of the whole site one has got to say well how much of it has actually been purchased by the developer? It is a good deal less than a third of the whole site. Now, that is the land that is being sold and that is the land for which the development towards the premium which has a value of £10 million, or whatever it costs them to build the amenities, may be more than £10 million. Well, highly unlikely to be less because the Government have not just accepted whatever figures the developer has drawn up. When the Government decide to accept the construction of assets instead of cash, of course they go to the trouble to make sure that they are getting constructions worth the amount of cash that they think they should be getting. That is why we say in answer to this Question that in addition to having done that, a second revalue is the fact that invariably when the Government procure a project it costs more. Private developers screw down, or negotiate, or are able to obtain more competitive prices from construction companies than public sector procurers invariably do. Therefore, to get these assets built for what in effect is a fixed price to the Government now, even though the thing is not going to be built except over a period of time, is something that has an additional value over and above the value that we are attributing to the assets because the developer runs the risk. The Education Department has specified a school, of a certain size with so many classrooms, for so many people, with a certain design, and he is going to build it. It cost him much more and if it does that extra cost is for his book, so we think that this is a very good deal for the public interest, for the Government in its wider context, it secures a development project which is in itself economically valuable activity, and

in addition to achieving that, it procures at no outlay and no resource effort, and no management effort and at a fixed price for the Government, a number of valuable public amenities. The policy of the Government is that the disposal of public lands goes out to tender and it all invariably does go out to tender, but we have also always stipulated that when there are exceptional proposals that are in the public interest, exceptionally in the economic and social interests, that the Government would consider direct allocations and this was such a proposal. The alternative is that when a developer comes along and says 'look, if you let me build this on that site I will build a school for you and I will do this for you and I will do that for you' I would say 'hang on that is an excellent idea. I am now going to get your idea and I am going to put it out to tender and give other people the opportunity'. This is different to the sale of a piece of land virgin. If the Government were just selling a piece of land, as there are many other tenders that have been advertised, then that is just a matter of price really. But when somebody comes to the Government and says 'look here is a specific development proposal', well the Government either says 'yes, that is a particularly interesting package proposal for Gibraltar I am willing for that project to allocate the land to you directly', which is what we have done here, or we say as I said a moment ago, 'thank you for the idea, I am now going to put out to tender for all your developer competitors to see if they can steal it off you by bidding better'. On that basis nobody would ever put a proposal to the Government and that is the basis of this particular transaction. None other.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Question No. 244 I do not think had been answered in the original answer, although the Chief Minister has now volunteered information. The question was how was the Government able to establish, have the Government been able to establish, whether any other developer would have offered a better deal? Really the answer is that we do not know because we have not actually gone out to any other developers, is that correct?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, it is like my asking my predecessors in office how will they know that somebody would not have made them a better deal for Europort than the Dutch. There are some proposals which are evaluated and which Governments are elected to make judgements. In our judgement this, both on financial grounds and on public amenity procurement grounds and on protecting the tax payer from escalating cost of construction or variations in the developer risks, is a very good proposal. As it was a very good proposal the Government thought that it justified the exceptional, and I think that this is one of only one or two direct allocations that we have done. In our judgement the Opposition Members may disagree and in our judgement we think on all those grounds, even on the simple cash valuation, never mind all the other things, we think it is an exceptional circumstance that justifies exceptionally departing from what is our policy, it has not been policy in Gibraltar in the past, that all disposing of public assets go out to tender. It is not a breach of the policy, the policy is not that everything goes out to tender, the policy is that everything goes out to tender except exceptionally, by direct allocation and not tender, when a particular proposal is thought to be exceptionally in the public interest.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I think the Chief Minister has misunderstood what I am saying. The criticism is not as to whether this was tender or directly allocated. The point that we are making is that even if it would have been directly allocated, could it not have been directly allocated to somebody else for a larger amount, and then would not the Government and the tax payer have derived more benefits from this?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure the hon Member is disregarding my answer because I think he started this supplementary by saying that I had just answered the information, so I think he may have acknowledged that I had dealt with this issue. If the Government were to do what the hon Member is indirectly suggesting the Government ought to have done, which is to put this out to some sort of market testing, it would have required the Government to explain what the proposal was, because the Government did not say this piece of land is for sale. The Government did not go up to a developer and say 'do you want this piece of land? How much will you pay me for it? £10 million, done'. That is not how it happened. I have explained to the hon Member that there are occasions on which developers bring specific proposals to the Government and that people come and say 'look, I would like to build this project there, and this is what I will do for you. I will do this, I will do that, I will include this, I will include that, I will build this, I will build that'. Then the Government have a decision to make. The Government could say 'no, go away. I am not willing to dispose of this piece of land unless it is by public tender', and miss that opportunity, or make the tender around this man's idea, this particular developer's idea.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Would the Chief Minister not agree there is a third choice, which is that the Government could say that they have had a proposal for this area, anybody that has got any idea that they would like to put forward to the Government can come forward and we will consider it alongside, without having to give away what the first one has said.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, because the Government wanted the proposals that were put to it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

They were lucky that the guy was clairvoyant.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the guy is not clairvoyant, the consortium which by the way is a very wide consortium that includes many of Gibraltar's property developers today, came to the Government and put a proposal. Frankly, for the Opposition Member to be making that representation to the Government when, when he was in Government practically none of these things were put out to tender, I think is a little bit rich. This is the

application of our policy which is, public tender is the norm, exceptionally in certain circumstances, it will be done by direct allocation. I do not know if this is the first or the second example of the caveat out of the generality, and that is what the Government have done. If in future another developer came up with a proposal which the Government thought exceptionally merited for some other site, the Government would consider a direct allocation as well. What the Government will not do is simply sell land, 'here is a bit of public land, do you want it?' The Government will not do that by direct allocation. The Government will always do that by public tender, but this is the Government's willingness to provide the land, at a price obviously, to facilitate a particular concept project that somebody has bothered to work out and to present to the Government and has incurred expenses, I suppose in running it up, and in those circumstances the Government think that it is justified in doing exceptionally what historically in Gibraltar was the norm with all asset disposal by the Government. I think that is reasonable. If the point that the hon Member is making is, 'well yes, but if you had gone to other people and said look well how much will you pay me for this site, and build me a school and build me this and build me that?' that would be touting around town a proposal that had originated in other people, and the Government do not think that that is ethical.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister seems to be contradicting himself, because he says that it was the initiative of this group, which seems to include almost every developer, I do not know who is left out to put up a competing bid anyway from one of his remarks, but at the same time it was what the Government wanted to do with it. Well look, is it that the Government wanted to do it.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not said it was what the Government wanted to do with it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, that was when I said that they must be clairvoyant because they actually came up with the idea that fitted what the Government wanted to put in those places. If the Government had no pre-conceived ideas and they decided to have a school there because a developer thought that it was a good idea to have a school there, or they decided to have a leisure centre in King's Bastion because a developer decided, no, they have been talking about the leisure centre well before the developers came along. So there was nothing in my judgement for them to say 'well look, we would like' before the developer came up with the idea, 'we would like to do a leisure centre and we would like to do a school', if that is what they feel is needed to meet the Government's own requirements. All they were saying is that if they would had had an alternative they would have been better able to evaluate how good value for money it was. We are not saying they have done anything that is somehow wrong because they allocated it with this idea to these people, who seem to be according to him a very large group anyway.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, but that is not how it happened. They did not have to be clairvoyant to know, the Government's desire to see a leisure centre in the King's Bastion, as they reminded me this morning, has been known since my 1996 election manifesto. The Government's desire to see a school built in that area has been publicly known long before, I think it was in the manifesto too. The initiative, which actually in fairness is not a Government initiative, for a public car park to be built somewhere I think was the subject matter of a Chamber of Commerce, so all they have done is got together, they did not need to be clairvoyant, all they have done is read the Government's election manifestos, they have read the Chamber of Commerce's annual reports and they have put it all into a package and put it in front of the Government on a silver plate. That is how it has happened. It is not that they clairvoyantly or that we somehow have given them a hint as to this is something that this is what we would like to see, now go off and present us something. It is all there in the public domain and all they have done is to wrap it up in a package, have the foresight to say to the Government 'do you want this done? Do you want that done? I will do it all'. That is all that has happened. That is how it has happened.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it is not quite the same as coming along with a project to do something that nobody has ever thought of, and then going round touting it for other people, because in fact they may have had the initiative to approach the Government but of course the Government would equally have initiated that process by saying 'anybody interested in doing this can put ideas to the Government', like they do with other things. Can I ask the Chief Minister is it the case that the bid that is going to be financed by these developers has to happen before they get hold of the land that they are going to develop for themselves?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They have the opportunity to do it in phases, except that the leisure centre must start in June. The rest, they have the opportunity to do in phases. The building of the school has to be contemporaneous with the building of the first commercial structure. So, the answer to the hon Member is not before, the only thing that they have got to do before anything is the leisure centre, because the leisure centre they start and pay for in June. They then can start building within a certain period of time, but I do not remember now what it is whether it is getting planning permission out to them, full planning permission and all of that and procure, they can then decide whether they do two buildings, or one and if they decide to do one which one. In either event, the school is done at the same time as that. So it is not before but at the same time as, insofar as the school is concerned and the leisure centre comes before any other construction. The last thing that happens is the gardens because that is in effect the site office.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

Could the Chief Minister explain to me this question of planning permission for the leisure centre? This morning I was told that because it was a Government project, planning permission was not required.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct, they need planning permission for their bits but not for our bits. So for example, they are in effect contractors in respect of the school, the leisure centre and the park, they do not need to get planning permission for that. Of course the Government go through their own internal process of ensuring that building standards and safety calculations and all of that, they do not have to go for example through public consultation and all of that but they do have to go through that process for their bits of it. The Royal Tower, the Princess Gate, the Retail Nelson Square and the Nelson Square, because this is that they are doing that on their own account. The bits that they are doing for the Government, I do not know if the hon Member knows that the Town Planning Ordinance does not apply to the Crown, that is why the Government do not need planning permission for their projects.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In answer to an earlier question we were told that there were 10 representations made against this project and actually none in favour. Can the Chief Minister say what was the purpose of the public participation then, given that all the representations made to the DPC were actually against it, and perhaps he could elaborate on what grounds?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is most unusual for people to exercise this open planning process, but very few people ever say anything in favour of projects, but it is possible that something is so magnificent that people are delighted to see it go up. So it is not unusual for all the representations received to be against, because this whole opportunity for people to express their views is to give people, mainly people who are opposed to express their views and the reasons why they are opposed, but of course that does not mean that the DPC converts, and indeed the law does not permit them to, the decision on the basis of a vox populi. This is not planning by referendum. The DPC is obliged to make its decision only by reference to the statutory criteria that are set out in the Town Planning Ordinance, and the number of people opposed to it or whether they are a majority or a minority, is not a consideration that they are lawfully permitted to take into account. What they are permitted to take into account is any issue brought to their attention by people making a representation which falls under one of the statutory criteria upon which they can make a decision. Frankly, for a project of this size, magnitude and location, with all the supposed criticisms of, I hear it has been baptised 'the thermos flask' in Spanish, for all the alleged controversy, 10 representations of opposition is by no means an overwhelming measure, or rather a measure of overwhelming opposition. Still, it is right that people now have an opportunity to express their views and that the DPC takes those views into account, insofar as it is lawful for them to do so. But I think the hon Members, certainly the Leader of the Opposition who has exercised Governmental responsibilities, will know that people like to get a flat or a house but then once they have got one they tend to oppose to any other flats being built around them for other people to have houses. One of the tough decisions that we had was that no sooner had Westview Park gone up, there are things between Safeways and the water front there, had gone up and everybody had bought their own house and were very excited naturally at their own house, but they objected to Euro Plaza being built. There is a tendency to say 'well here I am now, I really object to anything that spoils my view' and on that basis a small place like Gibraltar would never be developed. If a dozen people opposing a

scheme resulted in the Government not authorising the scheme, in a small place like Gibraltar nothing would ever get done because almost everything that is done adversely affects 10 or 12 or perhaps even a greater number of people. One has to balance that with the economic development of Gibraltar.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There are still two more issues that I want to raise in relation to this series of questions. Are the Government satisfied that heritage considerations have been adequately safeguarded in relation to the leisure centre going in King's Bastion?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, as may be known, the Gibraltar Heritage Trust is represented on the Development and Planning Commission. They have put forward their views and in fact some of their considerations and views have been noted for the developers to take into account when the project goes forward.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

And specifically in relation to the leisure centre which I think is what the hon Member was asking about. The answer is yes, we have submitted the proposals to the Heritage Trust, I have personally walked the site with the Chairman of the Heritage Trust and another member of the committee, we have taken on board all their advice and recommendations. Of course they would prefer, I mean the sort of heritage puritan and the sort of person who thinks that heritage is there to be gawked at and not to be incorporated into the fabric of society and therefore not to be touched or leant against or anything like that, would much prefer for the Government to spend a large sum of money just sort of tarring the place up so he can sit there for another 300 years. So I am sure that there are people in the Heritage Trust who would much rather we did not fiddle about building a leisure centre in it and all that. The reality of it is that the Government's policy, subject to advice and subject to consultation and being as sensitive as possible to the historical heritage value of things, is as far as possible to convert it into useable assets, which does not compromise the heritage importance and this is being done now in many parts of Europe and the world. It brings heritage alive if it is converted into something which is useable by contemporary current generations. So, yes, it does involve sort of putting restaurants and cafeterias and discotheques and ice-skating rinks and all these sorts of things where guns used to be fired from and people used to stand around in sort of red tunics. All that is true and it does involve, without interfering with the footprint of the building, it does involve doming the central courtyard. So if one were to impute when this project is done, assuming it is done on the basis that it is presently under consideration, if one looked at King's Bastion sort of bird's eye view from above, one would still see the wall, the roughly mushroom shaped protrusion from the Line Wall which is the King's Bastion itself, and all that would be perfectly visible and that is not cluttered, nothing is being built on top of the line of the building but then that internal courtyard, which the hon Member may be familiar with, it is not very obvious now because it has got modern buildings built inside it, all those are being demolished, that is where the bowling alleys will go on one floor, and the ice-skating rink and the cinemas and things on the other and all that will be arched over so one will see the King's Bastion with no buildings in the middle and a sort of dome over the central

courtyard. That is what it will look like. Heritage Trust is content with that but they might have preferred nothing to be done there at all.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The final issue that I wanted to raise in relation to this was the objection by the Ministry of Defence on behalf of the RAF that the Minister alluded to or told the House in his original answer. I think it was that an aeronautical impact study of the height of the main tower on the airfield and the runway was one of the things that the MOD wanted to see. Is that on the list of conditions for the developer to do or has that been disregarded?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

It is on the list of developments that need to be undertaken.

ORAL

NO. 248 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

On what date was the new development plan first submitted to an Environmental Impact Assessment and on what date was the assessment completed?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 224, 232 to 243 and 249 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 249 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Who is producing the Environmental Impact Assessment into the new development plan which was announced by the Minister for Trade and Industry on GBC's Viewpoint programme on 27 January?

**ANSWER**

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

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand over to him.

**Schedule to Question 249**

**Answer to Question 224**

Outline Planning permission has been granted.

**Answer to Question 232**

No planning application has been submitted to date.

**Answer to Question 234**

When the application was submitted in August 2003 the Development and Planning Commission received two letters of objection.

Following submission of the required Environmental Statement (submission dated 21 December 2004) the Development and Planning Commission received a total of 7 letters of objection (including one letter containing 26 signatures).

**Answer to Question 235**

No planning permission has been granted.

**Answer to Question 236**

The promoters of the project made a presentation to various Government officers and the Minister for Trade and Industry at the time to appraise them of the project and to discuss any issues of concern. A similar presentation was made to the Development and Planning Commission on 31 July 2003 to appraise Members of their proposals. The Outline Planning Application was submitted on 21 August 2003.

**Answer to Question 237**

The further information was received on 18 March 2005. The further information was required to clarify certain aspects of the Environmental Statement. The further information caused many topics too numerous to mention but included, for example, information on construction timescales, details of supporting infrastructure, more information on proposed stabilisation works, etc.

**Answer to Question 238**

Correction it is Queensway Wharf Ltd and not Commercial Queensway Wharf Ltd.

Only one representation received against the project.

**Answer to Question 239**

Outline Planning Permission has been granted to Queensway Wharf Ltd.

**Answer to Question 240**

No representations were received regarding this project.

Cont.....

**“Contd” Schedule to Question 249**

**Answer to Question 241**

Outline Planning Permission was granted on the 28 February 2005.

**Answer to Question 242**

Ten representations were received against the application. None were received in favour of the development.

**Answer to Question 243**

Outline Planning Permission has been granted by the Development & Planning Commission, but the relevant permit is now being prepared.

**Answer to Question 248**

Work on the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Development Plan commenced in late September 2004. Following agreement of the scope of the assessment in November/December 2004 the consultants produced a draft Environmental Report in January 2005. Following consideration of this Report amendments to the draft Plan are being made and the consultants will then produce a final Environmental Report in the light of the amendments. The Report will be published simultaneously with the draft Plan.

**Answer to Question 249**

Land Use Consultants of Bristol

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 224, 232, 234 TO 243, 248 AND 249 OF  
2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the Grand Magazine and Rosia development where outline planning permission has been granted, is it possible for the Minister to say whether this has been granted to the development in the form in which the application was made or whether changes have been made to it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Could the hon Member please repeat the question.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 224, outline planning permission has been granted for the development at Rosia and Grand Magazine. Has that been granted in the way in which the application was made or has the application been altered in any way by the DPC?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

These are outline planning and in this case it is an outline planning, and outline planning in the case of a major development like this are normally granted with a number of provisos and requirements. In this case it does have a list of provisos that the developer will need to address in order to be able to submit the final outline or the final application.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I remember correctly when we discussed this at the previous House, the one concern that had been expressed by residents of the area and I believe a petition had also been collected, was due to the actual scale of the project and the height of the project. Does the Minister know whether that has been addressed in one of these points or not?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I cannot recall. I do remember that it was an issue that was discussed by the Commission but I do not believe I can remember what the position was in respect of that.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to Question No. 236, that is the one to do with the funicular project and the preliminary discussions that took place, can I ask the Minister who were the

Government officers who were present at the DTI when this presentation was made in relation to Question No. 236?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Both developers of the funicular have made presentations to a number of Government officers and to the Minister or my predecessor at the Ministry for Trade and Industry. I was actually made a presentation as well as Minister for Tourism so basically it was not just one presentation. This has gone over a period of time where the developers have seen fit to contact various interested parties and make basically presentations to them in order to get some feedback in their respective areas of interest. Obviously, when I had the presentation made as Minister for Tourism, the focus was very much of a new tourist site and what that meant for tourism. I know that there was a presentation made to other Ministers and other Government officials in the Department of the Environment, in Trade and Industry et cetera in order to gauge feedback from some Government officials in different areas of competence.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

In relation to the questions on the Mid-Town project, that is Question Nos. 242 and 243, the answers given were that there were 10 representations against this development and none in favour, and that outline planning permission has been granted. In this particular case can the Minister say, I remember that one of the concerns expressed at the time was the actual scale and height of one of the main towers, would that be altered in any way or will there be a condition placed in relation to the height?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well, the height of this particular building will be subject to an aeronautical study which I think will be the determining factor as to the height of the building. The outline planning in respect of this particular project has been approved subject to a number of conditions by the Development and Planning Commission. Due to the complexity and magnitude the Department is currently going through the relevant process in order to put these as part of the conditions to the actual permit and until that happens the permit is not issued as such but I did not want to mislead the House when answering the Question because the Commission has actually approved it and has stipulated the conditions about the permit not being issued.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

One issue which arises in relation to this particular project is the relocation, presumably by the Government or by the developer I do not know by who, of existing tenants in the area. Is that an issue which has been resolved or agreed by the tenants?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I think the hon Member is probably referring to the nursery that exists in the Fleet Pavillion area, is that correct, which I think is the subject of one other Question on the

order paper? Alternatives, obviously are being considered for this particular nursery but it has not yet been agreed on a place to relocate them.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Moving on now to Question No. 248 which is the Question on the new Development Plan, the answer given by the Minister is that the environmental impact assessment on the plan commenced in late September and a draft environmental report was produced in January 2005. Can the Minister say when it is envisaged that the Development Plan itself will be ready?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I cannot really give a commitment on that. I think the House has to understand that this is being done in-house rather than being out sourced and therefore it is something that the Planning Department is doing amongst a lot of other issues, and particularly in the last few months we have been inundated with projects and applications. One can see by the number of meetings that the Development and Planning Commission have met, we have met 10 times in the last three months, and usually the Commission used to meet about 12 times, once a month. So there has been an exceptional amount of applications coming through. However, we are now almost at the end of the draft which will be put to the Government and to the Development and Planning Commission for consideration before we go out to public consultation but most of work has already been done.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

But I understand that the practice has been to issue these plans every 10 years or so and the last one dates back to 1991. Given the considerable time since the last plan was produced and given the considerable number of developments which the Minister has just alluded to, what I have not heard from him is exactly what time scale is all this envisaged to take place so that the plan can be in place, so that people who then submit developments or are interested in particular areas know exactly what the zoning of Gibraltar is going to be.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely, this Development Plan is long overdue. However, we are hoping that within the next few months the plan will be in place and will have the relevant information available for forward planning in the different areas of Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just ask the Minister whether he has made a declaration to the Development and Planning Commission, which I understand he is now the Chairman of, of the fact that there was a presentation to him in his earlier capacity as Minister for Tourism and is that reflected in the minutes of the relevant meeting of the DPC?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I see no reason why that should be the case. The fact that a presentation was made to me prior to being appointed as Chairman is really irrelevant, in the sense that the Chairman of the then Development and Planning Commission was made presentations as well as were officers of the Government who are members of the Commission themselves. I really do not know whether they were minuted at the time but I definitely did not feel that I had to make any declaration to that effect.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The simple answer is no. The Minister had a presentation made to him in relation to a subject which is now before the Commission which he is now the Chairman of and he has not made a declaration to the Commission of that. That is the simple answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, the simple answer is no he has not and he does not think that one was required. That is the simple answer, if he wants the simple and full answer as opposed to the simple and self-serving distorted answer.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I do not know why it is that the Chief Minister feels it appropriate to say that that is a self-serving spin that I put on the issue, but I certainly believe that it would be in the interests of openness that people who are sitting in a Commission, the Minister and I have long experience of being involved together in a hearing that I am sure neither he nor I would rather remember, in the spirit of openness everybody round the table should know that the Chairman, albeit in another earlier capacity, received information or a presentation in relation to this particular project. Surely that must be the fair theme and to be fair to the Minister he has told the House and therefore it is public, I am simply asking whether he had that reflected in the minutes of the DPC or whether perhaps he will agree to refer it to the DPC next time that they meet and simply make a short declaration like a director might make a declaration of an interest in a project which his company is going to become embarked on. But I see that the Chief Minister is raring to go.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Just for the record let me say that the Government wholly disagree with the hon Member's point. The Minister has no interest in the matter just because he has had a presentation.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order. I have not said that the Minister has an interest, I would not wish that to be on Hansard as being for one moment what I have suggested. I was simply analogising that in company law, as the hon Member is aware, if a director has an interest in a project that a company is undertaking, he simply makes a declaration of interest. Now this is not a case.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

So what is the analogy then?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The analogy is very simple. An individual sitting in a board considering an issue makes a declaration of things which may be relevant. Now, in this instance the relevance is that he has had a presentation made at an earlier date, in another capacity, in respect of which the same information that is put by the proposed developer before the Commission may have been put to him or it may be different information that is being put to him, but I simply rise to make a point of order so that it is not for one moment suggested that I am suggesting that the Minister has an interest. I do not believe he has, if I believed he did I would have said so.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member is learning how to move goal posts himself. Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. The Government do not agree. Ministers sit on the DPC because they are Ministers, to represent the Government with whatever knowledge they have as Ministers of the Government. The suggestion that this is somehow something characteristic that needs to be exceptionalised and recorded, and minuted and declared is a nonsense. That is why they are members of the DPC, to take to the deliberations of the DPC not just considerations of Government policy but indeed also information that they have. This is not a reason for recording, okay he said he does not mean interest, a knowledge, well look if everybody that takes part in a commission has to make a declaration of his knowledge I hope everybody who presumably have a lot of knowledge, they would have to spend a hell of a long time making declarations because if one has to declare everything that one knows about the subject matter that is under discussion, well that is not so. The Government do not share the hon Member's analysis. The Government do not think that Ministers that have presentations made to them in their Ministerial capacity in terms of information provided should then declare to the DPC or anywhere else, or minute it, or declare it orally or in writing, that they have received this representation, that is true of most development projects. Most development projects that go to DPC, the submission of a planning application is the culmination of a process which has for months invariably involved consultation with Government Ministers and Government officials, or is the hon Member suggesting that when previous administrations negotiated the Europort site, the previous Minister for Trade and Industry who was fronting that, went along to DPC when it was time to give planning permission to Europort and said *'hang on chaps, I want you all to know that I was flown by private plane to Denmark by the developers of Europort and of course I know all about it because I have a lot of knowledge because I have had a lot of meetings with them and a lot of presentations'*. That is absurd, that is not how Government works. The hon Member may not know it but I am certain some of his Colleagues next to him do. It would simply convert the DPC into something which he may think it should be but is not and never has been, and that is some sort of tribunal which is wholly independent, almost like a court, that is not what the DPC is. The DPC is a body which is a mixture of internal Government and external Government people and it does not pretend to be, of course it has got an obligation to be fair and to take statutory considerations into account and not to take non-statutory considerations, so it is subject to statutorily established criteria but it does not pretend to be something which is independent of the Government in the sense that there is no overlap,

personnel, clearly there is. Therefore to try and set up, register information and/or interests, and/or knowledge and or presentation or whatever is to pretend that it is something much more independent of the public administration than it actually is in fact. So just as he has recorded at some length what he thinks the position should be, I just wanted to make it quite clear that the Government do not share that analysis, do not think that that should be so and that the party of which he is now a member when it was in Government, did not think so either.

**NO. 250 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GRAND PARADE**

Can Government say whether the proposed construction of an underground car park at Grand Parade is going ahead?

**ANSWER**

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

There is a proposal which the Government are considering for the construction of an underground car park at Grand Parade. Discussions with the potential developers continue. It is not possible at this stage to confirm whether or not the proposal will go ahead.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 250 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The last time I think the question was raised in the House the answer was a similar one, discussions were still continuing. Are those discussions progressing towards a conclusion and are we to expect a conclusion shortly or are we still very far from having an agreement?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the discussions are progressing and at present basically we are at the stage of preparing draft heads of agreement which are currently being negotiated between lawyers.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Similarly to, well kind of parallel with the mid town project, but we loan the car park at the end of the day, has that been decided now? And what will the Government receive in exchange for this development?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I would prefer not to make an announcement on this particular point until the heads of agreement have been signed, but there is a financial consideration being considered and royalty fees being considered after the post development.

ORAL

NO. 251 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**LIND HOUSE**

Can Government state what is the surface area in square metres of the site on which Lind House is situated, including the area occupied by the building?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The total plot area is approximately 2,177 square metres.

ORAL

NO. 252 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**LOQUAT HOUSE**

Can Government state what is the surface area in square metres of the site on which Loquat House is situated, including the area occupied by the building?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The total plot area is approximately 2,072 square metres.

**NO. 253 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**DEVELOPMENT AID**

Can Government confirm that the Development Aid granted to the International Casino for repairs and alterations will be available to be offset against operating profits on completion of the works?

**ANSWER**

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

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 253 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the answer to Question No. 1787 of 2004 which finished up saying 'companies cannot have development aid that is not used up as aid is granted on a tax relief basis on completion of the project' is not quite accurate, is that not the case?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Could the hon Member please repeat the question.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In a previous meeting of the House when I asked about how the development aid was used up and whether if it was not used up it continued to be offsetable against other income streams, the answer given in answer to Question No. 1787 was 'companies cannot have development aid that is not used up as aid is granted on a tax relief basis on completion of a project' and in the list this is one of the areas where tax relief development aid has been granted. That is why I asked specifically about this one because in this case manifestly, repairs does not seem to be a project which has a finite date like building a building and then selling it. So the answer that I was given the last time is obviously not accurate in this instance.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

This is an application by the International Casino for a specific project of improvement with a specific value to be done over a specific time period, and as long as they meet that criteria then they can offset what has been allowed by the Development Aid Committee for this particular project.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Yes, but my question previously Question No. 1787, related to whether when the project was finished the development aid which the company is entitled to take tax free profits continued until it has been exhausted, until it had been used up.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Unused.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, the development aid is not used up as aid is granted on a tax relief basis on completion of the project.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What was the question?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I have got the answer but I have not got the question, but the question in the supplementaries.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

What was paid not used up.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think in the supplementaries to that Question, what the Government argued was that in fact since companies built buildings and then sold them off, even if the profit that they gained did not swallow up the tax relief, there was no way in which the balance could be used against other income. In instances such as the International Casino surely that is not the case. That is to say, if for the sake of a hypothetical example to illustrate it, if the Casino gets development aid of 100 per cent on repairs of £500,000 then presumably they will not start paying tax until their on-going profits on their on-going operations exceed £500,000. Is that not the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well I think that is not the impression that was given in answer to Question No. 1787 of 2004.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think so, I cannot say that I recollect exactly the question or the answer last time so I am on thin ground. The fact is that there cannot be any dispute about this, one submits a project, one gets a certain percentage value of the project allowed for development aid so if the project is £100 and one gets 60 per cent, one gets £60 that one can offset against future profits. Therefore one does not pay any tax on any income until one has made £60 worth of profits. Now, if no profit is made one cannot offset the aid against anything. On the contrary, one is building up offsettable losses carryable forward. I just do not see what the scope could have been for misunderstanding last time, that is simply how development aid works and I am not sure I understand what the hon Member thinks we indicated to him last time that is not consistent with that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think the way the answer was given to me in supplementaries the last time, which was in answer to a series of questions which were Question Nos. 1783 to 1787 of 2004, the thrust of it was that if for example, if Taylor Woodrow builds Queensway Quay the development aid on Queensway Quay can only be used for the profit on Queensway Quay and not the profits of the company.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh I see.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Now if the International Casino repairs the casino, is it not against.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand. In other words, the hon Member interpreted a previous answer to mean that one could only set off the development aid against profits from the asset to which the development aid related. So that if a company had an income stream from some other activity, it was not available to set off against those profits. He is now saying 'hang on, the casino is not a property developer and therefore it is not selling and setting off the development aid against the profits of the sale, it is setting them off against the profits from people playing on its gaming tables'. That is how it works when the development aid is to a company other than a property developer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, but given that there is one piece of legislation that provides for the granting of development aid, is this distinction made in the legislation? When I asked originally.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is quite unusual for there to be development aid for a non.....

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I assumed in my original question to the Government that in fact the answer that I have just been given on the casino is what was in fact the answer that applied to everybody and not the other one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is actually, I do not know if the hon Member knows or can think of any other cases, I am not personally aware, it is quite unusual for development aid to be granted other than in the context of a real estate development. But of course it is available because the Ordinance speaks I think of the economic and social interests of Gibraltar. At the end of the day the Casino has reached a stage which requires a large sum invested in it or it cannot continue, and the Government have to form a view, there are lots of jobs there, a lot of activity and they applied for development aid but it is quite unusual. Of course when it is given to somebody who is going to use the asset not to sell but to do his business in, which might have nothing to do with real estate, it always results in the aid being offsetable against an income stream which has nothing to do with asset sales, with real estate asset sales. So if we gave a different impression in the answer to the previous question, then that was the wrong impression to have given him.

**NO. 254 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government say how often and on what dates the Committee that appraises and scores applications for EU funding has met in 2005?

**ANSWER**

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

The Objective 2 Appraisal Sub-Committee/Small Grant Scheme Committee has met on five occasions during 2005 on the following dates:

1. 21 January 2005
2. 14 February 2005
3. 23 February 2005
4. 1 April 2005
5. 18 April 2005

The Objective 3 Appraisal Sub-Committee has met on one occasion during 2005 on the 23 February 2005.

ORAL

NO. 255 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EU FUNDING**

What is the composition of the Committee that appraises and scores applications for EU funding?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information requested is set out in the schedule attached.

**Schedule to Question 255**

There are 2 Committees that appraise and score applications for EU funding. Their composition is as follows:-

(1) Objective 2 Appraisal Sub-Group/Small Grant Scheme Committee:

Mr James Savignon	-	Chairman, DTI
Mr Jimmy Risso	-	Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce
Mr Ian Torilla	-	Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses
Mr Francis Martin	-	Environmental Agency
Mr Jason Davies	-	Secretary, DTI

(2) Objective 3 Appraisal Sub-Group:

Mr Charles Collinson	-	Chairman, DTI
Mr Jimmy Risso	-	Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce
Mr Ian Torilla	-	Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses
Mrs Giselle Catania	-	Department of Education and Training
Mrs V Gregory	-	Employment Service

**NO. 256 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Have the two parties who were under consideration for the receipt of EU funding in answer to Questions 1794 and 2380 of 2004 now submitted the additional information that was requested, and have these applications been successful or not?

**ANSWER**

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

The additional information requested from the two parties who were under consideration for the receipt of EU funding has not been forthcoming. The current status of these projects is as follows:-

1. SANDWICH BAR

The application is not being proceeded with by the applicants due to the fact that the firm in question closed down. The EU Unit was informed by the applicants that they did not wish to proceed with their application.

2. RISSO BAKERY

A new application is in the process of being submitted due to the fact that the material ownership of the sponsoring company has changed.

**NO. 257 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU FUNDING**

Can Government list the parties that have applied for:

- a) EU funding or
- b) Gibraltar Government funding

since the last Question Time in this House, indicating the amount of funding that was requested and the purpose for which it was intended, listing those applications that have been successful, those that have been unsuccessful, and those applications that are still pending?

**ANSWER**

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

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule attached.

**Schedule to Question 257**

**ESF PROJECTS**

<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>ESF</b>	<b>GOG</b>	<b>Private Sector</b>	<b>Purpose of Project</b>
36	Business Management Programme 8	Department of Education & Training	Still Pending	£41,966 (45%)	£28,353 (30%)	£22,940 (25%)	Training scheme leading to a Post Graduate in Management
37	Vocational Training Scheme 5	Department of Education & Training	Still Pending	£1,757,030 (45%)	£2,147,484 (55%)		Scheme to improve access to the labour market for school leavers & young people (under the age of 25)

Both projects are awaiting approval by the Economic Committee

**Cont...**

**"Contd Schedule to Question 257**

**ERDF PROJECTS**

<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>ERDF</b>	<b>GOG</b>	<b>Purpose of Grant</b>
72	Ministry for the, Environment, Roads & Utilities	Offer Letter withdrawn	£116,000	£116,000	Building & renovation works of permanent Bus Depot.
73	Catering Services Ltd	Approved	£3,755	£3,755	Renovation works, purchase of tables & chairs, & project management fees.
74	J B Engineering Consultants	Approved	£1,956	£1,956	Purchase of equipment, office furniture & Rent Subsidy Scheme
75	A M Capurro & Sons Ltd	Approved	£5,000	£5,000	Building works & purchase of equipment
76	Brugie Ltd T/A Trafalgar Pharmacy	Approved	£12,812	£12,812	Building works, project management fees, Rent & Rates Subsidy Scheme, purchase of clinical equipment & computer hardware & software, payment of Import Duty & marketing/advertising
77	Changes Hairdressing Salon	Approved	£735	£735	Purchase of hairdressing workstation, boiler & installation costs.
78	The Goldfish Bowl Ltd	Approved	£2,277	£2,277	Purchase of I.T & photographic equipment, renovation works, website set-up & advertising & Rent Subsidy Scheme
79	Rock Interactive	Approved	£5,000	£5,000	Rent Subsidy Scheme, building/renovation works, purchase of equipment & marketing
80	Turnbull Enterprise Ltd	Still Pending	£35,000	£35,000	Demolition, rebuilding & fitting out works, electrical works, promotion & set-up costs & the payment of professional services.

**Cont...**

**Contd Schedule to Question 257**

**GIBRALTAR GOVERNMENT FUNDING**

<b>Project No.</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Grant</b>	<b>Loan</b>	<b>Purpose of Funding</b>
70	The Gold Fishbowl Ltd	Approved	£2,500		Set-up of an artistic quality photographic studio
71	The Gibraltar Echo (Publishing) Ltd	Approved		£10,000	Set-up of a new independent daily newspaper
72	M H Bland & Co Ltd	Not Approved	£10,849		Installation of a multimedia audio & visual guide in the Upper Rock
73	Let's Go Ltd	Approved	£7,359		Refurbishment & installation of toilets at site at the entrance of World War II Tunnels

ORAL

NO. 258 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EU FUNDING**

How much EU funding was obtained for the GIBMANATUR project with Morocco under Interreg IIIA and what was the amount?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

A total of £48,500 of EU funding was obtained for the GIBMANATUR project with Morocco under Interreg IIIA.

**NO. 259 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INTERREG IIIB PROGRAMME**

Can Government say whether Gibraltar was directly involved in any of the 74 projects submitted for Interreg IIIB funding at the meeting that took place in Lisbon in March?

**ANSWER**

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

Gibraltar was directly involved in three of the 74 projects submitted for Interreg IIIB funding at the meeting that took place in Lisbon in early March 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 259 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say what these three projects were?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the first project was a project called ADMITRON II which is for the purchase of hardware and software to provide services using infrastructure set up under the Adminton 1 project. The ARQ. S.XX which is a study of modern architecture of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, basically led by the Town Planning Department, and Aqua Control which was led by AquaGib which is the creation of an indicator system common to the whole of the SUDOE area which enables the sustainable and efficient management of the existing hydric resources.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say how much funding was obtained in relation to each of these three projects?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

All three projects have successfully obtained funding. The ADMITRON II has an EU funding of 90,000 Euros. The ARQ. S.XX has 20,000 Euros and the Aqua Control has 49,000 Euros.

ORAL

**NO. 260 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**INTERREG IIIB PROGRAMME**

Can Government say whether Gibraltar was represented at the meeting in Lisbon at the beginning of March of the committee organising the Interreg IIIB initiative for South East Europe?

**ANSWER**

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

Gibraltar was represented at the Interreg IIIB (SUDOE) meeting in Lisbon at the beginning of March 2005 by Mr Douglas Ryan, the Gibraltar Interreg Programme Co-Ordinator.

ORAL

NO. 261 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**E-BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the E-Business Advisory Council met since 7 December 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 262 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 262 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**BUSINESS AND COMMERCE ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Business Advisory Council met since 3 December 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Business and Commerce Advisory Council met once since the 3 December 2004 on the 17 February 2005.

The E-business Advisory Council met once since 7 December 2004 on 3 February 2005.

**NO. 263 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP**

Can Government list the conferences that they have assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored in Gibraltar since 17 November 2004, showing the dates of the conferences in question, the cost, and the department that was most directly involved?

**ANSWER**

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

The Conferences that the Government has assisted with, sponsored or co-sponsored in Gibraltar since 17 November 2004, are as follows:-

1. Wednesday 29 September 2004, Gibraltar Bankers' Association annual conference, Caleta Hotel. James Tipping, Joe Macano and Guy Canessa attended. No cost involved.
2. Tuesday 16 November 2004, Willis Insurance Seminar, Ten Trinity Square (Willis Ltd's London office) – presentation by Finance Centre Director on "EU regulation/Gibraltar business environment". No cost involved except for the Finance Centre Director's transportation and accommodation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 263 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say, there was no cost in relation to the first conference and there was a cost in relation to the second one. Does he have what the cost is?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I am afraid I do not have the information available. There was no cost in respect of the conference but I have not got the information in respect of the Finance Centre Director's transportation and accommodation.

ORAL

**NO. 264 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MINISTER’S OVERSEAS VISITS**

Can the Minister with responsibility for Tourism give the dates when he has been away from Gibraltar on Government business since 10 December 2004 to date, giving the event or function attended, the venue, the city and the country visited?

**ANSWER**

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

Since 10 December 2004 I have been away from Gibraltar on Government business as follows:-

26-27 January 2005 – FITUR – Madrid  
7-8 March 2005 – Brighton Road Show – Brighton.

ORAL

NO. 265 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – NEW YEAR CELEBRATIONS**

Can Government say whether the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates went to the lowest bidder?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 266 and 267 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 266 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – NEW YEAR CELEBRATIONS**

Can Government say whether the successful tenderer for the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates was the tenderer chosen by the Treasury Tender Board?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 265 and 267 of 2005.

**NO. 267 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – NEW YEAR CELEBRATIONS**

Can Government list the parties who submitted a tender for the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates, showing the amount bid by each?

**ANSWER**

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

The tender for the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates did not go to the lowest bidder. As the hon Member knows, Government tenders clearly state that the Government do not commit themselves to accept the lowest tender.

The following parties submitted a tender for the organisation of the New Year celebrations at Casemates:-

Fastrite	£44,750
The Studio	£59,650
Word of Mouth Concert Promoters	£61,100
Andalucian Music Company	£23,700

The tender was not awarded to the bidder recommended by the Treasury Tender Board.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 265 TO 267 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say which bidder was recommended by the Treasury Tender Board?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The recommendation was Fastrite in £44,750.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say why the tender was not awarded to the person they recommended?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The contents of the proposal, in the light of the fact that this was the last event of the Tercentenary, was felt to have been better represented by the proposal put forward by The Studio. I think I have explained this already to the hon Member in this House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Let me just clarify for the hon Member generally not in specific to this tender. It is not the rule that Government tenders are always awarded as recommended by the Treasury Tender Board. It is most unusual for Ministers to displace the judgement of the Treasury Tender Board where the tender is simply a question of money, so all else is equal and it is just a question of who is the cheapest or who offers the best value for money. In other words, where the criteria for determining the winner the public interest is served by simply using money, cost, it is most unusual for Ministers to interfere with the Treasury Tender Board recommendations. But even in those circumstances it is possible to interfere for example, where the lowest tenderer owes a huge amount of Government arrears or has what we regard as a disproportionate level of resident employees. That does happen from time to time, the Government do have policies which are usually known to the Treasury Tender Board and usually they implement it, but even in those circumstances for reasons such as that, Ministers can displace the judgement of the Treasury Tender Board even when the thing just relates to money, unusual but possible. When the tender is for something that has content and is not just money, for example the design of a stamp, or the design of a building, something that is a question of taste or judgement or the content of a musical concert, or the Government puts out a tender for the design of a fountain, at the end of the day Ministers are not going to allow the three Civil Servants that happen to be on the Tender Board to decide what is the design that should go up, and Ministers often and in those circumstances usually the judgement is made by Ministers and not by Treasury Tender Board. So I think it is important because it is very easy to run away with the idea that the Treasury Tender Board's recommendations or decision necessarily always should and is accepted. In most cases, in the vast, vast majority of cases that is the case but there are also quite a lot of cases in which it is not.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

My next supplementary was going to be if the Treasury Tender Board did not allocate the tender then who allocates it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Only Ministers have the authority to accept or not accept the recommendations of the Treasury Tender Board. So there are some tenders which are never looked at by the Treasury Tender Board, so when the tender has a design element, as I expressed before, it does not go to Treasury Tender Board at all, it goes to a committee of relevant Ministers. But there is not any official who can refuse the recommendation of the Treasury Tender Board, it has to be Ministers.

**NO. 268 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – TOURISM WORKSHOPS**

On what date will the Gibraltar Tourist Board be holding tourism workshops in Madrid and Barcelona and on what basis will the Mancomunidad be able to promote its tourism products there?

**ANSWER**

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

In Madrid on 20 April, which has already taken place and in Barcelona on 8 June 2005.

The Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar will have their own exhibition table at these events.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 268 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does the Mancomunidad actually pay anything or contribute anything for having this stand or this table as part of the stand?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, they are being treated like local operators actually are able to do so. In other words, we hire the facility as a Tourist Board and we allow local operators to have their own displays and their own sort of little stands, in order for them to be able to establish commercial contact with operators in Madrid, and they have their own little table as well and stand trying to sell their wares as well.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Do the Government not accept that there is a difference between a local operator exhibiting in a tourism stand and the Mancomunidad exhibiting in a Gibraltar tourism stand, in the sense that the local operator will be attracting business to Gibraltar and to their businesses? Surely the aim of the Mancomunidad presence is to attract business or tourists to go and visit them and stay in their hotels and eat in their restaurants et cetera. Do the Government accept that?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Their focus is very much trying to attract visitors to the region and obviously if they can establish contact with Madrid operators that will actually be able to bring people to the region, it will obviously benefit Gibraltar in the same way as it benefits them. They recognise that Gibraltar is really the magnet in the area to bring visitors down here and therefore they jump on the bandwagon to try and benefit from that. Obviously they will not be doing that on their own but they realise that if they did that on their own, the attraction will be much, much less.

ORAL

NO. 269 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – SUB-COMMITTEE ON TOURISM**

Can Government list the members of the sub-committee on tourism that has been created with the Mancomunidad?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr Peter Canessa and Mr Nicky Guerrero representing the Gibraltar Tourist Board, and Inmaculada Ruiz and Myriam Jimenez representing the Mancomunidad de Municipios.

ORAL

**NO. 270 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – INFORMATION PATROL OFFICERS**

How many persons applied for the posts of Seasonal Temporary Visitor Information Patrol Officers that were advertised on 31 March 2005 and how many posts were vacant?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 272 and 274 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 271 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**GTB – BEACH FACILITIES**

Can Government confirm that full facilities will be available at all beaches for the official bathing season?

**ANSWER**

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

Yes.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 271 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

Will the Minister please note that I was recently approached by a resident of Both Worlds who complained to me about the amount of rubbish at Sandy Bay last weekend, could he have the matter investigated and take whatever remedial action he considers pertinent?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I will look into it.

ORAL

NO. 272 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – BEACH LIFEGUARDS**

How many persons applied for the posts of Beach Lifeguard that were advertised on 31 March 2005 and how many posts were vacant?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question Nos. 270 and 274 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 273 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – MARKETING CO-ORDINATOR**

How did the vacancy which was advertised for the post of Marketing Co-ordinator in the Gibraltar office in Madrid come about?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The holder of the post resigned and moved to Greece to further her career.

**NO. 274 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING CO-ORDINATOR**

How many persons applied for the post of Marketing Co-ordinator at the Gibraltar Office in Madrid that was advertised in March and has anyone been selected for the post?

**ANSWER**

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

**Answer to Question No. 270**

There are 12 vacancies for Temporary Seasonal Visitor Information Patrol Officers, and 58 persons applied. The successful candidates will be taking up employment on 4 July 2005. Selection will not take place until the first week in June.

**Answer to Question No. 272**

There were 44 persons that applied for the Lifeguard vacancies and there are 28 vacancies for this post. The successful candidates will not be taking up employment until the commencement of the Summer Bathing Season on the 11 June 2005. Selection will not take place until the last week in May.

**Answer to Question No. 274**

Six persons applied for the post of Marketing Co-ordinator at the Gibraltar Office in Madrid. Five persons were short-listed for interview, one person withdrew the application, no one was found suitable and the vacancy will be re-advertised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 270, 272 AND 274 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible to say why it was that of the five who were short-listed nobody was found suitable for this job?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe that none of the candidates had the suitable marketing experience or qualification for that matter to take up the post. Therefore the Board decided not to nominate any of the applicants.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The actual advert which invited the applicants who were interested in this post mentions a degree in marketing and experience in the field of tourism and/or marketing, is it that nobody had any of those qualifications at all? If they did not, why were they short-listed in the first place?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I am not aware of the details to be honest. The only thing that I know is that of the four that were finally interviewed, none of them were found to be suitable. Whether they actually had the qualifications I would assume they have if they were short-listed but I assume that they did not feel that they had the relevant experience in tourism for that matter.

**HON DR J J GARCIA**

Can the Minister say whether these were actually Gibraltar people resident in Gibraltar or whether the people who applied were resident in Madrid or somewhere else?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I believe three of them were local, four of them were local but three of them were resident in Gibraltar and I believe one of them was already resident in Madrid.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Was the person resident in Madrid, was this somebody else employed by the Government in that same office in Madrid or was it someone else?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No.

**ORAL**

**NO. 275 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government say how much revenue has been raised on a monthly basis from December 2004 inclusive:

- a) by charging coaches that use the coach park;
- b) in admission fees to the Upper Rock;
- c) in admissions to the Gibraltar Museum?

**ANSWER**

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

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule attached.

**Schedule to Question 275**

The revenue raised on a monthly basis from December 2004 inclusive is as follows:-

(a) Coach Park

	<b>£</b>
<b>December 2004</b>	4,480.00
<b>January 2005</b>	3,500.00
<b>February 2005</b>	5,020.00
<b>March 2005</b>	7,130.00

(b) Upper Rock

	<b>£</b>
<b>December 2004</b>	88,470.85
<b>January 2005</b>	86,226.50
<b>February 2005</b>	96,982.10
<b>March 2005</b>	157,720.75

(c) Gibraltar Museum

	<b>£</b>
<b>December 2004</b>	668.60
<b>January 2005</b>	1,041.20
<b>February 2005</b>	1,079.52
<b>March 2005</b>	1,886.87

**NO. 276 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Can Government say how many interviews have been carried out with persons who said:

- a) that they had not stayed at a hotel;
- b) that they had stayed at a hotel;

since November 2004 inclusive, on a monthly basis, stating where they were interviewed and the number interviewed at each location and in the case of those who stayed in hotels what was the average length of stay in each case?

**ANSWER**

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

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand over to him.

**Schedule to Question 276**

**Place of Interview  
Interviews Not Stayed at Hotel**

	Total Interviews Not Stayed at Hotel	Airport	Port	Frontier	Waterport	Marina	Coach Park
Nov 04	1,506	44	1	1,286	-	8	167
Dec 04	1,496	29	1	1,317	1	-	148
Jan 05	1,495	11	1	1,365	-	3	115

**Place of Interview  
Number of Interviews Stayed at Hotel**

	Total No of Interviews	Stayed at Hotel	Airport	Average Length of Stay	Frontier	Average Length of Stay	Elsewhere	Average Length of Stay
Nov 04	1,524	18	16	5.8	2	3.2	-	-
Dec 04	1,506	10	9	4.9	1	1.0	-	-
Jan 05	1,507	12	12	6.4	-	-	-	-

The figures for February and March 2005 will be available shortly.

**NO. 277 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – HOTEL ASSISTANCE SCHEME**

Can Government say what amounts are due and owing to Government in respect of loans under the Hotel Assistance Scheme, listing the hotels in question and the amounts repaid as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

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

There are no amounts due and owing to Government in respect of loans issued under the Hotel Assistance Scheme as at 31 March 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 277 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is that because the loans have been repaid in full or because the Government have decided to reschedule the amounts, for what reason?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Government early this year considered the possibility of reaching an agreement with a local bank in order to take over these loans from the Government. An agreement was reached and these loans were repaid to Government in full. However, there was a difference between the interest being paid by the hotels to the Government which was based at base rate and those that were agreed with the local bank at 0.75 per cent, and the Government decided that they would pay the difference in that interest over the period of the loan over the amount left and the Government was paid in full for the loans that were owing by the local hoteliers. The interest difference resulted from the amount owed to us by the hotel.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister firstly what bank it was, and secondly how much this differential in terms of the rate of interest that hotels are now paying which the Government have paid, what does that come to in pounds and pence?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

The bank involved was Barclays Bank plc, and the difference that we are talking about was £85,862.94.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not sure the hon Member has got the gist of that. The other sum that was due was £2. something million or £3. something million was due but it was due by people who had an agreement that had some time left to go and they were paying interest rate at base. We invited them to refinance themselves so that the capital would be released to the Government to be reinvested, but of course we had to somehow compensate them for the fact that they had to go and finance themselves at a higher rate. That differential in interest rate was capitalised, in other words, the net present value of that payment was capitalised and that capitalised sum was deducted from the amount of capital that they were obliged to repay, resulting in a capital discount of £80 odd thousand. See what I mean, but it is a capitalised value of the forward interest rate differential. So the amount of capital repaid was the amount of capital outstanding on the loans minus this sum to reflect the net present value of the increased interest rates that they had to pay the bank over and above what they were paying the Government.

ORAL

NO. 278 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – TOURISM ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Tourism Advisory Council met since 26 November 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Tourism Advisory Council has met once since 26 November 2004, on the 24<sup>th</sup> February 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 279 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – MARKETING, PROMOTIONS AND CONFERENCES**

How much of the 2004/2005 £980,000 Tourism budget for Marketing, Promotions and Conferences has been spent as at 31 March 2005, giving a breakdown of the expenditure in question?

**ANSWER**

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

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

Schedule to Question 279

<b>Marketing, Promotions &amp; Advertising</b>	<b>£</b>
Literature	91,532.77
Activity (Trade)	21,275.09
Activity (Media)	15,848.01
Promotional Material	3,610.41
Advertising	346,818.91
Trade Fairs	39,444.04
Website	7,537.81
Recurrent Expenditure	127,067.98
Activity (Media)	6,872.85
Events	204,562.05
Contingencies	40,689.31
Trade Consumer Fairs	36,927.41
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>942,186.64</b>

**NO. 280 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – IBERRAIL**

Have there been any results from the discussions between the Government and Iberrail for the development of rail packages to Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

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

Yes. Iberrail has included Gibraltar in their package.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 280 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister, obviously the question was submitted to the House before the Government release had come out, when the tourists arrive at Algeciras from Ciudad Real or from Madrid, what is the procedure to bring them from Algeciras to Gibraltar and is that included as part of the rates that they pay?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

They have to make their own way from Algeciras to Gibraltar. Alternatively, as part of an option on the package, they are able to obtain car rental within the package which then means that they have a car available during their period here.

ORAL

**NO. 281 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – CANCELLED FLIGHTS**

How many flights between Gibraltar and the following airports were timetabled and how many were cancelled on a monthly basis to or from:

- a) London Gatwick;
- b) London Heathrow;
- c) London Luton;
- d) Manchester;

since December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

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

The information sought by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule which I hand over.

**Schedule to Question 281**(a) Flights from/to London Gatwick

Month	Scheduled	Cancelled
December 2004	From 52 To 52	Cancelled 8 Cancelled 8
January 2005	From 39 To 39	Cancelled 1 Cancelled 1
February 2005	From 27 To 27	Cancelled 3 Cancelled 1
March 2005	From 31 To 31	

(b) Flights from/to London Heathrow

Month	Scheduled	Cancelled
December 2004	From 0 To 0	
January 2005	From 21 To 21	Cancelled 1 Cancelled 1
February 2005	From 25 To 25	Cancelled 3 Cancelled 3
March 2005	From 31 To 31	

(c) Flights from/to London Luton

Month	Scheduled	Cancelled
December 2004	From 23 To 23	
January 2005	From 22 To 22	
February 2005	From 20 To 20	
March 2005	From 22 To 22	

(d) Flights from/to Manchester

Month	Scheduled	Cancelled
December 2004	From 16 To 16	Cancelled 2 Cancelled 2
January 2005	From 15 To 15	Cancelled 3 Cancelled 3
February 2005	From 16 To 16	
March 2005	From 17 To 17	

**NO. 282 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FLIGHT PLANS**

Can Government say whether any Gibraltar-bound flight has:

- a) been diverted to a Spanish airport;
- b) been allowed to enter a Spanish airport as an alternative when filing its flight plan;

since 3 December 2004, and if so on what dates did this happen?

**ANSWER**

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

Eight flights have been diverted to a Spanish airport on the following dates:

9<sup>th</sup> February 2005 – 1 flight  
27<sup>th</sup> February 2005 – 2 flights  
28<sup>th</sup> February 2005 – 4 flights  
1<sup>st</sup> March 2005 – 1 flight.

Since 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2004, every single flight from a UK airport to Gibraltar enters Malaga as its diversion airport when filing their flight plan.

**NO. 283 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – AIRLINES**

Can Government say with how many airlines interested in flying to Gibraltar it is in discussion with at present?

**ANSWER**

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

Two.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 283 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government able to give the names of those airlines?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Considering that there have been some reports in the press of late, EasyJet and Thomson Flying.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister will recall the number of times I have requested the names of airlines across the floor of this House to be told that this is commercially sensitive and this information cannot be disclosed to the Opposition or indeed in public, so imagine the surprise when the names of these two airlines were disclosed at a tourist event in Madrid. Can the Minister say whether this is a new policy on the part of the Government and now whenever we ask the names of airlines these will now be disclosed to the Opposition?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

There had not been a change of policy, what actually happened was that a member of staff in the Madrid office was speaking to somebody in the local office and somebody overheard the conversation that happened to be a journalist that

subsequently published it. That was picked up by the local media and reported locally. That was unfortunate.

**NO. 284 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – AIR TERMINAL**

What procedures are in place to provide electricity power back-up at the Air Terminal in the event of a power cut?

**ANSWER**

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

There are none at present, Government are currently considering various options to address the situation.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 284 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is the Minister therefore saying that when there is a power cut in the evening or when the night flight is expected or has arrived, passengers are actually in the air terminal in pitch dark, in complete darkness?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, we may have that sort of situation, in fact it has happened of late on a couple of occasions. We are looking at ways to remedy this now.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it the case that this emergency power back up or emergency lighting has actually never existed at the air terminal, or has it been in place before and been withdrawn?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No there has never been emergency lighting at the terminal. It is something that I believe should be addressed and will be addressed.

**NO. 285 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FITUR**

How many Spanish operators met with the GTB during FITUR this year to progress discussions on the development of Gibraltar holiday packages and who were they?

**ANSWER**

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

The GTB met with Iberrail to progress discussions on their Gibraltar holiday packages.

New contacts were made with the following entities:-

Barcelo Viajes  
Viajes Iberia  
Livingstur

In addition, most of the agents and operators that visit the Gibraltar Stand at FITUR speak to Gibraltar operators and do business with them directly and therefore not the function of the Tourist Board as such.

ORAL

NO. 286 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – FITUR**

What was the cost of the dinner hosted by the Minister responsible for Tourism for a number of Spanish travel journalists on the eve of FITUR in Madrid, how many journalists attended and what media did they represent?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

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

**Schedule to Question 286**

The cost of the dinner was £1,404.72.

**Fitur Dinner 2005 - Journalists**

P Dalmases	Radio Nacional de Espana
M Melchi	Mas Viajes Magazine
M F Fernandez	Turismo Aereo Y Transporte Magazine
V Rodrigo	Airclasse Magazine
J L Gonzalez Salgado	Convenciones Y Incentivos Magazine
Angel Mas	Diario Metro Magazine
M Tello	Hosteltur Magazine
M Moran	IH Magazines
A Olea	Lunas de Miel Magazine
M V de Rojas	Ejecutivos Magazine
M Rinon	Escapada Magazine
N Ros	Editur Magazine
C Arregui	Viajeros Magazine
E Villar	Canal Viajar
R Navarro	Canal Viajar
A Santa Cruz	Turismo Y Aventura Magazine
M Cascajares	La Vanguardia
J L Yague	La Tribuna
A Florez	Turismo Aereo Y Transporte Magazine
M Ramos	Aviacion Y Turismo Magazine
J De Lucas	The Tourist Magazine
A Falco	Periodico de Catalunya
E Garcia	Hoteles de Espana & Del Mundo Magazine

**NO. 287 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FITUR**

Can Government say how many persons formed part of the official Gibraltar delegation to FITUR and indicate what posts they hold?

**ANSWER**

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

Mr Peter Canessa, Chief Executive, Gibraltar Tourist Board and myself visited FITUR on the 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> January.

The delegation composed of:

Mr Nicky Guerrero	-	Sales and Marketing Manager
Mr Dylan Ferrer	-	Sales and Marketing Co-ordinator
Ms Gloria Macedo	-	Sales and Marketing Assistant
Ms Denise Devincenzi	-	Sales and Marketing – Madrid Office
Ms Gillaine de los Santos	-	Sales and Marketing – Madrid Office

ORAL

NO. 288 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – FITUR**

What was the cost with a breakdown of Gibraltar's participation in FITUR from 26-30 January 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

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

**Schedule to Question 288**

	<u>£</u>
Travel Expenses	940.91
Air Passage	842.80
Photo and Video	500.83
Stand	15,670.44
Literature Transport	247.90
Overtime	997.29
Subsistence	2,492.75
Posters	480.00
Accommodation	600.10
Giveaways	2,347.90
Miscellaneous	317.96
	-----
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>£25,438.88</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 288 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister clarify, does the £2,492 for subsistence include the £1,400 of the dinner for journalists or is that shown somewhere else?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, that is a separate cost this is not included in the FITUR analysis that I have just handed over to him. Subsistence is basically subsistence to staff.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Would it be correct then to say that the total cost of FITUR would have been the £25,438 plus £1,400 for the journalists?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct although the dinner is coincidental on FITUR and not part of FITUR.

**NO. 289 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – FITUR**

Can Government confirm whether the Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar made use jointly of the Gibraltar Government stand at FITUR this year, and if so tell the House exactly what that entailed?

**ANSWER**

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

The Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar did not jointly use the GTB stand at FITUR. Representatives from the Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar visited the stand and Mancomunidad de Municipios del Campo de Gibraltar literature was displayed at the stand.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 289 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether the Mancomunidad had their own stand and that is why there was nobody in the Gibraltar stand, and did they include their exhibition literature on other stands as well or only on the Gibraltar one?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Mancomunidad had their own stand in which the different municipalities had their own sort of desk. The Municipio had their own literature on our stand but they did not have a stand on their own as such.

**NO. 290 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – UKGTA**

What was the cost with a breakdown of holding the UKGTA meeting in Gibraltar in January 2005?

**ANSWER**

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

The cost of holding the UKGTA meeting in Gibraltar in January 2005 is as follows:-

Air fare for Mr Ian Lomas, Cresta	£41.16
Airport taxes for 5 people	£95.40
London Office staff expenses	£68.40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£240.96</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 290 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

I am not sure I heard the Minister correctly, the air fare was £41.16 in relation to one person, is that right?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That was correct. I do not know why that air ticket has actually been paid, I have not been able to follow that up but it is normal for the airlines to offer free passages to members. When we have the UKGTA meetings in the UK, which is at least three times a year, we all travel to the UK free of charge and we pay for our hotel accommodation with those coming in this direction enjoying the same privilege of flights and I believe even hotels.

**NO. 291 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – SMALL POCKET CALENDARS**

Can Government say whether the Gibraltar Tourist Board has published small pocket calendars and if so at what cost and where were they printed?

**ANSWER**

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

Yes, they were printed by Analgo in Spain at a cost of £870.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 291 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say whether this was a competitive tender and they happened to be the cheapest or what was the decision?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, I think one has to understand that we cannot go out to tender in a place like Madrid for example, for £870, nobody would respond to this. What they do is that they seek at least three quotes from different entities in order to make sure that we get value for money and then select a tender. The value of this sort of work is not worth the bother.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister confirm that the distribution of these calendars is actually in Madrid, or in Spain or where exactly are they being distributed?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

These calendars are given to the trade when for example, our Marketing Manager visits travel agents or operators or whatever, she carries bags full of them and gives them around with the hope that they will stick them on to their computer and have a reminder of Gibraltar and our telephone numbers et cetera.

ORAL

NO. 292 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – MISS GIBRALTAR**

Can Government say whether the tender award of £19,750 to Stage One Productions for the Organisation, Production and Staging of the Miss Gibraltar 2005 contest was the highest bid of the three received?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

No, it was the lowest bid of the three received.

ORAL

NO. 293 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**MARITIME MUSEUM**

Can Government say whether they have been approached to help set up a maritime museum in Gibraltar and can they say what locations are envisaged for this project?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The Government have not been approached with any formal proposal.

**NO. 294 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – DUTY FREE SALES**

What is the procedure currently in place for Main Street businesses who wish to make duty free sales to clients coming into Gibraltar overland and leaving across the border?

**ANSWER**

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

Duty Free Sales can only be made by those businesses that hold a Private Bonded Store (PBS).

The procedure currently in place is that the client makes the purchase, the Private Bonded Stores Operator prepares an export declaration and accompanies the client to Customs Station at Four Corners where the goods are checked, the declaration signed and the export supervised.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 294 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The reason for tabling the question was representations made by some traders in relation to the actual process being rather cumbersome and that it involves the trader going with the client to the Customs with the goods and I am then not quite sure how the duty free side of it works, but their complaint was that many clients were reluctant to do this and felt almost as if they were doing something weird or wrong by going.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is the traders who are policing not the clients.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government satisfied with the way in which this procedure is working?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, remember it is a very unique procedure. It is not normal anywhere in the world for there to be any duty free facility on the high street over a land frontier. I mean there is a procedure for a refund, as many Gibraltarians do when they are exiting Spain, one can get paperwork, get a refund and eventually it would be possible I suppose to mount a system like that but it would be quite cumbersome really and require a huge amount of paperwork and administration. So, short of some self-policing system, which I think would be open to potential and easy abuse by people, this is the only way that the administration has thought of of enabling the facility to exist without there being a huge risk to the integrity of the duty system. If it can be refined somehow in a way that still does not make it easier to abuse, the Government would consider it.

ORAL

NO. 295 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – ROADSHOW IN BRIGHTON**

What was the cost of the dinner hosted for selected guests at the GTB roadshow in Brighton in March, and can Government list those who attended?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand over to him.

**Schedule to Question 295**

The cost of the dinner including the room hire was £6,780.11.

**Attendees at the GTB Brighton Roadshow**

NAME	SURNAME	TRAVEL AGENT
Susanne	Grinstead	Adur Travel
Alison	Kelsey	Adur Travel
Mia	Pooley	Adur Travel
Laura	Caley	American Express Europe Ltd
Lorna	Hills	American Express Europe Ltd
Dawn	Steele	American Express Europe Ltd
Jeni	Stevens	American Express Europe Ltd
Laura	Taylor	American Express Europe Ltd
Tracey	Wainwright	American Express Europe Ltd
Jonathan	Gayle	American Express Europe Ltd
Candy	Homewood	American Express Europe Ltd
Samantha	Ingle	American Express Europe Ltd
Samantha	Eden	American Express Europe Ltd
Judith	Faulds	American Express Europe Ltd
Keith	Gough	American Express Europe Ltd
Ian	Warwick	American Express Europe Ltd
Carole	Stanton	Aossa Travel
Jane	Bounds	Aossa Travel
Zusanna	Gombarova	Aossa Travel
Mrs A	Reed	Bargain Travel Bureau Ltd
Gary	Willis	Bargain Travel Bureau Ltd
Jason	Donald	Bargain Travel Bureau Ltd
Roger	Mallock	Bath Travel
Karen	Heath	Beacon Travel Service
Sarah	Keel	Beacon Travel Service
Sheila	Williams	Beacon Travel Service
Catherine	Cooper	Chillout Events Ltd
Jack	Cooper	Chillout Events Ltd
David	Drew	Chillout Events Ltd
Patricia	Redmann	Chillout Events Ltd
Jospeh	Leonard	Cruising in Style Travel
Kevin	Moran	Cruising in Style Travel
Lawrence	Patterson	Cruising in Style Travel
Jane	Hollobone	Eclipse Travel Office
Julie	Humphries	Eclipse Travel Office
Claire	Johnson	Eclipse Travel Office
Laura	Alpon	First Choice Travel Shop
Karen	Audhley	First Choice Travel Shop
Louise	Cooper	First Choice Travel Shop
Dawna	Smith	First Choice Travel Shop
Claire	Wallis	First Choice Travel Shop
Cherie	Dooley	First Choice Travel Shop
Rebecca	Gibbons	First Choice Travel Shop
Hannah	Paino	First Choice Travel Shop

Cont...

**“Contd” Schedule to Question 295**

Tracey	Weller	First Choice Travel Shop
Jess	Combe	Flight Centre (UK) Ltd
Ana	Dunham	Flight Centre (UK) Ltd
Pauline	Sayer	Global Travel (Worthing)
David	Sayer	Global Travel (Worthing)
Sharon	Smith	Global Travel (Worthing)
Ian	Carr	Haywards Travel Ltd
Janice	Chapman	Haywards Travel Ltd
Shereen	Haylock	Haywards Travel Ltd
Vicky	Morten	Haywards Travel Ltd
Lisa	Radkin	Haywards Travel Ltd
Jacqueline	Bardsley	Holiday Shop
Louise	Gregory	Holiday Shop
Marcella	Miron	Holiday Shop
Tracy	Warren	Holiday Shop
Sandra	Bachram	John Proctor Travel
Sharon	Hollingsdale	John Proctor Travel
Julia	Lauren	John Proctor Travel
Zoe	Lower	John Proctor Travel
Sharon	Morgan	John Proctor Travel
Nicky	Bicknell	La Manga by Design Ltd
Zoe	Boniface	La Manga by Design Ltd
Elaine	Kerr	La Manga by Design Ltd
Joe	Ball	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Ian	Butters	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Lutz	Ehrich	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Robert	Phillips	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Tony	Prcas	Madison Travel Worldchoice
Michelle	Potter	Meon Valley Travel
Jill	Tibbets	Meon Valley Travel
Ben	Cook	Panorama Holiday Group Ltd
Karla	Earp	Panorama Holiday Group Ltd
John	Farrugia	Panorama Holiday Group Ltd
Paul	Andrews	Personal Service Travel
Vivien	Leigh	Personal Service Travel
Mark	Thorogood	Personal Service Travel
Yvonne	Evenden	Personal Service Travel
Gay	Hawgood	Personal Service Travel
Geraldine	Noatshlo	Personal Service Travel
Pat	Arrowsmith	Personal Service Travel
Paul	Hopwood	Personal Service Travel
Angela	Merrick	Personal Service Travel
G	Bell	Rutherfords Travel
S	Bell	Rutherfords Travel
Trevor	Bones	Southern Cross Travel
Penny	Tedham	Southern Cross Travel
Melanie	Krolick	STS Schools Travel
Leanne	Ramsden	STS Schools Travel
Ilaria	Sassi	STS Schools Travel
Marie	Appleton	Thomas Cook Ltd
Sarah	King	Thomas Cook Ltd

Cont.....

**“Contd” Schedule to Question 295**

Chris	Reid	Thomas Cook Ltd
Nicola	Tinnuche	Thomas Cook Ltd
Annemarie	Boyd	Thomas Cook Ltd
Scarlett	Chocker	Thomas Cook Ltd
Debbie	Lewis	Thomas Cook Ltd
Karen	Richardson	Thomas Cook Ltd
Gemma	Shepard	Thomas Cook Ltd
Nigel	Simon	Thomas Cook Ltd
Janet	Walsh	Thomas Cook Ltd
Lara	Harris	Thomas Cook Ltd
Karen	Speirs	Thomas Cook Ltd
Amy	Baines	Thomas Cook Ltd
Francesca	Baulding	Thomas Cook Ltd
Janette	Romaniuk	Thomas Cook Ltd
Rebecca	Thrift	Thomas Cook Ltd
Kerry	Arnold	Thomson Retail
Corry	Cluch	Thomson Retail
Leanne	Grant	Thomson Retail
Michelle	Hurtham	Thomson Retail
Louise	Roberts	Thomson Retail
Joe	Seynan	Thomson Retail
Angie	Smith	Thomson Retail
Sophie	Dean	Thomson Retail
Lian	Oliver	Thomson Retail
Naomi	Starbrown	Thomson Retail
Carla		Thomson Retail
Donna		Thomson Retail
Lynn		Thomson Retail
Karen	Burt	Thomson Retail
Caroline	Finbow	Thomson Retail
Caroline	Ratray	Thomson Retail
Christine	Dobson	Touchdown
Alan	Forbes	Touchdown
Sharon	Jones	Touchdown
Janet	Sherwood	Touchdown
Natasha	Steele	Touchdown
Karen	Uden	Touchdown
Lilly	Waite	Touchdown
Joanna	Farr	Travel Counselers/Home Workers
Sue	Verall	Travel Counselers/Home Workers
Julie	Burton	Travelcare
Stephanie	Dyer	Travelcare
Chris	Hurcombe	Travelcare
Trevor	Ridler	Travelcare
Rosa	Flores	Travelcare
Charlotte	Hanbin	Travelcare
Julia	Smith	Travelcare
Donna	Sullivan	Travelcare
Shirley	Waters	Travelcare
Nicola	Charles	Worldhoppers Ltd

Cont...

**"Contd" Schedule to Question 295**

Charlotte	Emerton	Worldhoppers Ltd
Holly	Goulson	Worldhoppers Ltd
Shirley	Martin	Worldhoppers Ltd
Kelly	Ruthven	Worldhoppers Ltd

ORAL

NO. 296 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**GTB – ROADSHOW IN BRIGHTON**

How many of the over 150 travel agents and representatives of the UK media accepted the invitation to the GTB roadshow in Brighton and actually attended?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

A total of 150 travel agents and representatives of the UK media attended the Brighton Roadshow.

**ORAL**

**NO. 297 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**GTB – ROADSHOW IN BRIGHTON**

What was the cost with a breakdown of the GTB roadshow in Brighton in March 2005?

**ANSWER**

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

The information requested by the hon Member is set out in the written schedule that I hand over to him.

Schedule to Question 297

Breakdown of the GTB Roadshow in Brighton in March 2005

	£
200 invitations printed	446.50
145 dinner menus	5,957.61
5 sandwich lunches	27.91
Room hire	822.50
Hotel accommodation	814.18
Photocopying	74.41
London Office staff expenses	41.20
150 silver plated key rings	1,099.50
Print and fill 15x6 helium balloons	234.00
Visual and sound system	1,307.19
Invitations	446.60
Accommodation and expenses for Minister	237.43
Travel/flights/travel for GTB staff	382.10
GTB staff expenses	117.96
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,009.11</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 297 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The answer handed to me by the Minister says that there were 145 dinner menus and that this cost nearly £6,000 which works out at about £41 per person. Can I ask the Minister what the menu was?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Well at £41 not very much. No we are talking about a buffet dinner where there was a spread of different options and when inviting such a cross section of people one has to take care for vegetarians and people who do not eat certain foods et cetera so that is what they got.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can I ask the Minister where it was?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

In the hotel where we had the presentation, I am not sure which hotel it was. I arrived there at night and got out very early in the morning, one of the seafront hotels in Brighton where they have the party conferences, I think it was the Metropole.

**NO. 298 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – BONDED STORES**

Can Government say how and on what date the Gibraltar Chamber of Commerce and the Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses were consulted in its review of bonded stores facilities?

**ANSWER**

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

Issues relating to bonded stores have been discussed at meetings of the Business Advisory Council and e-Business Advisory Council at which persons who belong to the Chamber of Commerce and the Federation of Small Businesses have been present. Although their membership of these Councils is in a personal capacity, they are nevertheless able to reflect the views of both of these trade organisations.

There have been no formal discussions on the matter with either the Chamber or the Federation with me as yet. However, I understand that discussions were held with my predecessor.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 298 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister will recall that we had some correspondence on the question of bonded stores in that those traders who do not have one and who want one feel aggrieved because the whole process has been frozen for some time and no new licences or whatever have been issued. In his letter to me which was an open letter and was not confidential or anything, the Minister refers that as part of the review there has been full consultation with the Chamber of Commerce and the Gibraltar Federation of Small Businesses, is it that there has not been any formal consultation with either of those two?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the Government have consulted the Chamber and the Federation but it was done by my predecessor not by myself. I have taken over the process which entails the possible changes and options that are open to us in this respect so consultation has taken place but not with me, that is why I say in my answer that I understand that discussions were held with my predecessor and I have taken those on board. These

views have been updated by members who actually sit on these Councils where the issue of bonded stores have been discussed openly with the various members and their views have been taken on board as an update of what was said at the time.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Minister has said that this obviously were issues which his predecessor had raised with the Chamber and with the FSB and in our own correspondence I was led to understand that the existing review is expected to take a further six months, can the Minister say how long this has been going on for, and for how long have no new facilities been made available?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

I would say that possibly for at least nine months before the last General Election, this topic was already on the radar screen for discussion with the Chamber and the Federation by my predecessor and it was an issue that has been brought forward for me to deal with.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The issue that arises here is obviously the question of unfair competition, the traders who do not have it feel that those traders who do have an edge over them and whilst this review goes on, the situation is obviously one where they feel they are losing out. Can the Minister give a clearer indication as to when he expects this review to be finalised so that new licences or new facilities can be made available to traders who may want it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member should not assume that the conclusion of the review will result in new licences being issuable. The results of the review may be the opposite.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Does that mean revoking existing licences from those who have them or does it mean freezing things where they are? Obviously the review can have several conclusions at this stage.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

One does not need a review just to carry on operating the same system and issuing more licences on the same basis.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

No but given that it has been going on for so long perhaps could the Government add some urgency to their review and come to a conclusion so that traders know where they are?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the review as to the conditions that should apply or is the review as to whether more people should enjoy the benefits of the system?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

It is a review about the extent to which the present system is capable of causing loss of revenue for the Government, about whether the risks of that outweigh or are outweighed by the benefits to trade, that sort of thing. Remember this is in effect self-policing, because although theoretically Customs do audits, at the end of the day these are not bonded stores like the good old days in Queens Stores, this is in the back of ones shop on Main Street, one has a pile of bottles of this or boxes of that and at the end of the day it is really a self-policing system. It is open to abuse because frankly the Government do not devote the resources to policing it that it would have to devote to it in order to, so we are reviewing which is not to say that the review is going to conclude one thing or the other but that is the nature of the review, once and for all to have a look at this to see what are the benefits to trade and do those benefits justify the dangers in the system.

ORAL

NO. 299 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT – SECURITY**

Following increased security measures at the Port, can Government say what documents are required to be produced by non-resident anglers who want to fish from the North Mole?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 300 of 2005.

**NO. 300 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SECURITY**

Following increased security measures at the Port, can Government say what documents are required to be produced by Gibraltar anglers who want to fish from the North Mole?

**ANSWER**

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

The documents required to be produced by both Gibraltar and non-resident anglers who want to fish from the North Mole are Passport, Identity Card or Driving Licence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 299 AND 300 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government satisfied as to the security of the present arrangements?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes they are satisfied and complies with ISPS requirements.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government confirm whether this is the position, if somebody wants access to the North Mole and they produce an ID card they will be let through on the basis that they are an angler and presumably they have angling equipment with them or a fishing rod or whatever, whereas if one does not have the fishing rod then one cannot have access to the North Mole, is that the position?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

That is correct.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

At what point does somebody check whether the person who has gone into North Mole with a fishing rod is actually fishing or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, there is a serious issue here and that is that the present system works well to a point in the sense that we could have a system of licensing, and indeed there are those in Government who would prefer a system of licensing as one would require in other countries. Spain, for example, requires to have a licence, they are quite easy to get one buys these fishing licences I think in banks and post offices and all sorts of places but one still needs a licence to go and we, it is just not in our culture. Can the hon Member just imagine when his child has grown up that he suddenly decides that 'daddy can you take me fishing this sunny Saturday afternoon?', can he just imagine saying to him 'I am sorry Johnny I cannot because I have not got a licence', it is just not in our culture to require people to have to get a licence to go and throw a line off the edge of the North Mole to sort of fish. If we go down the licensing route, which there are organisations in Gibraltar urging us to do that, it is actually quite curtailing of the spontaneous leisure activity that parents may want to do with their children, not having a licence and all of a sudden finding that one cannot just decide on the spur of the moment to go and take ones children or grandchildren fishing because one needs a licence. Those were the reasons why we have so far not decided to go to a licensing system but the situation is constantly under review and it may be that at some stage a licensing system may be the option that is pursued.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are the Government aware that the curtailment which the Chief Minister describes is actually happening already and it is surprising or fitting that he describes the father and son wanting to go out to fish because those are some of the people that the Opposition have had coming with complaints? This is the second issue that arises from here. The complaint is this, that what is happening in different places of Gibraltar including the North Mole is that Spanish anglers are coming through with 20 fishing rods, placing them across the shoreline, this was until two weeks ago when I got complaints, Easter, in the North Mole and in other areas.

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Two rods maximum.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Certainly it is happening in other areas then, where they are coming through with 10 fishing rods, 20 fishing rods planting them all across the seafront and then depriving local anglers of the room in which to fish. Actually it is interesting that the Minister mentioned the father and son wanting to go and fish and being unable to because that is precisely what has already been happening and already complaints which have been made to the Opposition have been made, not exclusively, but certainly there were a few cases of people coming and saying 'well look this statement that you issued is actually true, this weekend my son wanted to go fishing, we decided to

go to the reclaimed area where the East Side development is earmarked for and there was a Spaniard there with 28 fishing rods right across the whole of the seafront and we had to go home'. The other point which is made and is similar to the diving point when we discussed the issue in Question No. 10 this morning, is that what non-resident anglers are doing here is what Gibraltar anglers cannot do in Spain. That is to say, one cannot go to Spain stand on a beach or a reclaimed area or whatever and start fishing just like that, one does need permits or licences. So in order to phrase all this as a question, can I ask the Minister whether they are satisfied with the present arrangements, both in terms of the North Mole and elsewhere, and whether Government will look at this matter and see whether any improvements can be made?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am really not prepared to have the same debate as I had with him this morning in relation to diving in relation to fishing, so if he can sort of remember what I said to him this morning and carry it forward. At the end of the day we have a different culture, the Spanish practice and therefore culture is that one needs a licence to do a whole lot of things that one does not need a licence for here. I suppose we could replicate that culture but they are used to needing a licence and permission from the State to go and throw a fishing rod and we are not, and does one really want to tie up all our leisure activities and all our citizens freedoms to go about, does one really want to link it to the State so that one needs a piece of paper from Uncle Sam for every little thing that one wants to do. It is a way forward, I am not saying, of course it is possible to do that, it is possible to replicate the Spanish system. The question, and it is not a rhetorical question, there is an issue for debate, whether we want to in Gibraltar go down that road or whether we want to try and find some other way to address unfair situations. So for example, for ones 28 fishing rods along the East Side reclamation we may not need a system of licensing it may be possible to do it by legislation or by some regulation which limits fishing rods to two. In other words, extend to the whole of Gibraltar by some law what we have done in the Port through the enforcement of Port Regulations. That might be a possibility. I think, having the State regulate and licence individual people's activities, particularly leisure activities, should be a last resort, not a first resort because one could very quickly find oneself where one needs the Government's permission to do anything and everything. My personal philosophical instinct is to avoid that unless there is a very good reason that renders it unavoidable and inevitable. We can debate this and if we collectively come to the conclusion that we want to go down this sort of licence everything that moves route, we can do.

**HON C A BRUZON:**

If I could just not deviate entirely from the question but maybe broaden the debate. What has happened? I get elderly people coming to me and saying to me 'from time immemorial we have gone and walked to the North Mole, why should we have a fishing rod to be able to go for a walk to North Mole?' Are there serious security implications?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

With the greatest of respect to the hon Member, it is a little bit of an irresponsible piece of oratory because he well knows that it is not the Government that are

unilaterally and domestically decided to consider every Gibraltarian who does not have a fishing rod a security threat. He knows very well, because it has been explained to him in this House on several occasions, that this is an international code which some of our main cruising clients are making compulsory. In other words, if we do not comply with this code they will not allow ships that have visited the Port to visit our Port and they will not allow their cruise ships to call into our Port at all. Now, we can decide to suffer all those consequences and uniquely in the whole world, regard a commercial Port as a sort of social promenade. This community can make that choice if it wants to, it comes with a huge economic price tag. The hon Member has got to understand that this is not the Gibraltar Government deciding that for security reasons people should not be allowed in, it is the Gibraltar Government complying in the way that gives it most freedom to allow the historical event, which is fishing, to take place. There are those who argue that even the fishing facilities that are being allowed is stretching it. We think we have persuaded those who have to make the judgements internationally to accept the fishing thing, that is the context. He should regard the fishing regime, as it is at the moment, as something that we have salvaged from the implementation. He ought to consider, any other commercial port, does he know of any other commercial port in the world where people can just go in and out for leisure, it is very unusual nowadays.

Now we have had that historical culture, so his rhetorical oratory has to be considered in the context of external compulsion, that this is not something that we have chosen to do although frankly the idea of having youth driving around the Port at 3 o'clock in the morning after a long, wet night out in a discotheque frankly has always been an accident waiting to happen, as indeed it did. The inside of a Port is a dangerous place, there are trailers, there was an incident some years ago where a car full of kids crashed into a trailer and the corner of the trailer went in. Ports are not safe places, it is a sea wall with a precipice straight into the sea. So I think it is enough that we have salvaged the fishing. Only the other day I was walking down the street and somebody stopped the car and said to me if we could not do something at least about lifting, in fact I have been meaning to speak to my Colleague about it and have not yet had the opportunity, whether apparently after the ship goes it takes longer than this chap thought was necessary to lift the restrictions and let the fishermen in. I am sure there is some explanation because I am assured by the Port that the regime is the minimum that it has to be. So I would urge the hon Member not to say things that give the impression that there are things that the Government could easily do which they are not doing and the effect of that is some unnecessary curtailment of our leisure enjoyment here in Gibraltar. That is not the case.

ORAL

**NO. 301 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT AUTHORITY**

Can Government list the areas of co-operation between the Gibraltar and Algeciras Port authorities that are planned for the meeting in Algeciras next month?

**ANSWER**

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

The meeting to be held with the Algeciras Port Authority in late May 2005 is intended to be the commencement of discussions with a view of identifying areas of co-operation between both ports. The answer to the question will be forthcoming after the initial meeting has been held.

**NO. 302 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

Have any new applications for a bunkering licence been made since December 2004 and have any new licences been issued?

**ANSWER**

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

One application has been received which has resulted in the issue of a licence.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 302 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say who the licence was issued to?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, the name of the company is Bunkers (Gibraltar) Limited.

ORAL

NO. 303 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

How many bunkering licences were there in place as at 31 March 2005, showing the name of the operator and the date when first issued?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Answered together with Question No. 304 of 2005.

**NO. 304 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – BUNKERING LICENCES**

How many bunkering licences were there in place as at 31 March 2005, showing the name of the operator and the date when first issued?

**ANSWER**

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

The Licensing regime came into effect on 22 May 2002. The following entities were issued with licences at the time:-

Vemaoil Ltd  
Aegean  
CEPSA  
FAMM  
Shell

A further licence was issued to Bunkers (Gibraltar) Limited in March 2005. Prior to 22 May 2002, there was a sort of licence in place but not under the current system where there are certain specifications attached to the licence which all bunkering operators must adhere to.

**ORAL**

**NO. 305 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SHIPS VISITS**

How many ships have called at Gibraltar since December 2004 inclusive for:

- a) bunkering;
- b) cargo;
- c) repairs;

on a monthly basis and how many tonnes of bunker fuel were sold each month?

**ANSWER**

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

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

**Answer to Question 305**

Ships calling at Gibraltar from December 2004 to March 2005:

<b>Month</b>	<b>Bunkering</b>	<b>Cargo</b>	<b>Repairs</b>
December 2004	458	11	9
January 2005	428	2	11
February 2005	439	2	6
March 2005	446	2	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1771</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>31</b>

Tonnes of bunker fuel sold at Gibraltar from December 2004 to March 2005

<b>Month</b>	<b>Tonnes</b>
December 2004	342,706
January 2005	323,251
February 2005	304,134
March 2005	312,064
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,282,155</b>

ORAL

NO. 306 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT ADVISORY COUNCIL**

How often and on what dates has the Port Advisory Council met since 17 December 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

Since 17 December 2004 the Port Advisory Council has met once, on 10 February 2005.

**NO. 307 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT AUTHORITY**

Have Government been consulted by the UK on the European Commissions proposed directive on market access to port services and what is the view of the Government on what is being proposed?

**ANSWER**

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

The Government have not been consulted by the UK in this matter.

The Government have not yet formulated a view on the proposed directive.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 307 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Minister say, during the last House we discussed the role of Gibraltar in AMRIE and APRIE that were shipping organisations in the EU, whether any information has been made available to the Government through those organisations?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

My understanding is that the issue has been raised but only in the form of the fact that the whole of the EU members are totally in different views as to this directive. There is no consensus on the way forward and it is unlikely that there will be any major developments in the foreseeable future because of the disparity that there are different views on the directive.

**NO. 308 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**PORT – SEA TRADE CONVENTION**

Can Government say why the Port of Gibraltar did not have its own stand at the Sea Trade Cruise Shipping Convention in Miami this year?

**ANSWER**

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

The Gibraltar Port Authority and the Gibraltar Tourist Board always consider the marketing strategy for the concise business on the basis of effectiveness, value for money, the ability to access the desired target market and so on. The fact that Gibraltar attends a particular trade fair or event one year does not necessarily mean that it will attend the subsequent year's event in the same way, or at all.

In the case of Sea Trade Miami, the decision that was taken was to have a Gibraltar presence in two ways: through having a speaker and a delegate at the conference, and by having a presence in the Medcruise stand, from which to promote Gibraltar's cruise industry.

ORAL

NO. 309 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**PORT – SEA TRADE CONVENTION**

What was the cost with a breakdown of Gibraltar's attendance at the Sea Trade Cruise Shipping Convention in Miami in March 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

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

**Schedule to Answer 309**

A Davis:

(a)	Air – Gibraltar/London/Miami/London/Gibraltar	£2,032.20
(b)	Hotel – 1 night London	£140.00
	4 nights Miami	£785.00
(c)	Half Subsistence	£328.82
(d)	Conference Pass	£673.48
	TOTAL:	£3,959.95

A Poggio:

(a)	Air – London/Miami/London	£1,975.00
(b)	Hotel Miami	£723.08
(c)	Conference Pass	£490.14(reduced Medcruise BoD Rate)
	TOTAL:	£3,188.22
	GRAND TOTAL:	£7,148.17

**NO. 310 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**PORT – SECURITY**

What were the unforeseen Port security arrangements for the Port that have required additional funds of £75,000 beyond the £30,000 approved by the House in the Estimates of Expenditure for the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

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

The international implementation on 1 July 2004 of the International Ship and Port Security Code, known as the ISPS Code, required the introduction of Port security, which cost £105,000 for the financial year. When the Estimates for 2004/2005 were prepared, the cost of providing security was not fully taken into account.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 310 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But it was known that this would have to be done, that is the requirement was known at the beginning of the financial year, was it?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

No, the requirement was not known. We had put in an outline plan which was subject to audit. When the international auditors came to have a look at the security system they insisted on certain alterations and these alterations required additional expenditure.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. Given that the additional cost is more than twice the original budget, can the Minister say what were the nature of these alterations that cost three times as much as expected?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Yes, one was the inclusion of the ferry terminal area as part of the security area, and for there to avoid having to put security guards there on a 24 hour basis, we had to instal CCTV cameras in order for it to be controlled from the one post, in order to reduce costs on security guards. In other words, what we have done is invested more in capital and reduced on on-going expenditure in terms of man hours that would have been needed to be able to cater and oversee the whole system.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact then, is some of this additional £75,000 then money that has been spent on equipment?

**HON J J HOLLIDAY:**

Absolutely, its totality has been spent on buying equipment.

ORAL

**NO. 311 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – COMPUTERS IMPORTED**

What was the value and number of computer items imported into Gibraltar since December 2004 inclusive on a monthly basis?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 312 and 313 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 312 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – GOODS VEHICLES**

What was the number and value of goods vehicles imported by:

- a) individuals;
- b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

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

Answered together with Question Nos. 311 and 313 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 313 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**TRADE – PRIVATE MOTOR VEHICLES**

What was the number and value of private motor vehicles imported by:

- a) individuals;
- b) licensed dealers;

on a monthly basis since December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

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

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

**Schedule to Question 313**

**Answer to Question 311**

The value of computer hardware imported into Gibraltar on a monthly basis since December 2004 is as follows:

	<b>Value of Computers (£)</b>
Dec 04	374,697
Jan 05	528,146
Feb 05	417,005

We are unable to provide a figure for the number of computers imported into Gibraltar, as it is the individual components that are being imported and not fully assembled computers.

**Answer to Question 312**

The number and value of goods vehicles imported by individuals and licensed dealers on a monthly basis since December 2004 is as follows:

	<b>Goods vehicles imported by individuals</b>		<b>Goods vehicles imported by licensed dealers</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Value (£ thousands)</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Value (£ thousands)</b>
Dec 04	2	4	1	2
Jan 05	-	-	2	24
Feb 05	4	5	6	24

**Answer to Question 313**

The number and value of private motor vehicles imported by individuals and licensed dealers on a monthly basis since December 2004 is as follows:

	<b>Private motor vehicles imported by individuals</b>		<b>Private motor vehicles imported by licensed dealers</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Value (£ thousands)</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Value (£ millions)</b>
Dec 04	14	52.8	506	6.0
Jan 05	8	30.7	443	5.4
Feb 05	18	65.1	494	6.1

ORAL

NO. 314 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**TRADE – IMPORTS**

Can Government provide the total value of imports, excluding petroleum products, and the breakdown by country of origin for the year 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE MINISTER FOR TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNICATIONS

The total value of imports for 2004, excluding petroleum products, stood at £292 million. The breakdown by country will be published in the usual manner as part of the Abstract of Statistics 2004 later on this year.

ORAL

**NO. 315 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.2 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 1 (Lighting) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 316 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 316 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 1 (Lighting) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 and 317 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 317 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.5 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 2 (Power) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315, 316 and 318 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 318 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.3 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 3 (Domestic) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 317 and 319 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 319 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 3 (Domestic) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 318 and 320 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 320 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge for the Flexible Cost Adjustment Formula and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 319 and 321 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 321 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing 11.7 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 4 (Commercial) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 320 and 322 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 322 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 4 (Commercial) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 321 and 323 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 323 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the Primary Charge for Tariff 5 (Industrial Maximum Demand) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 322 and 324 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 324 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 5 (Industrial Maximum Demand) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 323 and 325 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 325 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12 per cent the Secondary Charge per unit consumed for Tariff 5 (Industrial Maximum Demand) and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 324 and 326 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 326 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.5 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 6A and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 325 and 327 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 327 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 6A and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 326 and 328 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 328 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 11.1 per cent the rate per unit charged for Tariff 6B and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 327 and 329 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 329 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Tariff 6B and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 328 and 330 to 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 330 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the Electricity Supply Connection charge and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 329 and 331 to 33 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 331 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 500 per cent the Discontinuation of Electricity Supply Charge and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 330, 332 and 333 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 332 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 11.1 per cent the rate per unit charged for Summer Air-Conditioning Tariff and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 315 to 331 and 333 of 2005.

**NO. 333 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for Summer Air-Conditioning Tariff and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Question Nos. 332 and 333 refer to "summer air-conditioning tariff". There is no such named tariff and consumers who might have separate installations for air-conditioning (or heating) are supplied under the Off-peak Tariff 6B.

In relation to Question No. 331 of 2005, the information requested cannot be provided for 2004/2005 since there have been no disconnections for non-payments for a number of years. The number of consumers that may be disconnected in the future would be dependent on the arrears situation and it is not possible to give any reliable figures at this stage. With those caveats, I now hand the hon Member a Table which gives him all the information that he has requested.

Answer to Question 333 of 2005

Increased Electricity Tariff - Billing

Tariff	Previously			Increased Tariff wef 1.4.05 = 4/05 bill		
	Unit Cost	FCA	Standing Charge	Unit Cost	FCA	Standing Charge
Lighting	£0.090	£0.0281	£2	£0.101	£0.0326	£4
Power	£0.080	£0.0281	£4	£0.090	£0.0326	£8
Domestic	£0.065	£0.0281	£2	£0.073	£0.0326	£4
Commercial	£0.060	£0.0281	£3	£0.067	£0.0326	£6
Industrial (KVAs)	£0.050	£0.0281	£4	£0.056	£0.0326	£8
Off Peak	£0.040	£0.0281	£3	£0.045	£0.0326	£6
Off Peak	£0.045	£0.0281	£3	£0.050	£0.0326	£6

Connection Charge Previously £5.00 W.e.f 1/4/05 £30.00

Tariff	Net Increase			Number of Consumers (as at 31.3.05)	Units Billed FY 04/05	Total			
	Unit Cost	FCA	Standing Charge			Unit Cost Increase	FCA Increase	Standing Charge	Total
Lighting	£0.011	£0.0045	£2	300	498,022	£5,478	£2,241.10	£7,200	£14,919.34
Power	£0.010	£0.0045	£4	62	329,996	£3,300	£1,484.98	£2,976	£7,760.94
Domestic	£0.008	£0.0045	£2	12,616	51,300,308	£410,402	£230,851.39	£302,784	£944,037.85
Commercial	£0.007	£0.0045	£3	2,782	66,206,735	£463,447	£297,930.31	£100,152	£861,529.45
Industrial (KVAs)	£0.006	£0.0045	£4	34	14,073,966	£84,444	£63,332.85	£1,632	£149,408.64
Off Peak	£0.005	£0.0045	£3	18	207,090	£1,035	£931.90	£648	£2,615.36
Off Peak	£0.005	£0.0045	£3	17	823,208	£4,116	£3,704.44	£612	£8,432.48
				15,829	133,439,325	£972,223	£600,476.96	£416,004	£1,988,704.06

Connection Charge net increase £25.00 New connections during 04/05 1,394 Total increase £34,850.00

Grand Total £2,023,564.06

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 315 TO 333 OF 2005**

**HON L A RANDALL:**

I apologise if I have misled the House in respect of summer air-conditioning tariff but when I looked at Gazette 3461 of the 17<sup>th</sup> March, on page 123, there is a reference to summer air-conditioning tariff.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Apparently it is not in use any more then.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can the Government confirm that in the Estimates that have been Tabled, the expected yield is included or not?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The answer is yes, but when considering the implications of the answer I would ask him to bear in mind that, I do not want to refer to the Estimates but obliquely that Gibraltar Electricity Authority is now catered for elsewhere. So in terms of the Government's Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure the implication of it being included or not included, and I have told him that it is, is that it would alter the amount of subsidy, subvention that the Consolidated Fund would otherwise have to vote across.

ORAL

**NO. 334 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to receive in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 65.7 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Shipping from Waterport Wharf and North Mole and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 335 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 335 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 65.7 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Hotels and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 and 336 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 336 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Hotels and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334, 335 and 337 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 337 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Hospitals and Schools and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 336 and 338 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 338 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to pay in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Hospitals and Schools and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 337 and 339 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 339 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to pay in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16.7 per cent the charge per 100 litres for the first 4,500 litres of potable water supplied to domestic consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 338 and 340 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 340 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 15.6 per cent the charge per 100 litres consumed in excess of 4,500 litres of potable water supplied to domestic consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 339 and 341 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 341 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Domestic Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 340 and 342 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 342 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water undelivered supplies from public fountain by small barrels, buckets or similar small containers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 341 and 343 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 343 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Swimming Pools and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 342 and 344 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 344 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Swimming Pools and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 343 and 345 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 345 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 15 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Industrial and Commercial Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 344 and 346 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 346 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Industrial and Commercial Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 345 and 347 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 347 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 15 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Industrial and Commercial Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 346 and 348 to 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 348 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Industrial and Commercial Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 347, 349 and 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 349 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16 per cent the charge per 100 litres of potable water supplied to Government Departments and the Ministry of Defence and Other Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 334 to 348 and 350 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 350 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the Standing Additional Charge for potable water supplied to Government Departments and the Ministry of Defence and Other Consumers and how many consumers were invoiced for this type of charge in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule setting out all the information that he has requested.

Answer to Question 350 of 2005

Answer to Questions 334 to 350

NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS WATER BY TYPE	NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS BY TARIFFS											
	Apr-04	May-04	Jun-04	Jul-04	Aug-04	Sep-04	Oct-04	Nov-04	Dec-04	Jan-05	Feb-05	Mar-05
SHIPPING	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	22
HOSPITALS AND SCHOOLS	22	22	22	22	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
HOTELS	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	11
DOMESTIC (Primary)	11706	11705	11691	11716	11718	11716	11706	11706	11720	11694	11681	11694
SWIMMING POOLS	15	15	15	15	15	16	16	18	18	19	18	18
INDUSTRIAL	40	39	38	39	37	38	41	40	42	40	41	40
GOVT. DEPTS. (IncMOD)	156	163	172	171	174	174	175	177	173	170	173	172
COMMERCIAL	1232	1232	1299	1308	1308	1311	1319	1320	1330	1313	1314	1316
FOUNTAINS	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
UPPER ROCK	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
INACTIVES	577	578	584	580	600	608	625	621	620	627	638	630
TOTAL NO. OF CUSTOMERS	13796	13802	13869	13900	13923	13934	13953	13953	13973	13933	13936	13940

Please note that Customer Number in respect of shipping includes accounts of Shipping agents who will be billed for a number of vessels  
There were 504 sales vouchers to shipping in 2004-2005 However a number of these were for the supply of water to barges that subsequently may supply more than one vessel.

Table 1 to Question 350

Number of Customers by Type

Cont....

Cont'd Answer to Question 350 of 2005.

Cont'd Answer to Questions 344 to 350.

**POTABLE WATER TARIFF REVIEW**

Estimated additional revenues from Tariff increases of 1/4/05

Tariff	Category	Additional Revenue Estimated to be raised on projected quantity of water to be sold	Additional Revenue From Standing Chgs	TOTAL expected Additional Revenue 2005/2006
A	Shipping	£ 41,125	£ -	£ 41,125
B	Hospital/Schools	£ 12,735	£ 264	£ 12,999
C	Hotels	£ 23,571	£ 144	£ 23,715
D	Domestic (Primary)	£ 131,970	£ 210,744	£ 342,714
D	Domestic (Secondary)	£ 189,023	£ -	£ 189,023
E	Pools	£ 4,011	£ 180	£ 4,191
F	Industrial	£ 26,266	£ 492	£ 26,758
G	GOG/MOD	£ 43,767	£ 1,896	£ 45,663
H	Commercial	£ 97,078	£ 14,736	£ 111,814
I	Fountain	£ 48	£ 36	£ 84
J	Upper Rock	£ 909	£ 234	£ 1,143
		<b>£ 570,503</b>	<b>£ 228,726</b>	<b>£ 799,229</b>

Note the above is an estimate based on current product mix and anticipated sales

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 334 TO 350 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In relation to the yield of these changes which affect the water company, are they all reflected in a reduction in the Government's subvention or is some of this revenue sort of going to the company instead of going to the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the answer to the hon Member's question is yes but there are timing issues because the contribution in lieu of tariff increases is paid in arrears, so in the first place this subvention is for the benefit of the company but of course it will reduce next year's payment or contribution in lieu of rate increase by the Government. So it will have no effect when he looks at the budget, he will see from the Estimates book that it actually goes up this year but that is explained because it is in arrears. That payment by the Government is in arrears where this is current. So these revenue raising measures on water tariffs reduce the Government's subvention contribution in lieu of allowing them to raise tariffs to the company as of next year, financial year that is.

ORAL

NO. 351 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £250 for a Self-Drive Operators Licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 352 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 352 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £250 for a Road Haulage Operators Licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 and 353 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 353 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 1,100 per cent the annual licence fee for a self-drive car and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351, 352 and 354 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 354 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the monthly licence fee for a self-drive car and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 353 and 355 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 355 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of amending the criteria and increasing the licence fees charged annually in respect of motorcycles and how many fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005 in respect of motorcycles that did not exceed 50cc, exceeded 50cc but did not exceed 150cc and that exceeded 250cc?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 354 and 356 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 356 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 22.2 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle not exceeding 507kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 355 and 357 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 357 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 20 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 507kgs but not exceeding 762kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 356 and 358 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 358 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 18.2 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 762kgs but not exceeding 1,016kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 357 and 359 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 359 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 15.4 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 1,016kgs but not exceeding 1,270kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 358 and 360 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 360 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 14.3 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 1,270kgs but not exceeding 1,524kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 359, and 361 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 361 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 12.5 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 1,524kgs but not exceeding 1,778kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 360 and 362 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 362 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 14.6 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 1,778kgs but not exceeding 2,032kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 361 and 363 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 363 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16.1 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 2,032kgs but not exceeding 2,286kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 362 and 364 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 364 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 17.2 per cent the annual licence fee charged for a Private Motor vehicle exceeding 2,286kgs but not exceeding 2,540kgs and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 363 and 365 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 365 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the annual licence fee charged for each additional 254kgs or part thereof in excess of 2,540kgs for a Private Motor vehicle and how many such licence fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 364 and 366 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 366 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee charged for registering a motorcycle with an engine capacity up to 50cc and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 365 and 367 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 367 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 20 per cent the fee charged for registering a vehicle other than a motorcycle with an engine capacity up to 50cc and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 366 and 368 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 368 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for a certificate of registration of a vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 367 and 369 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 369 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for a transfer of ownership of a vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 368 and 370 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 370 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for a Duplicate Certificate of Registration of a vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 369 and 371 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 371 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the fee charged for an application for a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 370 and 372 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 372 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee charged for every Road Service licence (per vehicle) and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 371 and 373 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 373 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee charged for every transfer of a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 372 and 374 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 374 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee charged for every Road Service licence (per vehicle) and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 373 and 375 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 375 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 400 per cent the fee charged for every duplicate of a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 374 and 376 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 376 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the fee charged for every application for the amendment of a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 375 and 377 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 377 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the fee charged for every renewal of a Road Service licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 376 and 378 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 378 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 900 per cent the fee charged for a Dealers licence to use one vehicle at any one time and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 377 and 379 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 379 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for a Dealers licence to use one vehicle at any one time and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 378 and 380 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 380 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for each additional Dealers licence issued to the same motor trader during the currency of the licence to use one vehicle at any one time and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 379 and 381 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 381 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the fee charged for the issue or renewal of a Drivers licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 380 and 382 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 382 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the fee charged for the issue of a duplicate Drivers licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 381 and 383 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 383 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for the issue of a duplicate of an Advanced Drivers licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 382 and 384 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 384 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 25 per cent the fee charged for the issue of a duplicate Drivers licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 383 and 385 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 385 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for inspecting the register, for each hour or part thereof, and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 384 and 386 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 386 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 200 per cent the fee charged for providing a copy or extract from the registrar, for each folio of 72 words or part thereof, and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 385 and 387 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 387 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £25 for the addition of a further category to a Driving Licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 386 and 388 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 388 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £25 for a change of particulars to a Driving Licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 387 and 389 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 389 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £25 for the exchange of an EEA Driving Licence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 388 and 390 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 390 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 300 per cent the fee for a licence to drive a Public Service Vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 389 and 391 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 391 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 300 per cent the fee for a licence to act as conductor of a Public Service Vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 390 and 392 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 392 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 300 per cent the fee for a duplicate of any licence related to a Public Service Vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 391 and 393 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 393 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by charging £20 for the renewal of a Public Service Vehicle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 392 and 394 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 394 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "A" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 393 and 395 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 395 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "B" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 394 and 396 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 396 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "C" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 395 and 397 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 397 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "C1" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 396 and 398 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 398 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "D" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 397 and 399 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 399 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "D1" driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 398 and 400 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 400 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £50 for a category "B+E" driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 399 and 401 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 401 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "C+E" driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 400 and 402 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 402 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "C1+E" driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 401 and 403 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 403 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "D+E" driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 402 and 404 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 404 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £60 for a category "D1+E" driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 403 and 405 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 405 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of revenue raised in the financial year 2004/2005 by virtue of charging a fee of £40 for a category "E" driving test?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 404 and 406 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 406 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing by 150 per cent the fee for a category "F to J" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 405 and 407 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 407 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing by 50 per cent the fee for a category "K" driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 406 and 408 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 408 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing by 25 per cent the fee for an advanced driving test and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 407 and 409 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 409 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing by 100 per cent the fee for a driving test for a Public Service Vehicle up to 8 seats in addition to the driver's seat and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 408 and 410 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 410 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increasing the annual licence fee by 24.4 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 2,032kgs but not exceeding 2,286kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 409 and 411 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 411 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £10 for a Theory "A" Category driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 410 and 412 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 412 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £10 for a Theory "B" Category driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 411 and 413 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 413 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £15 for a Theory “C” Category driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 412 and 414 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 414 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a fee of £10 for a Theory "D" Category driving test?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 413 and 415 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 415 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Private Car and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 414 and 416 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 416 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Motorcycle and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 415 and 417 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 417 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Public Service Vehicle with over 8 seats and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 416 and 418 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 418 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Public Service Vehicle with no more than 8 seats and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 417 and 419 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 419 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Goods Vehicle with an unladen weight of over 1,525kgs and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 418 and 420 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 420 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee for the Motor Vehicle test of a Goods Vehicle with an unladen weight of no more than 1,525kgs and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 419 and 421 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 421 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 66.7 per cent the fee for the application for examination of a Trailer and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 420 and 422 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 422 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 92.3 per cent the fee for the re-examination of a vehicle under regulation 23 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 421 and 423 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 423 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee for the issue of a duplicate roadworthiness certificate and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 422 and 424 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 424 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee for the purchase of a Personalised Number and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 423 and 425 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 425 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee for the transfer of ownership of a Personalised Number and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 424 and 426 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 426 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 43.5 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 508kgs but not exceeding 762kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 425 and 427 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 427 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 41.7 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 762kgs but not exceeding 1,270kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 426 and 428 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 428 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 35.7 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 1,270kgs but not exceeding 1,524kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 427 and 429 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 429 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 33.3 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 1,524kgs but not exceeding 1,778kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 428 and 430 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 430 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state how much additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the annual licence fee by 28.6 per cent for a Taxi exceeding 1,778kgs but not exceeding 2,032kgs and how many such fees were charged in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 429 and 431 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 431 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the renewal of a Work Permit for Workers from Central and Eastern European Countries and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 430 and 432 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 432 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 150 per cent the fee charged for an application for a Work Permit for Detached Workers and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 431 and 433 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 433 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for an application for a Work Permit for Workers from Central and Eastern European Countries and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 432 and 434 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 434 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the Annual Notification of a Certificate of Registration and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 433 and 435 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 435 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for a Statement on Variations in the Particulars of a Certificate of Registration and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 434 and 436 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 436 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state what additional revenue they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of the increase from £7 to £10 per person on the departure tax on civil aircraft passengers?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 435 and 437 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 437 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the application for a wholesale licence for single premises and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 436 and 438 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 438 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the annual renewal of a wholesale licence and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 437 and 439 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 439 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for the application for a wholesale licence for single premises and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 438 and 440 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 440 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £500 per annum for the licence of operating a bonded store measuring 50sqm or less?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 439 and 441 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 441 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of introducing a charge of £1,000 per annum for the licence of operating a bonded store measuring more than 50sqm?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 440 and 442 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 442 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of adding a charge of 5 per cent on items 2203.00.03, 2204.10.01, 2204.10.02, 2204.10.03, 2204.21.01, 2204.21.02, 2205.10.00, 2203.00.01 and 2203.00.02 referred to in column 4 of the table in Chapter 22 of Schedule 2 of the Import Duty (Integrated Tariff) Regulations 2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 441 and 443 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 443 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Street Traders of any goods excluding flowers and greenery to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 442 and 444 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 444 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Street Traders of flowers and greenery to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 443 and 445 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 445 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Pedlars of market produce to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 444 and 446 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 446 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Pedlars of articles of food or drink not being market produce to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 445 and 447 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 447 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing the licence fee per month charged for Other Pedlars to £20 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 446 and 448 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 448 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee when an empty coffin is delivered by hearse and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 447 and 449 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 449 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee when an empty coffin is not delivered by hearse and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 448 and 450 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 450 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the office fee (previously £10 now £15) referred to in schedule 2, paragraph 4 in relation to indent (b) of the Licensing (Fees) Rules 1991 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 449 and 451 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 451 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the office fee (previously £20 now £30) referred to in schedule 2, paragraph 4 in relation to indent (b) of the Licensing (Fees) Rules 1991 and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 450 and 452 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 452 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for a Certificate of Registration and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 451 and 453 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 453 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 100 per cent the fee charged for a Certificate of Registration and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 452 and 454 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 454 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 75 per cent the fee charged for each child aged 5 to 11 inclusive who pays £0.50 for entry as a walker and subsequently wishes to visit tourist sites and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 453 and 455 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 455 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 16.7 per cent the fee charged for each person aged 12 and over who pays £1.00 for entry to the 100 Ton Gun and subsequently wishes to visit tourist sites and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 454 and 456 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 456 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 50 per cent the fee charged for each person aged 12 and over who pays £0.50 for entry as a walker and subsequently wishes to visit tourist sites and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 455 and 457 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 457 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee charged for each person for entry at Jew's Gate as part of a tour group with a tour operator or in a taxi on an inclusive 'Rock Tour' and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 456 and 458 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 458 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 33.3 per cent the fee charged for each person for entry from the cable car middle or top stations for the purposes of visiting any tourist site if admission ticket is pre-purchased at the cable car bottom station and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 457 and 459 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 459 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 14.3 per cent the fee charged for each person aged 12 and over for entry at Jew's Gate and Willis's Road for persons visiting tourist sites and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 458 and 460 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 460 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £100 annual registration fee as a Port operator?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 459 and 461 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 461 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £10,000 bunkering licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 460 and 462 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 462 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £3000 stevedoring licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 461 and 463 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 463 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £1000 ship repairing licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 462 and 464 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 464 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £1000 ship agency licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 463 and 465 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 465 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £1000 ship chandlery licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 464 and 466 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 466 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £250 dolphin boat operator licence?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 465 and 467 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 467 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the “any other port operator licence”?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 466 and 468 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 468 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £2.00 annual fee for registration of a port worker?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 467 and 469 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 469 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the annual fee of £2.00 for re-registration of a port worker?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 468 and 470 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 470 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £5.00 fee for issue of a renewal certificate of registration as a port worker?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 469 and 471 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 471 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £5.00 fee for issue of a renewal of a certificate of registration as a port operator?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 470 and 472 to 481 of 2005.

**NO. 472 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the following under the Port Operations and Fees Regulation 2005:

- a) the £5.00 fee for issue of a duplicate certificate;
- b) the £5.00 fee for Endorsement certificate of registration;
- c) the £5.00 fee for an Amendment certificate of registration;
- d) the £10.00 fee for Inspection of a licence;
- e) the £5.00 fee for a Certified copy of a licence or certificate;
- f) the £5.00 fee for a Inspection of an application;
- g) the £5.00 fee for a Copy of an application?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 471 and 473 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 473 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the increase from £0.04 to £0.06 in the bunkering levy per ton?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 472 and 474 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 474 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £60.00 passenger certificate issued pursuant to rule 72 of the Port Rules?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 473 and 475 to 481 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 475 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the following charges under Paragraph 3 Schedule 4 of the Port Rules:

- a) the increase from £0.50 to £2.00 per tonnes deadweight for a lighter;
- b) the increase from £10.00 to £20.00 for a pleasure boat over 10ft in length;
- c) the increase from £0.10 to £0.50 for a carrier of petroleum, water or any other product?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 474 and 476 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 476 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £62.50 charge for a Suez Canal Certificate?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 475 and 477 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 477 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £2.50 per square metre charge for a portacabin?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 476 and 478 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 478 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £2.50 per square metre charge for the storage of oil drums?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 477 and 479 to 481 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 479 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £1000 charge for first registration as a Port Operator?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 478, 480 and 481 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 480 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

How much additional revenue do Government expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 in respect of the £50.00 fee for each overland container being used, unstuffed at any unstuffing shed in the container berth?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 351 to 479 and 481 of 2005.

**NO. 481 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**ADDITIONAL REVENUE RAISED**

Can Government state the amount of additional revenue that they expect to raise in the financial year 2005/2006 by virtue of increasing by 1,438.5 per cent the fee charged for the annual licence for Premises or Ships and how many such fees were charged in the financial year 2004/2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member tables listing individually all the revenue-raising measures with full details of what the fees were before the increases and the level of the increases, the previous revenue and the projected additional revenue from the increases. Also details of when each of these fees were last increased and a cross-reference to each individual question to assist him in his analysis of the answer.

Answer to Question 481  
PORT

TABLE 1

ITEM	QUESTION NUMBER	CURRENT FEE	LAST INCREASE	PROPOSED FEE	CURRENT ESTIMATED YIELD P.A	ADDITIONAL ESTIMATED REVENUE YIELD P.A
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	460/2005	£100.00	INTRODUCED 3.5.01	£100.00	£4,200.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	461/2005	£10,000.00	"	£10,000.00	£60,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	462/2005	£3,000.00	"	£3,000.00	£3,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	463/2005	£1,000.00	"	£1,000.00	£2,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	464/2005	£1,000.00	"	£1,000.00	£15,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	465/2005	£1,000.00	"	£1,000.00	£6,000.00	Remains unchanged
HARBOUR CRAFT LICENCE	466/2005	£250.00	"	£250.00	£1,000.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	467/2005	£1,000.00	"	£1,000.00	£13,100.00	Remains unchanged
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	468/2005	NIL	NEW	£2.00 PER PERSON	NIL	Not commenced
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	469/2005	NIL	NEW	£2.00 PER PERSON	NIL	Not commenced
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	470/2005	NIL	NEW	£5.00 PER CERT.	NIL	Not commenced
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	471/2005	NIL	NEW	£5.00 PER OPS.	NIL	Not commenced
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	472/2005	NIL	NEW	£5.00/£10.00	NIL	Not commenced
BUNKERING CHARGES	473/2005	£0.04	INTRODUCED 2002	£0.06	£150,000.00	£75,000.00
PAX SHIP CERTIFICATES	474/2005	NIL	NEW	£60.00	NIL	£1,000.00
HARBOUR CRAFT LICENCE (1)	475/2005 (A)	£0.50	N/A	£0.50	N/A	N/A
HARBOUR CRAFT LICENCE (2)	(B)	£10.00	INTRODUCED 1993	£20.00	£6,000.00	£6,000.00
HARBOUR CRAFT LICENCE (3)	(C)	£0.50	N/A	£0.50	N/A	N/A
SUEZ CANAL CERTIFICATES	476/2005	£50.00	N/A	£62.50	NIL	£1,000.00
MISCELLANEOUS (3)	477/2005	£2.00 PER S.F.	1984	£2.40 PER S.F	£8,500.00	£1,700.00
MISCELLANEOUS (4)	478/2005	£2.00 PER S.F.	1984	£2.50 PER S. METRE	£3,010.00	£2,560.00
PORT OPERATORS LICENCE	479/2005	£1,000.00	INTRODUCED 3.5.01	£1,000.00	£3,000.00	UNABLE TO ESTIMATE
CONTAINER UNSTUFFING LICENCE SHIP & PREMISES	480/2005	NIL	N/A	£50.00	NIL	£72,000.00
	481/2005	N/A	N/A	N/A		NO SUCH LICENCE KNOWN

(1) This fee was amended in March 2005, from £2 to 50p (due to misprint) hence no additional revenue yield.

(2) This fee was amended in March 2005, from 10p to 50p (due to misprint in Gazette) hence no additional revenue yield.

(3) The current increase made by the Port (Amendment) Rules 2005 (L.N. 59/2005 31 March 2005) raised the fee from £2.00 per square foot to £2.40 per square foot. However, the Port (Amendment) (No.2) Rules 2005 makes provision for the fee to be raised to £2.50 per sq. metre, but this legislation has not been commenced.

(4) The Port (Amendment) (No.2) Rules 2005 make provision for the fee to be raised to £2.50 per sq. metre, but this legislation has not been commenced.

Cont ...

**Contd Answer to Question 481****Table 2****Employment**

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Estimated Revenue Yield p.a.
Issue of work permit (400)	433/05	£10	Introduced 1994	£20 <sup>1</sup>	£4K	+ £4K
Renewal of work permit (1100)	431/05	£5	Introduced 1994	£10 <sup>1</sup>	£5K	+ £5K
Detached worker notification (700)	432/05	£20 p.a.	Introduced 1994	£50p.a.	£14K	+ £21K
Employer registration (300)	452/05 453/05	£25	Introduced 1991	£50	£8K	+ £8K
Annual notification/renewal (2800)	434/05	£10	Introduced 1991	£20	£28K	+ £28K
Variation notification (300)	435/05	£5	Introduced 1991	£10	£1K	+ £1K

( ) Figures in brackets show approx. annual number issued.

**Cont ...**

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 3**

Customs

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Estimated Revenue Yield p.a.
Import duties						
- Wines	442/05	- containers <2 litres	1984	5% ad valorem	£186K	£ 95K
- Malt liquors	442/05	-bottles/cans 27p/litre - casks 14p/litre	1984	5% ad valorem	£438K	£174K
Tobacco licences						
- wholesale	437/05	£500	1997	£1000	'n'	-
- each add premises	439/05	£ 70	1997	£ 150	'n'	-
- renewal	438/05	£150	1997	£ 300	£3K	+ £3K
Bonded Stores (new) (64)	441/05 440/05	-	-	Large £1000 <sup>1</sup> Small £ 500 <sup>1</sup>	-	+£38K +£13K

( ) number issued.  
'n' less than £1K

Cont ...

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 4**

**Civil Status and Registration**

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Revenue Yield p.a.
Apostille	450/05	£10	2000	£15	£132K	+ £66K
Emergency service	451/05	£20	2000	£30	£ 57K	+ £28K

**Cont ...**

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 4**

**Civil Status and Registration**

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Revenue Yield p.a.
Apostille	450/05	£10	2000	£15	£132K	+ £66K
Emergency service	451/05	£20	2000	£30	£ 57K	+ £28K

**Cont ...**

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

Table 5

Tourism

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Estimated Revenue Yield p.a.
<u>Tourism</u>						
Upper Rock entry fee	454/05* to 459/05	Various	1998	Add. £1 per person	£2.17m	+ £ 550K
Airport Passenger tax	436/05	£7	2001	£ 10	£1.17m	+ £ 450K

\* Breakdown sought is not available.

**Cont ...**

TRANSPORT

Table 6

Contd Answer to Question 481							
Item	Question Number	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Current Estimated Revenue yield per annum	Additional Estimated Revenue yield per annum	No of fees charged
Self Drive operators licence	351/2005	New fees introduced	—	£250.00	*	*	*
Road Haulage Operators Licence	352/2005	New fees introduced	—	£250.00	*	*	*
Self Drive Cars	353/2005	£12.00	1-12-90	£24.00	£4,212.00	£4212.00	351
Monthly licence self drive car	354/2005	Does not exist					
Motor Vehicle Licence	355/2005	0 to 124cc	1-6-87	£15.00	£43,050.00	£21525.00	2152
Motorcycles		125 To 249cc		£35.00	£23,370.00	£3895.00	129
		250 and over		£45.00	£20,800.00	£2600.00	65
Private Motor Vehicles (not exceeding 507 Kgs)	356/2005	£45.00	1-6-87	£55.00	£675.00	£150.00	15
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 507 Kgs not exceeding 762 Kgs)	357/2005	£50.00	1-6-87	£60.00	£32,250.00	£6450.00	645
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 762 Kgs not exceeding 1016 Kgs)	358/2005	£55.00	1-6-87	£65.00	£206,800.00	£37,600.00	3760
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 1016 Kgs not exceeding 1270 Kgs)	359/2005	£65.00	1-6-87	£75.00	£221,000.00	£34,000.00	3400
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 1270 Kgs not exceeding 1524 Kgs)	360/2005	£70.00	1-6-87	£80.00	£148,120.00	£21,160.00	2116
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 1524 Kgs not exceeding 1778 Kgs)	361/2005	£80.00	1-6-87	£90.00	£64,320.00	£8,040.00	804
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 1778 Kgs not exceeding 2032 Kgs)	362/2005	£100.00	1-6-87	£110.00	£62,900.00	£6,290.00	629
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 2032 Kgs not exceeding 2286 Kgs)	363/2005	£120.00	1-6-87	£130.00	£37,200.00	£3,100.00	310
Private Motor Vehicles (exceeding 2286 Kgs not exceeding 2540 Kgs)	364/2005	£140.00	1-6-87	£150.00	£3,920.00	£280.00	28
Private Motor Vehicles (each additional 254 Kgs in excess of 2540 Kgs)	365/2005	Sliding scale	1-6-87	Sliding scale	£8614.00	£500.00	50
Registration of Motorcycle up to 50 cc	366/2005	£10.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£3,630.00	£1,815.00	181
Registration of any other vehicle	367/2005	£25.00	01-12-90	£30.00	£66,125.00	£13,225.00	529
Certificate of Registration	368/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£16,260.00	£32,520.00	6504
Transfer of Ownership	369/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£16,590.00	£33,180.00	6636
Duplicate Certificate of Registration	370/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£4,970.00	£9,940.00	1988

\* not possible to determine the number of applicants who may apply.

Cont ...

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

**Table 6 (Cont'd)**

Item	Question Number	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Current Estimated Revenue yield per annum	Additional Estimated Revenue yield per annum	No of fees charged
Application for a Road Service Licence	371/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£50.00	Depends on the number of applications No new applications received	Nil	
For every road service licence (per vehicle)	372/2005	£100.00	01-12-90	£250.00	£12,200.00	£18,300.00	122
For every transfer of a road service licence	373/2005	£100.00	01-12-90	£250.00	Variable depends on no of transactions	Nil	
For every road service licence (per vehicle)	374/2005	THE SAME AS QUESTION 372/2005					
For every duplicate road service licence	375/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£25.00	Variable depends on no of transactions	Nil	

For every application for the amendment of a road service licence	376/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£50.00	Variable depends on no of transactions	Nil	
For every renewal of a road service licence	377/2005	£10.00	01-12-90	£100.00	£100.00	£22,200.00	10
For a Dealers licence to use one vehicle at any one time	378/2005	£100.00	01-12-90	£200.00	£2,900.00	£2,900.00	29
For a Dealers licence to use one vehicle at any one time	379/2005	THE SAME AS QUESTION 378/2005					
For each additional Dealers licence issued to the same motor trader during the currency of the licence	380/2005	£25.00	01-12-90	£50.00	£3,025.00	£3,025.00	121
For the issue or renewal of a driving licence	381/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	£17,312.00	£4,338.00	866
For the issue of a duplicate driving licence	382/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	£11,149.00	£2,776.00	557
Duplicate Advanced Driving Certificate	383/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£0.00	£0.00	
For the issue of a duplicate driving licence	384/2005	THE SAME AS QUESTION 382/2005					
For inspecting the register, for each hour or part thereof	385/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£1,150.00	£2,300.00	230
For a copy or extract from the register for each folio of 72 words or part thereof	386/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£15.00	£0.00	£0.00	

Cont ...

Contd Answer to Question 481

Table 6 (Cont'd)

Item	Question Number	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Current Estimated Revenue yield per annum	Additional Estimated Revenue yield per annum	No of fees charged
For additional entitlement	387/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	This fee is included in issue of new licence		
For a change in particulars	388/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	This fee is included in issue of new licence		
Exchanging licences from other EEA States	389/2005	£20.00	01-12-90	£25.00	£3,575.00	£875.00	178
For a licence to drive	390/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£20.00	£3,985.00	£11,915.00	797
for a licence to act as a conductor	391/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£20.00	£0.00	£0.00	
For a duplicate of any licence	392/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£20.00	£15.00	£45.00	3
Renewal of licence to drive or conduct a Public Service Vehicle	393/2005	£5.00	01-12-90	£20.00	£625.00	£1875.00	125
A Category	394/2005	£20.00	24-07-97	£30.00	£6,000.00	£3,000.00	300
B Category	395/2005	£20.00	24-07-97	£30.00	£17,200.00	£8,600.00	860
C Category	396/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£1,000.00	£500.00	25
C1 Category	397/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£400.00	£200.00	10
D Category	398/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
D1 Category	399/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£800.00	£400.00	20
B+E Category	400/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£50.00	£400.00	£100.00	10
C+E Category	401/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
C1+E Category	402/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£200.00	£100.00	5
D+E Category	403/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
D1+E Category	404/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£60.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
Amount raised in the Financial Year 2004/2005 for an "E" Category Driving test at a fee of £40.00	405/2005	E category not tested on its own. It is combined with other category					
F to J	406/2005	£20.00	24-07-97	£50.00	£400.00	£600.00	20
K - Moped	407/2005	£20.00	24-07-97	£30.00	£2,800.00	£1,400.00	70
Advance Driving Test	408/2005	£40.00	24-07-97	£50.00	£80.00	£20.00	2
Public Service Vehicle up to 8 seats	409/2005	£25.00	24-07-97	£50.00	£375.00	£375.00	15
Annual licence fee Taxi exceeding 2032 Kgs but not exceeding 2286 Kgs	410/2005	£41.00	1-6-87	£51.00	£41.00	£10.00	1
Theory "A" Category	411/2005	£5.00	1999	£10.00	£3,280.00	£3,280.00	656
Theory "B" Category	412/2005	£5.00	1999	£10.00	£2,340.00	£2,340.00	468
Theory "C" Category	413/2005	£10.00	1999	£15.00	£350.00	£175.00	35
Theory "D" Category	414/2005	£10.00	1999	£15.00	£300.00	£150.00	30
Roadworthiness Testing Private Motor Vehicle	415/2005	£15.00	24-07-97	£20.00	£105,000.00	£35,000.00	7000
Roadworthiness Testing Motor cycle	416/2005	£10.00	24-07-97	£15.00	£20,000.00	£10,000.00	2000

Cont...

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

Table 6 (Cont'd)

Item	Question Number	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Current Estimated Revenue yield per annum	Additional Estimated Revenue yield per annum	No of fees charged
Roadworthiness Testing PSV with seating capacity for more than 8 passengers	417/2005	£30.00	24-07-97	£45.00	£3,000.00	£1,500.00	100
Roadworthiness Testing PSV with seating capacity not for more than 8 passengers	418/2005	£15.00	24-07-97	£20.00	£1,800.00	£600.00	120
Roadworthiness Testing Goods vehicle the unladen weight over 1525 Kilograms	419/2005	£25.00	24-07-97	£40.00	£3,750.00	£2,250.00	3725
Roadworthiness Testing Goods vehicle the unladen weight under 1525 Kilograms	420/2005	£15.00	24-07-97	£20.00	£12,750.00	£4,250.00	12735
Roadworthiness Testing Trailer	421/2005	£15.00	24-07-97	£25.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
Re-exam under Reg 23	422/2005	£13.00	24-07-97	£25.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
For the issue of a duplicate roadworthiness certificate	423/2005	£5.00	24-07-97	£10.00	£500.00	£500.00	100
Personalised Number	424/2005	£100.00	1985	£200.00	£19,600.00	£19,600.00	196
Transfer of Personalised Number	425/2005	£20.00	1997	£50.00	£2,540.00	£4,460.00	127
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 508 Kgs but not exceeding 762 Kgs	426/2005	£23.00	1-6-87	£33.00	£0.00	£0.00	0
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 762 Kgs but not exceeding 1270 Kgs	427/2005	£24.00	1-6-87	£34.00	£144.00	£60.00	6
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 1270 Kgs but not exceeding 1524 Kgs	428/2005	£28.00	1-6-87	£38.00	£728.00	£260.00	26
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 1524 Kgs but not exceeding 1778 Kgs	429/2005	£30.00	1-6-87	£40.00	£1,530.00	£510.00	51
Motor Vehicle Licence Taxi exceeding 1778Kgs but not exceeding 2032 Kgs	430/2005	£35.00	1-6-87	£45.00	£700.00	£200.00	20

**Contd Answer to Question 481**

Table 7

Environment

Item	Question No	Current fee	Last increased	Proposed fee	Estimated Current Revenue Yield p.a.	Additional Estimated Revenue Yield p.a.
<u>Environment</u>						
Street Traders & Pedlars fees (30)	443/05 to 447/05*	£6 (+£6 if use motor vehicle)	1980	£20	£3K	£4K
Provision of hearse	448/05 449/05	£15/£20	1995	£30/£40	£5K	£5K

\* Breakdown sought is not available.

ORAL

**NO. 482 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPETENT AUTHORITY**

Can the Attorney General confirm that the Chief Secretary will be legally empowered to discharge the functions of the Competent Authority of a Member State under the provisions of Article 3 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 1763/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 483 of 2005.

**NO. 483 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**COMPETENT AUTHORITY**

Can the Attorney General confirm that the Chief Secretary will be legally empowered to discharge the functions of the Competent Authority of a Member State under the provisions of Article 4 of Council Regulation (EC) No. 798/2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes, the Chief Secretary is legally empowered to discharge the functions of Competent Authority under the laws of Gibraltar.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 482 AND 483 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the Government appreciate that I am seeking a legal as opposed to a political view? I take it for granted that the political view is that that is the case otherwise we would not be having a motion before the House approving the thing, but having read the text we would like a legal view confirming this before we come to vote on it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not issue legal opinions in the House to the Opposition, but the hon Member is entitled to assume that if the Government bring legislation to this House, the Government which includes their law officers, are satisfied as to the legality of the Bill. If we were not satisfied as to the legality of the Bill then we would not bring it to the House. Therefore he can read the answer to his question, or rather he can read the answer to his request for a legal as opposed to a political assessment of the question by the fact that the Government have brought the legislation. The competence of authorities in Gibraltar is a matter for the laws of Gibraltar, that is the position and therefore the Chief Secretary is and will be competent under the Regulations that we are going to approve to do that. I have to say to the hon Member in partial contradiction of what I have just said, that there are political circumstances in which the Government might bring legislation to the House to make a political point, such as failure to accommodate Gibraltar properly in an EU measure, even if we thought that it was of dubious enforceability, not legality. To ask whether something is legal or not legal is to suggest that it is illegal to do it. It is a question of whether it is enforceable but of course in those circumstances we would

say so. We would make that point to the House, but when the Government bring legislation to this House without comment then the hon Members are entitled to assume that the Government are persuaded that it is fully enforceable and that this is not just a political point in the making, despite the Government's view on enforceability.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I accept entirely what the Chief Minister has said as regards our own law, that is to say the law that we pass here is the law that authorises the Chief Secretary or anybody else to do whatever the law says. What we are going to be asked to do is approve what has already been done by His Excellency the Governor, which can only come in if it is approved by a resolution of the House. So implicit in that is that all the people, including the Governor, believe that what they are doing is what the law provides, but I think if we are going to be voting a resolution in this House the responsible thing for us to do is to look at the text of the relevant Regulation to see whether in our judgement in fact we are permitted by the Regulation to do what we are doing, whether it is legal in that sense. Now, in fact having established that it is the established practice in the United Kingdom Parliament that the Attorney General is asked to give legal opinions on matters on which the House has to take decisions to the Parliament as well as to the Government, then that his role is to advise the Parliament as well as the Government, because the Chief Minister has sometimes said to me that he is not here to give me advice as a lawyer, and I accept that he is not, but I believe that the Attorney General is and that is why the thing is addressed to the Attorney General. I assume that the Government have taken note of the fact that the Regulation in question allows a provision which is in fact a derogation from the requirement of the Regulation. If the Attorney General were here then I would be able to ask him but certainly I hope the Attorney General is here when we come to vote on the motions because we are not happy that what we are doing is in fact explained simply by the answer that we have been given today and we would like to be sure that what we are doing is in fact not challengeable.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the hon Member's view that he is not willing to vote anything that may be challengeable is a very new one, and as I say, he is perfectly entitled to want to know whether something is a proper transposition of the Regulation before he votes on it and to ask that of the Government, and I am telling him that the Government do not do that by giving written legal opinions through the Attorney General or anybody else for that matter, I am saying to the hon Member that it is implicit in the fact that the Government are bringing the legislation that the Government consider that it is a proper way to do things. I would as an aside and without any degree of animosity, say to the hon Member that the proposal that he suggests that the Attorney General should somehow be required to certify the, I cannot remember if he used the word 'legality' or 'compliance' or 'appropriateness or suitability of the laws in this House', before this House were willing to pass them, would set a hugely dangerous precedent at least whilst we have the present constitutional model, so the idea that this House can only pass what the Attorney General is satisfied, is passable or should be passed, is not a view which I think any of us could live with. Of course the suggestion may be made in the context of an innocuous example but once the principle is yielded to, of course it would have much wider application and I am not sure that that is what we want. The Attorney General serves a variety of roles. He is

the Government's legal adviser, he is the Governor's legal adviser and he is the director of public prosecutions. Those are his three distinct constitutional roles.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, and therefore he is not the legal adviser of the Parliament of Gibraltar, unlike his counterpart in the United Kingdom?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not think he is, I do not think that is the case.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, the matter has in fact recently been debated and it is apparently established and accepted going back to Clement Atlee and 1946, so I suggest the matter is researched because it is not an innovation. I must say that in the past the Attorney General has in fact answered questions in this House when I was in Government and when I was in Opposition before. The question is addressed to him and can I just say that when the Chief Minister talks about domestic legislation, this is not domestic legislation. The Regulations are already the laws of Gibraltar. Yes, because directives are what we transpose into our laws but regulations are primary laws of the European Community, and therefore if we have got these two regulations, what we have to do is to put in Gibraltar the machinery to give effect. That machinery is being done by the Governor, not by the Chief Minister or the Attorney General, and the House is being asked to approve what the Governor has already done and published in the Gazette. Now, what the Governor has published in the Gazette permits the competent authority in Gibraltar to do what the regulations permit the competent authority of a Member State to do, except that in the regulation it says the competent authorities are able to do x, y and z and the competent authorities are listed. Now, the point that I would wish Her Majesty's Attorney General to address is, if the competent authority that this House is happy to have, we are not opposed to our competent authority being the Chief Secretary but if the regulations give the power to entities listed in the EU Regulation to depart from the requirements, can we depart from those requirements without being listed? That is the point we would want and we will raise it certainly when we come to having to vote on this, and I hope that we are able to get a clear answer on that point.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think that the hon Member will get a clearer answer. There is only one Government, everybody sitting on this side of the House is part of that Government, I do not share the hon Member's constitutional making on the hoof that the Attorney General is the legal adviser of this House, I have told him whose legal adviser the Attorney General is, I do not believe that the Attorney General is the legal adviser of Parliament. If the Attorney General in the United Kingdom were the legal adviser of the House of Commons, then his opinion about the legality of the United Kingdom's involvement in the war against Iraq, would not have been given to the Prime Minister it would have been given to the Parliament who also had to vote on going to war or not going to war, without the benefit of knowing the Attorney General's legal opinion on the matter. So I do not accept the premise of the Leader of the Opposition's

question or on his attempt to carve out that new constitutional role for the Attorney General. The hon Member also, when he speaks about this being the act of the Governor, well of course it is the hand of the Governor but the hon Member also knows, because I inherited and then further developed his own policy on the matter when I came into office in 1996, is that there are certain issues on which the Governor means Government and the Governor signs and does, I suppose he would refuse to sign things that he thought were improper or illegal, but so long as it is not in an issue which is of his constitutional prerogative, for example internal security and things of that nature, then the Governor intervenes in the signing of these regulations qua Government, and the idea that this regulation is the act of the Governor in the sense that he has instructed it to be drafted, that he has made the various decisions and exercised the various choices and options that it contains, to his knowledge, is not how these things work. He knows that this is the Government, that the Government do the drafting, that the Government make the choices to the extent that there are choices or options in these matters, and then passes the matter up to His Excellency for his signature, because of course the European Communities Ordinance vests the power to actually sign these things in His Excellency. That is the way it happens.

The Government are entirely satisfied that the Chief Secretary has complete competence to exercise these functions in Gibraltar and the European Union regulation does not specify a different competent authority for Gibraltar. It specifies the competent authority for the United Kingdom but Gibraltar is not the United Kingdom, and therefore there is no incompatibility. He may want to argue that the regulation's list of competent authorities is deficient because it is short because there is one item missing in it, and this is a discussion that we have had on a number of occasions, but he cannot argue that it is in contradiction with our regulation. Treasury is listed, in fact it is listed in our own regulation, the Treasury is listed as the competent authority for the United Kingdom. That is what the regulation says, for the United Kingdom the competent authority shall be the Treasury. Question, who is the competent authority for Gibraltar? The regulation does not say, the European Regulation does not say and therefore we are advised that Gibraltar is free to designate its own, which we have done, and the European Community is free to decide whether it wishes to correct the obvious error, at least he will agree that it is a deficiency in the regulation as with so many other cases where we have come across, periodically, where they do not make provision for our competent authority. We do not in those cases accept, and therefore, because they do not list our competent authority therefore the competent authority for Gibraltar must be whoever it lists for the United Kingdom. We do not take that view and neither is he to take that view, well historically Gibraltar has not taken that view and this that we are doing on this occasion, is just a continuation of the basis upon which we have dealt with these situations on all the occasions that they have risen. So the Government are confident and the hon Members can raise their points, whatever points they want including whatever view they might have about these questions, on the debate on the motion.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, I have already indicated that we intend to do that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would urge the hon Member if he would just give way, to resist the temptation to make points which then can come back to haunt us all when it comes to other examples of this, and that this Parliament should not be expressing a view which facilitates decisions by others not to properly include us and not to properly accommodate Gibraltar's constitutional position in EU measures generally. Of course if this House sends the signal that in cases where the directive or the regulation does not specify Gibraltar, then a substantial part of the Parliament in Gibraltar thinks that in those circumstances the competent authority for Gibraltar has to be domestically, that has as he knows a very wide read-across.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I think nothing that I have said has that wide read-across. I think the more the Chief Minister elaborates on possible interpretations of what I may have said, seems to me the more he is running the risk of what he wants to avoid. All I am saying, and the Chief Minister has chosen to answer the question which was specifically addressed to the Attorney General, presumably because the Government's view is that the Attorney General may not answer questions addressed to him, because I know he has acted as Attorney General on a number of occasions here when moving things which the Attorney General is required to move, but now I am assuming that he is not answering my question as acting Attorney General that is, and answering my question as Chief Minister and consequently that it is a political decision that the Attorney General should not answer it. Now, the point of course that we are raising and is being addressed is because on this occasion, this is in our judgement quite different from many other examples that we have come across where competent authorities are given the power to grant licences or do things, which they then do and if people argue that they are not a proper competent authority well then they can challenge the validity of the documents that are issued. But here we have got a situation where what the article in the regulation says, is that what is prohibited and therefore illegal, may by way of derogation be done by the authority listed in Annex 2. I am not a lawyer, Mr Speaker is and so is the Chief Minister, but to me as a citizen faced with reading a law, as a layman, it would seem to me that if the law says 'you are prohibited from doing (a) unless by way of derogation you happen to be one of the people listed in the Annex' and I am not one of those people, then whatever the law of Gibraltar may say this prohibits me from doing it. Now, it is a point on which I would welcome a technical reply from the technical person in the Government, that is the adviser of the Government and the Governor, and I had hoped will be the adviser of this House when there are matters like this to be done, and which certainly seems to be the view in the UK Parliament and it is an issue that came up specifically in relation to the Iraq war. So the matter which has been researched for me by my hon Colleague on my right, has come out in the UK press and Lord Goldsmith has accepted his duty to Parliament on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2003.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

His duty to Parliament to do what?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

To advise Parliament on the legal issues precisely and on the legal advice he gave the Government on the war, which is the example that he gave.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Assuming that the hon Member is correctly citing from a press article and therefore I am assuming that the press article is correct, neither of which I do by the way, then he must conclude that the Attorney General in the UK has singularly failed in his duty to Parliament, because he has singularly failed to advise Parliament of the legality of war. In fact Parliament has only discovered this after it had risen for the election because somebody leaked the opinion.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

No, that is actually entirely wrong. What the Attorney General did was recognise on 10<sup>th</sup> March his duty principally to advise Parliament on legalities, what has been called for repeatedly, and we should not fall into the trap of discussing the politics of another place, what has been called for repeatedly is that the Attorney General should review the advice he gave the Prime Minister, which the Attorney General has repeatedly said is confidential, but in fact on 17<sup>th</sup> March the Attorney General advised Parliament himself in answer to a written question on the legality of the war. He gave his own advice to Parliament on the legality of the war and that was in a written question and it is in Hansard of the UK Commons. The carfuffle, the political issues in the UK, are that he should disclose the confidential advice that he gave the Prime Minister and all the preliminary issues that he considers in that respect, but if the Chief Minister needs other authorities to be persuaded, in 1963 in Hansard it is established by Sir Harold Wilson that it is the duty of the Attorney General to advise the House on legal matters, a duty going beyond his responsibility to this Government and the Crown. So, on that basis, I think it is clear beyond peradventure that the Attorney General is above and beyond everything else the legal adviser to this Parliament, and therefore Opposition Members are entitled to ask the question of the Attorney General 'is x, y or z legal?', in exactly the same terms as the question put to him on 10<sup>th</sup> March, which he accepted he should answer and he did answer on 17<sup>th</sup> March, 'was the war in Iraq legal?', and he answered that positively.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The Government do not accept that what the hon Member is saying is the position simply because he asserts it, and simply because he quotes from two unspecified and un-notified quotations from Harold Wilson. Look, if it were a constitutional position it would not require the political Prime Minister of the day to say it. Frankly, if this hon Member wants to establish whether for the purposes of this House the Attorney General is the adviser of the House, then he has to establish it other than by quoting from press clippings in Question Time. He has got plenty of opportunities, he can bring substantive motions on the question, he can do whatever he likes but the idea that he reads from a newspaper article and then he says 'and then it must be true because I am reading it from a newspaper article', he can hardly expect me to accept it on that basis.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not asking the Chief Minister to accept it on that basis, in fact wherever I have read from I have actually referred him to the Hansards in questions of the House of Commons, and perhaps all we should do is go back and in time for the debate that we are going to have on the regulation, ensure that both the Government and the Opposition have come to a fixed view as to whether that in fact is what is established, which I am very clearly of the view it is, so that the Attorney General's duty when we come to debate the regulation is not an issue for debate as of itself, but certainly I would have thought that the position of the Government has been made clear. That is, that the Attorney General has three duties and none of them is to this Parliament. What I would ask is that the Chief Minister go back, look at the references which I have given him, which are in Hansard and I am happy to give him outside this House again, so that he can review that position in time for the debate.

**MR SPEAKER:**

What does Erskine May say?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Erskine May is silent on the issue, it does not actually address what the duties of any of the parties are in the Parliament. It says what the historical role of the Speaker is et cetera, but as Mr Speaker is fully aware, a lot of Parliamentary procedure is established through the debates and not necessarily contained in the rule book. But I think that we have to look at the substance of the answers given by the Attorney General and come to a very fixed view.

ORAL

**NO. 484 OF 2005**

**THE HON L A RANDALL**

**RETIRED FIRE OFFICERS**

Can Government state if they have now taken a policy decision in respect of representations they have received from retired Senior Fire Officers regarding revalued backdated pay and pension?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 484 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government give a timescale by which they expect to look at this issue and take a policy decision?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it possible for the Chief Minister to say whether this is something they are going to look at at all?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, it is being looked at and has been looked at but I cannot give the hon Member an indication as to when the Government may come to a decision about it. The hon Member should distinguish between looking at something and making a decision about it. They are not synonymous things.

ORAL

**NO. 485 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – 50/50 SALES**

Can Government state if there has been any further response to the current offer for sale of Government 50 per cent share of the co-ownership homes with a 5 per cent uplift, giving the same breakdown as was given in answer to Question 2388 of 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The latest offer closed on 31 October 2004 and late completions were allowed until 31 December 2004. Since the answer to Question No. 2388 of 2004 there have been 41 new completions. The schedule which I hand the hon Member provides a breakdown of the information that he has requested.

**Answer to Question 485**

**Sale of Government share of the current co-ownership scheme**

Estate	Completions in the period from Q2388/2004 to date		Total completions to date	
	No. of completions	Proceeds £	No. of completions	Proceeds £
Brympton	1	28,800	9	241,977
Harbour Views	14	285,643	49	943,568
Montagu Crescent	4	94,524	19	517,265
Montagu Gardens	12	317,846	28	770,766
Sir William Jackson Grove	4	71,810	18	411,416
Westview Park	6	132,200	18	395,067
	<b>41</b>	<b>£930,824</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>£3,280,058</b>

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 485 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What is the position of anybody wanting to buy them after the closing of the last offer? Does it go back to the original system that there was before these offers were made?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There was not an original system.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well people have always had an option to buy out the Government share, from day one.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well people have always had the option yes, but remember this was a reduced formula. The Government have actually not considered what they would do in those circumstances, the offer has closed and nobody has put in a request. It may be possible that the Government from time to time will re-open windows but we have to be careful if we re-open windows in the future, that there has to be some penalty because otherwise we are being unfair to the people who exercise their choices earlier. So every time the Government re-open a window there has to be a tightening of the terms otherwise we are just failing to recompense the people who exercised the choice originally. So I am not ruling out that there will be some further Government schemes in the future but we would have to think very carefully about the terms that that would be on. In the meantime, yes, I suppose there is, I suppose the hon Member is right, people were always free to come to the Government and say 'I will buy you out on these terms', but I think from memory that the Government's commitment to buy at a given annual percentage has expired. I think that only lasted nine or ten years, from memory, and that the Government could now demand to sell their share at market value. That would be, I think, the technical position which is why I suspect so many of these people opted to buy.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact I assume that the change from 4 to 5 per cent that took place from the first offer to the second offer is a reflection of what the Government have just said about tightening it a little bit when going out again. Is that the case?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.

**ORAL**

**NO. 486 OF 2005**

**THE HON C A BRUZON**

**HOUSING – THE SANDS**

Can Government now state how many tenders have been received for the Housing Project on the site commonly known as 'The Sands' by North Mole Road?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Given that a construction contract has not yet been signed, it is commercially inappropriate to provide this information publicly. But I am happy to tell the hon Member privately and confidentially. As soon as a contract is signed the information can then be given publicly.

ORAL

NO. 487 OF 2005

THE HON L A RANDALL

**LAND PROPERTY SERVICES**

Can Government state whether a new contract with Land Property Services is now in place?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Although the main Heads of Terms have been agreed, in principle, the final contract with Land Property Services Ltd has not yet been finalised. This is expected to be ready shortly.

**NO. 488 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**POLICE AND CRIMINAL EVIDENCE ACT 1984**

Have Government made any progress in respect of their consideration of the possibility of implementation of the Police & Criminal Evidence Act 1984?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is not a question of progress, I interpret the question to mean have Government considered the implementation of the report. The answer is yes, Government have studied the original report and met with the authors to discuss their recommendations. We are awaiting further input from the authors, commissioned from them in that meeting and it is Government's hope that they will be in a position to bring legislation to this House later this year.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 488 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that the report of 5<sup>th</sup> October, maybe not of 5<sup>th</sup> October but received by the Chief Minister on 5<sup>th</sup> October, which is as he told me in his last answer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes. I have only had one report. There may now be another as a follow-up, but yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

When was the meeting with the authors held, which led to the request for further information?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I could not tell the hon Member the date without notice of the question but several months ago.

**NO. 489 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES OMBUDSMAN**

What progress, if any, has been made by the Government in relation to the possibility of establishing a Financial Services Ombudsman since the last answer in this House?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are not working on this possibility at this time, and therefore the question of progress does not arise.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 489 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is really the nature of the answer that I was given in Question No. 1913 of 2004 but I was told that that might change. I reminded the Chief Minister then, in October, that the answer he had given in answer to Question No. 446 of 2004 was actually considerably different to the answer and expectation raised by his answer to Question No. 1913 of 2004. In fact in answer to Question No. 446 of 2004 the Chief Minister was speaking in terms of we will have a financial services ombudsman, the only issue is who is going to pay for it, we will find out when we get there in terms of what powers he had or he was going to have. Can I ask the Chief Minister what it is that has changed his attitude to the implementation of this office?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, no he cannot because I do not accept the premise of his question. I do not accept that there has been any change nor do I accept that he has correctly summarised the import of my previous answers. I certainly remember telling him that the Government had in principle no objection to a Financial Services Ombudsman and recognised that indeed it may be a valuable addition to our Finance Centre. I certainly also remember telling him that there was certainly an issue in the Government's mind about how it would be financed, which had not been resolved, so he cannot convert whatever he chooses to draw by way of expectations from my words and he cannot convert those expectations into Government commitments. How he chooses to interpret my remarks and the degree of expectation that he chooses to raise in his own mind is not something that I can answer for. The position

that I have told him in the past is as I have just told him now in the last 30 seconds. However, what I am telling him today is the answer to his question. He does not ask what is the Government's view on the possibility of establishing an Ombudsman, he has asked me what progress, if any, have the Government made in relation to bringing one about and I am telling him that no progress has been made because the question of progress does not arise, because at the moment at this time, as the answer says, it is not being worked on. That might change but if he asks me what progress is being made on something that the Government are not engaged in at all, the answer can only be at this time the issue of progress does not arise because it is not being worked on. That is the answer. If he asks me well what view do the Government have on a Financial Services Ombudsman and do the Government think it is a good, bad or mediocre idea?, I would then give him the views that indeed I have just given him in answer to supplementaries, from which he would presumably recall and recollect the answers that I have always given him on this.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Except of course I am not just summarising his previous answers in a way that might be self-serving. In fact, on page 781 of the Hansard for the First Session of 2004 in answer to Question No. 446, he said, and I accept that this was not part of his prepared answer and we were debating across the floor of the House but he did say this, *'I would expect our Financial Services Ombudsman, when we have one, to be the same sort of creature with the same sort of powers and roles as is the norm in the UK, which is what we did with our Public Services Ombudsman. We got all the legislation from comparable territories, we based ours on Malta, New Zealand and Ireland, primarily to make sure that we were doing more or less what everyone was doing, and I assume we will do the same for the Financial Services Ombudsman too'*. Now when we finished that Question Time, I was very encouraged by the Chief Minister's attitude who had then answered a question of mine prefaced with 'will the Government create and establish the office of Financial Services Ombudsman?'. In his answer last time in Question No. 1913 of 2004, he gave a different impression saying there was nobody senior in Government involved, there might be somebody junior beavering away at it, there were lots of requests for things that Government might consider were good ideas but this was not going to be something that they were going to initiate themselves at this stage. It might change he said, that is why I asked whether there was any progress, and has it changed and I assume from what he has said that the answer is no.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Exactly, I could have just said no there is no progress but that would have given him the false impression that it is being worked on and that there is no progress because we are stuck on issues. There is no progress because there is no work being done on it and that is what the answer is. If he asks me next time and still no work has been done, I would have to tell him the same thing. If on the other hand next time he asks me there has been some work done on it then that is what the answer will reflect but the answer does not address the substance of whether the Government are going to do one, are not going to do one, think it is a bad idea, think it is a good idea et cetera. That is the point.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes, I appreciate that. Clearly I think there was agreement across the floor of the House that it would be a good idea. What I am saying is that in the first answer the Chief Minister gave me the impression that it was a good idea and that it was going to happen and that now we have moved to a stage where it is unlikely to happen or at least it is not at the top of the agenda for things to happen. Perhaps the next question will be this: Is it not at the top of the agenda because the issue of costs has been determined in a way that is going to require this House to fund it, and it is not going to be funded by the industry?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, there is no specific reason why it is not being worked on or is not on the agenda. Certainly, the hon Member says it would be a good idea, well that depends on how it pans out. I do not think it is a good idea that the taxpayer should constantly take on its shoulder the financing of activities that in other countries are financed directly or indirectly by the industry. But that issue has not arisen because the Government have not consulted anybody about it and no one has had the opportunity to say whether they think it is a good idea that they should fund it or that it is not a good idea. So the answer to his last supplementary is no, neither that nor any other specific substantive issue in relation to the model is the cause why there is no progress.

**NO. 490 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**BETTING INDUSTRY**

Can Government say how many persons are employed in the betting industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by company and by nationality, showing how many are Gibraltarian, as at 30 June 2004 and 31 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This data has not been compiled for the specific dates requested, but is available as at 1 April 2005 and 30 September 2004. As at 1 April 2005 a total of 1,107 persons were employed by 15 companies, this is based on information supplied by the gaming operators themselves. This compares to 950 employed by 14 companies on 30 September 2004. I hand the hon Member the information.

**OFFSHORE GAMING COMPANIES - EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2004**

**Answer to Question 490**

	<u>Gibraltarian</u>	<u>Other British</u>	<u>Spanish</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Ladbrokes (Gibraltar) Limited	15	42	4	1	62
Victor Chandler (International) Limited	69	174	13	54	310
BAW International Limited	12	15	3	18	48
Stan James (Gibraltar) Limited	6	76	0	7	89
Trafalgar Betting and Gaming Limited	3	11	0	1	15
St Minver Limited	4	18	0	3	25
Cassava Enterprises (Gibraltar) Limited	63	118	6	89	276
Carmen Media Group Limited (Formerly Demmysportsbet .com Ltd)	22	15	2	11	50
Digibet Limited	0	2	1	1	4
Eurobet (Gibraltar) Limited	1	1	1	7	10
Globet.com Group Limited	0	1	0	3	4
International Betting Association Limited *	0	0	0	0	0
Bay Management Limited	5	5	1	14	25
Mansion (Gibraltar) Limited	5	11	0	16	32
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>950</b>

\* In process of recruitment

Source : Office of the Financial & Development Secretary

Contd.....

**OFFSHORE GAMING COMPANIES - EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS AS AT 1 APRIL 2005**

Contd Answer to Question 490

	<u>Gibraltarian</u>	<u>Other British</u>	<u>Spanish</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Ladbrokes (Gibraltar) Limited	16	44	4	1	65
Victor Chandler (International) Limited	69	172	16	59	316
BAW International Limited	12	17	3	25	57
Stan James (Gibraltar) Limited	7	91	1	7	106
Trafalgar Betting and Gaming Limited	4	16	0	1	21
St Minver Limited	6	23	0	8	37
Cassava Enterprises (Gibraltar) Limited	55	116	8	70	249
Carmen Media Group Limited (Formerly Dermmysportsbet .com Ltd)	22	15	2	9	48
Digibet Limited	0	2	1	1	4
Eurobet (Gibraltar) Limited	0	1	0	4	5
Globet.com Group Limited	0	1	0	5	6
International Betting Association Limited	2	0	1	2	5
Electroworks Limited (Formerly Bay Management Limited)	29	43	4	31	107
Mansion (Gibraltar) Limited	5	31	1	36	73
Futuresbetting.com Limited	1	7	0	0	8
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>1107</b>

Source : Office of the Financial & Development Secretary

**NO. 491 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**SALE OF S/Y PERKEO**

Have the proceeds of sale of the S/Y "Perkeo" sold by auction on 14<sup>th</sup> July 2004 now been earmarked or ring fenced exclusively for investment in respect of law enforcement?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

As I already informed the hon Member in answer to Question No. 1972 of 2004, S/Y "Perkeo" was not sold by auction as the reserve price was not met. It was subsequently sold by private sale for £81,579. The proceeds were credited to the Consolidated Fund.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 491 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In fact, in answer to Question No. 2413 we also dealt with this issue and the Chief Minister had told me then that no decision had yet been made, this I think was December 2004. As to the use of the funds, once they are in the Consolidated Fund I imagine there is no longer any possibility of them being ring fenced for law enforcement, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, except to the extent that the Consolidated Fund finances law enforcement.

**NO. 492 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCIES**

When will the Government be publishing and circulating information on what procedures citizens should follow in the event of an environmental emergency?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A booklet which provides the public with general advice in the event of a major incident, including an environmental emergency, has been compiled. It is proposed to publish the booklet shortly. I cannot tell the hon Member exactly when.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 492 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

That is not a million miles from where we were when the Chief Minister answered Question No. 1975 of 2004. He told me then that he expected that he would be able to do it before the end of the year 2004 and Question No. 1975 was answered in October. We are now five months almost into this year, it was not done before the end of last year and has not been done yet. Can I ask the Chief Minister whether 'shortly' in his answer means before the end of this term, before the summer or are we looking at the second part of next year or is there not yet any possibility of telling us when?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I cannot honestly give him an accuracy of when. The hon Member can ask the Government's view of things and he can be critical of the Government if he wants to for not doing things as quickly as he would want to but he cannot convert himself into the Government's time keeper in respect of our policies. In respect of our policies we do them when we either want to do, or when we can do them, very often it is not a matter of choice, it is a question of prioritisation of resources, legislative and drafting time. My understanding is that there is now a draft available for final consideration. I dare not give him a more accurate indication. I would be very surprised if it was not published this year. It is possible that it will be published before the summer. So I dare not say to him 3 weeks or 4 weeks because it may not be 3 or 4 weeks and then he will be holding me to the time table, or he will be trying to hold me to the time table. So the answer is that this is something which could emerge in the next month

or two or could wait until after the summer. As I say, the long stop is that I cannot think of any reason, given that the draft is already at such an advanced stage, why it should certainly not be out before the end of the year and I would expect it to be out much sooner than the end of the year.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister by way of further supplementary, what the problem is with the booklet at this stage? Is it that it has had to go through more drafts than expected, who is it with, is it with him for review or with another body?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well lots of people have had an input. I think that the position right now is that it has come back to my office and it is awaiting our input and our confirmation as to content. Yes, I think that is now the position.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In those circumstances if it is with the Chief Minister, I suppose in his capacity of whatever the Cobra equivalent in Gibraltar is, and he has this bunker there under No 6 Convent Place, can I urge him please to ensure that this is towards the top of his agenda because it is something that obviously causes some people a lot of concern and could be very important in the unlikely event, I hope, that we ever were to have an environmental emergency, although I do not know whether people would be reaching for the booklet if we do.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the fact that it is now with me does not mean that it will not require further modifications as a result of being seen by me, but of course the possibility for environmental catastrophes did not arise for the first time on 16 May 1996, and previous Governments did not think that in order to satisfy the concerns of those people who may be concerned that the way to satisfy them is to put out a booklet. Now, I accept that with the passage of time the way in which societies gear up for accidents and emergencies changes, and it may be that in the 1980s there was not the same awareness, public consciousness as there is now, because of terrorism and other things. I accept that expectations move on but if the hon Member has looked at the one that the UK issued he will see that, I mean we should not make too much fuss, at the end of the day it deals with some quite banal things like making sure one has a torch at home and if there is an explosion do not please run in the direction of the explosion, run in the opposite direction. Well I like to think that most people in Gibraltar are sensible enough not to need to be told that. So we must not either create the impression that this pamphlet when it is issued will sort of be the panacea that will provide, miraculously, a sort of defensive and protective shield around the community. It actually is, if he has seen the one in the United Kingdom, it is best described perhaps by his last rhetorical question just before he sat down, which is not a reason for not publishing one but nor should we exaggerate the effect and value and the practical purpose. Most of it is common sense.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Let me start where the Chief Minister started. I do not think it is fair to go for the 1996 get out of jail free card. If it was not done by 1996 how dare one press me to do it, I have only been in Government for almost 10 years, I think that is unfair. Let us get to the substance of this issue. I note that the Chief Minister rises to criticise the first two GSLP administrations with an ease and a disposition that he does not really lend to his criticisms of the AACR administrations before then. It may be that he does not want to offend those who might have been linked to those administrations or that he feels free to offend those of us who are associated with the GSLP, but so be it. The nub of the issue here is fairly narrow and we should not allow partisan concerns to enter this debate, and I am sorry to say that I think it is the Chief Minister who threw the first stone in that respect. These booklets, although they may seem banal to him and to me to an extent, to an extent because we need to know what different areas of Gibraltar we need to be going to if an explosion were in the south, where in the north should we congregate, what are the procedures that are in place in the event of a major emergency, are issues that are important. Both of us will agree on that. Environmentally and because of terrorism and for a number of other reasons these things have become more important and continue to become more important, and that is why I urge him please despite his remarks to ensure that it is at the top of his agenda, if at all possible.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I can agree with the last bit of what he said but on the politics of it I really cannot agree with the hon Member so let us amuse ourselves with a bit of banter. There is no point asking rhetorically as he just did, well why does he offend the GSLP, why does he not refer back to the AACR? Why is he picking on us poor GSLP, oppressed GSLP Members of the House? I would have thought the answer to his question was so perfectly obvious that I am surprised that he made the point. The AACR do not stand in this House today criticising this Government for not doing things, or not doing things quickly enough that they did not think was important enough to do at all during the years that they were in office. I do not say to the hon Members that because they did not do something when they were in office that they are not free politically or in any other sense to demand that we do it, but I think it is relevant and the hon Members cannot escape this, and he can call it a 'get out of jail free' card when he likes, I think that is a wholly inappropriate analogy, he cannot escape from the reality that the position that the hon Members adopted on a particular question, not this one necessarily, when they were in office, the extent to which they attached importance to that question when they were in office, the extent to which they bothered to deal with the issue when they were in office, is a relevant consideration to take into account when assessing the credibility of the views that they express on it when they demand that we do it. It does not disentitle them from demanding, it does not disentitle them from being the watchdog or the time keeper or whatever he wants to call it in relation to it, but it is a perfectly legitimate device for the Government to say, 'well hang on chaps, do not be quite so demanding of us. In other words, do not make the issue so important now than you attached importance to it when you were in Government and when you were in a position to do something about it'. I see that I am not alone in this because I see that in the United Kingdom Parliament I often come across Mr Blair and other members of his Government reminding the Conservatives of what they did when they were in office, or what they did not do when they were in office. It is perfectly legitimate. It does not address ones entitlement to do it now. As Members of the House of Assembly today, Opposition Members are entitled to hold the Government to account on each and

every issue that they please regardless of what their position was when they were in Government, but it is equally true that in terms of the political response, as opposed to the factual response, in terms of the political response to the questions we are entitled to draw the distinction between the Opposition's position on an issue now and the Opposition's performance on that issue when they were in Government. I do not think that the hon Member is being fair when he describes that as causing offence to the GSLP as opposed to causing offence to the AACR. It is not causing offence, it is the normal political rough and tumble, which we have not invented in Gibraltar, and that is what political process is. Of course it is not just the Opposition that can practice political process, the Government can take part in the political process as well so I do not see it as offending the GSLP as opposed to the AACR. If there was somebody from the AACR here doing the same thing we would say the same things. Of course we cannot do it to the Liberal Party because of course they have not been in office before, so when it comes to the Liberal Party we are limited to saying 'the party with which you are now in an alliance and the party whose manifesto you tore up', we can say all that but we cannot say 'when you were in office'. So I would urge the hon Member please not to be so sensitive, it is not a question of causing him offence, it is just a question of the politics of the matter.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister can rest assured that my sensitivities are not offended. I have a very thick skin. He and I know that a lot of what we say when we use the word 'offence' does not mean offence of a personal nature. I am not one of those that will take it that way, whatever our debates may be and however acrimonious they may get on the issues, whenever we get outside this door, as far as I am concerned, no offence is taken. That is what we are here for but one of the things that is important when dealing with a Government that has been in office now for nine and a half years is to say 'well look, Gentlemen, you have been in office for nine and a half years, you are responsible for the state of Gibraltar today'. Of course that Government can turn around and say 'yes and look at all the brownie points we believe the people of Gibraltar should give us as a result and why they invest us and continue to invest us with their confidence'. But if they do that, if they rely on their nine and a half years in office as their badge of achievement they must also accept that they have had longer in office today than the GSLP had between 1988 and 1996. So they are, in my view and it is simply this point that I make, responsible for the state in which we find ourselves in today. Now, as an Opposition, we will say 'well look, these aspects of our society still need a lot of work, you are neglecting them et cetera., that is our role and they will say 'well look, these aspects of our society have improved dramatically in this way and that way'. That is the cut and thrust, the rough and tumble of our political debate but on this question where we are really talking about an environmental booklet, I think we have done it to death. As long as it comes out quickly I will buy my copy.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I agree with the hon Member's analysis but not with the conclusions that he draws. I agree that the Government are responsible for things that we have chosen not to do in eight or nine years, just as we are responsible for the things that they have done. The fact that the Opposition did not do it when they were in office in no way relieves the Government of their duty to account for the fact that they may not have done it either. That is not what I was saying. What I was saying to the hon Member is that when he says 'why have you not done this?'. Look, take for example the question of

the Financial Services Ombudsman, the Finance Centre, much as it has improved and prospered since we have been in office, did not actually start when we were in office. So, if he asks me every three months why is there not a Financial Services Ombudsman? When is it going to be done? Why is there no more progress? He is attaching a degree of importance to it that his own party did not attach to it when they were in Government in a position to have introduced a Financial Services Ombudsman and they gave it no importance. That is the point that I am making, not that the fact that they did it or did not do it relieves the Government of their duty as Government today. I fully accept his analysis in that respect, but that does not mean that when the Opposition Members are castigating Government or criticising Government, or holding Government to account on a basis which is so hugely different, on a particular issue I am not talking now about this environmental matter, but hugely different to their attitude and position when they were in Government, it is legitimate for the Government to say 'well yes, we do have a plan to put an Ombudsman or to do this and to do that, but look get off my back because when you guys had the chance to do it you chose not to do it'. That is the only point that I am making which is a slightly different analysis and of course, the reason why I have taken some time to go into this issue into a somewhat detailed and extended basis, is that I detected in the hon Members, they almost poo poo whenever the Government remind them of their own record on something, they say 'why do you keep on looking backwards and not forwards?'. The reason why we look backwards and not forward is for the reasons that I have explained. The hon Members cannot when exercising critical judgement from the Opposition benches, think that they are entitled to be given the credit for having no record in Government themselves. It is just not a realistic expectation on the hon Members' part, which is not to be confused with the question of whether the Government are relieved or not relieved of the responsibility today, which I acknowledge and accept from him is clearly vested in us regardless of how bad their record might have been when they were last in office.

**NO. 493 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**FINANCIAL SERVICES – CONFERENCES**

Can Government give the cost, with a breakdown, of attending all and any conferences which related or were considered to relate to financial services in the months of January to March 2005, giving the offices of those who might have attended as part of the Government delegation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Finance Centre in conjunction with The Society of Trust & Estate Practitioners (STEP) held a Private Clients Seminar in Manchester on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2005.

The Government delegation consisted of:

Mr James Tipping	Finance Centre Director
Mr Joseph Macano	Director Licensing Unit
Mrs Sabrina Ramagge	Executive Officer
Mr Marcus Killick	Commissioner – Financial Services Commission

The breakdown of the costs is as follows:-

Flights and Accommodation	£1,170.00
Travel Expenses	£ 722.15
Seminar Costs	<u>£1,350.00</u>
Total	£3,242.15

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 493 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is that the only conference identified for that period?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, on financial services yes.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister would not have the cost with him of attending the conference in Philadelphia which occurred, I think, in April and is therefore not covered by the principal question, but if he has it as a further titbit to provide I would be grateful for it and save myself asking next time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have glanced at the back of my hand and it just happens not to be written there. I am afraid I have not got the answer.

ORAL

NO. 494 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Have any applications to form a Protected Cell Company been submitted in the months of January to March 2005 which remain pending consideration or which have been rejected?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 495 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 495 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**PROTECTED CELL COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many Protected Cell Companies were registered in Gibraltar in the months of January to March 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The Government are not aware of any pending applications and no Protected Cell Companies were registered in the months of January to March 2005.

ORAL

NO. 496 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

How many tax exempt companies have terminated their tax exemption certificates in the months of January to March 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 497 and 498 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 497 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many tax exempt company certificates have been issued in the months of January to March 2005 stating how many were issued before and how many after the coming into effect of the new arrangements required by the EU Commission as part of its state aid investigation?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 496 and 498 of 2005.

**NO. 498 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Can Government state how many companies are presently awaiting the grant of exempt status dependent on the maximum number allowed under the new arrangements required by the EU Commission as part of its state aid investigation?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 496**

The number of tax exempt companies which have terminated their tax exempt certificates total 190. This figure is made up as follows:

January	55
February	53
March	82

“Termination” is interpreted as being companies which have returned their certificate and no longer require their tax exempt status.

**Answer to Question No. 497**

There were 491 tax exempt certificates issued in the months of January to March 2005, out of which 464 were issued before and 45 after the commencement of the appropriate measures conditions.

**Answer to Question No. 498**

There are about 832 companies awaiting the granting of exempt status.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 496 TO 498 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Will the Chief Minister tell us what criteria is being used for the grant of certificates to those 832? Is it simply a list system or are there other criteria related to the creation

of employment et cetera? I have heard in the industry discussion of such criteria but I do not know that it is objectively available.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

There is not a quota system. The system is still being refined because of course it is a learning curve for everybody. We had no idea what the demand would be, indeed we do not know how much of these is just built up over a period of time, because of course there has been a suspension of applications for more than just a day, so this figure carries back, it has got to be audited because some of these demands might have gone away but the applications have not been formally withdrawn. So the system for managing the quota that we are allowed to issue will be developed as and when it goes along. Of course the Government are concerned not to create a sort of a grey market in these things. If there is more demand than supply, which would be good news, because it would mean that despite the difficulties the Finance Centre is continuing to attract business, the question then arises whether it is in a position to satisfy that demand. That said, some criteria have already been put in place for deciding, the principal one of which is that priority should be given to exemption certificates for economic activities by the certificate applicant. So for example, if there was a contest between a certificate required by a financial services provider, a bank, an insurance company, fund manager, something which is itself a substantive economic activity in its own right, that would get priority to an application on behalf of Mr Smith for his private investment company, on the basis that that does not generate as much employment in Gibraltar and economic activity. But it is very early days and of course a lot of this demand will be satisfied because traditionally, come the 1<sup>st</sup> April, a lot of people forfeit their exemption certificate by not paying the tax due. So that is the opportunity in the year when there is the largest amount of vacancies created and I cannot tell him, unfortunately, because the information has not been provided to me of how many have gone. I do have the information actually, 810 companies forfeited their exempt status on 1<sup>st</sup> April for non-payment of the tax, so most of the cases outstanding at the end of March could be dealt with. We now have to apply to the 810 that have forfeited their certificate on 1<sup>st</sup> April, the Finance Centre now has to calculate by the application of the rule, how many of those can be re-issued, then there has got to be an assessment of the 832 applications, they have got to be given and a small margin have got to be kept back for urgent applications between now and the next forfeiture because it would be terrible if somebody came up saying they would like to set up an insurance operation and ask for an exempt certificate and being told that they have to wait until somebody goes out of the revolving door. So we are always going to keep a small batch for the major economic activity. That is how the system is.

ORAL

NO. 499 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

How many companies have been removed from the companies register in the months of January to March 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 500 and 504 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 500 OF 2005

THE HON F R PICARDO

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government list the companies formed in Gibraltar in the months of January to March 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 499 and 504 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 501 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**INSURANCE INDUSTRY**

What is the total number of persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar giving a breakdown by company and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 502 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 502 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING SECTOR**

Can Government state how many persons were employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by bank and by nationality (showing how many are Gibraltarian) in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member has requested is on the attached table.

**Answer to Question 502**

**Answer to Question 501**

Persons employed in the insurance industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by nationality.

Month	No. of Employers	No. of Employees	Gib	Other British	Spanish	Moroccan	Other EEC	Other Non-EEC
January-05	32	235	133	82	15	0	3	2
February-05	31	230	130	78	15	0	5	2
March-05	31	232	132	78	15	0	5	2

**Answer to Question 502**

Persons employed in the banking sector in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by nationality.

Month	No. of Employers	No. of Employees	Gib	Other British	Spanish	Moroccan	Other EEC	Other Non-EEC
January-05	15	662	473	106	33	2	46	2
February-05	15	672	477	109	33	2	49	2
March-05	15	683	486	109	36	2	47	3

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 501 AND 502 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I ask the Chief Minister, I ask him this question because it relates to parts of the financial services industry. I assume that the information comes principally from the Employment Service and not from any part of his Ministry which relates to financial services and he has answered it because it is financial services and I think Mr Azopardi used to answer before. Would it be appropriate for me to direct this question to the Minister for Employment, with whom I have an arrangement, as it is statistical information which can be provided as part of that arrangement also, because it is employment and not necessarily financial services?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, he could only do that if indeed the source is the Employment Service and I cannot be sure that it is. Unlike the previous question the answer to which prompted me to say that it was provided, the gaming question that his Colleague asked, I cannot confirm to him what the source of this information is, whether it is the Employment service or the industry. If it is the industry then the Employment service would not have the information. If it is the Employment service then of course they do have the information and he is free to ask the Minister if he wants to.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I write to him, then perhaps we can determine that afterwards? Perhaps that might be the easiest way.

**NO. 503 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**BANKING LICENCES**

Can Government state whether any new banking licences have been issued in the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There have been no new banking licences issued in the months of January to March 2005.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 503 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister will recall that this Question used to be phrased in terms of whether applications for banking licences had been received, rather than licences issued. In fact, it was answered like that to the Hon Dr Garcia by his predecessor and to me by him on a number of occasions in this House, until the answer to Question No. 1946 of 2004 where it became apparent that the Commissioner for Financial Services had decided that it was not appropriate that the information be given. As a result, the Chief Minister told us that he did not share the view of the Financial Services Commission in that respect, in the decision no longer to provide the information and that he was going to raise the issue with him. I would be grateful if the Chief Minister could tell me whether he has raised the issue with the Financial Services Commissioner and whether in future we will once again receive an answer to that question in this House?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The matter remains on the agenda for a meeting that has not yet taken place between me and the Financial Services Commissioner. Let me say that I find it wholly unacceptable that the Government of Gibraltar should not be provided with this information by the Financial Services Commissioner. If he does not agree to vary his position then the Government will give serious consideration to introducing legislation requiring him to do so. It is not acceptable for any part of the public administration, however independent of Government it may be, refuses to provide information to the Government which is relevant to the macro-economic management and assessment and evaluation of the economy of Gibraltar.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

May I press the Chief Minister that in the event that we were to get to the stage where the Government once more are able to have that information, because as he did tell us and is reflected in his answer, it is also the Government that are no longer receiving the information. Once the Government are again in receipt of it, the Government will revert to the practice of answering the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course, we are only not providing it now because we have not got it ourselves. If the hon Member asks the question and we have the information he will get it.

ORAL

**NO. 504 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COMPANIES REGISTER**

Can Government state how many companies have been redomiciled out of Gibraltar in each month from January to the end of March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The information the hon Member seeks is on the attached schedule.

**Answer to Question 504**

**Answer to Question 499**

The following companies were removed from the Companies Register in the months of January to March 2005.

January	225
February	161
March	318

**Answer to Question 500**

The following companies were formed in the months of January to March 2005.

January	317
February	284
March	166

**Answer to Question 504**

The following Companies have lodged applications for consent to re-domicile out of Gibraltar in the months from January to March 2005.

The Registrar gives consent 30 days after the notice is issued and consent is given almost without exception.

January	127
February	27
March	40

ORAL

**NO. 505 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 2 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 2 status in Gibraltar as at the end of each of the months of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 506 and 507 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 506 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 3 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 3 status in Gibraltar in each month from January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 505 and 507 of 2005.

**NO. 507 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CATEGORY 4 STATUS**

Can Government state how many individuals joined the register of people with Category 4 status in each month of January to March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In the months of January to March 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 2 status:-

January	0
February	6
March	2

In the months of January to March 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 3 status:-

January	5
February	4
March	4

In the months of January to March 2005 the following number of individuals joined the register of people with Category 4 status:-

January	1
February	1
March	1

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 505 TO 507 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In respect of Categories 3 and 4, does the Chief Minister have the information to tell me how many of those, if any, were Gibraltarians?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Is the hon Member suggesting, which may or may not be the case, that some of them might be Gibraltarians? I know that we have extended status to one or two individual post holders, for example, but I am not presently aware that we have given Category 3 or 4 status to any Gibraltarian. It may have happened, is that what he is after?

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am under the impression that there are more than two, as I understand it, Gibraltarians who have either Category 3 or Category 4 status. I know that for example there are post holders in the Government who do, not necessarily Gibraltarians. For example, the Chief Executive Officer of the GHA is either Category 3 or 4 but he is not a Gibraltarian, but I think there are a number of Gibraltarians who have this status. One of them actually is also a post holder in the Government and he is one of the persons of whom I ask questions about frequently in relation to one of the portfolios that the Chief Minister has. Has there been any new Gibraltarian in these months.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would have to check, I have not got that information. If the hon Member writes to me I will give it to him.

**NO. 508 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TEP's**

Will the Government now state what answers they have provided to the Committee of the TEP Plan Association and/or their solicitors in respect of their request for assistance in pursuit of the claims of these parties and what action the Government are taking or have taken, if any, in pursuance of the said issues?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are in on-going discussions with the TEP Plan Association and their solicitors and it is not appropriate to give the hon Member an account of on-going discussions.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 508 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Can I just tell the Chief Minister that if it were to become necessary as a result of the conclusion of those discussions to bring legislation to this House for any purpose, certainly he will be able to count with the support of the Opposition in respect of the issues that I understand may be considered in that respect.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am grateful to the hon Member for his open cheque book offer of supporting the Government in whatever legislation they wish to bring on this matter. I am grateful to him for that indication. It may well need legislation.

**NO. 509 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CIVIL SERVANTS**

Will the Government state whether they allow any civil servants to stay in employment over the age of 60?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Yes, exceptionally.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 509 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In dealing with those exceptions what criteria do the Government apply to their decision-making?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well the most typical case would be when inadequate succession planning would result in a gap in availability of experience, knowledge and expertise upon the retirement of a particular officer. On the industrial side, I think on some occasions the Government have exercised some latitude when allowing an officer to serve for a bit longer would have carried him across or to the end of a personal financial requirement, like children finishing university in June 'please can I stay until June?', that sort of thing.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

So it is very much on an ad-hoc basis that this criteria is applied. There is no objective criteria which is in writing and which I could have a copy of and things like that, it is ad-hoc.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, because it is very exceptional. I think there have only been two or three cases that I am personally aware of. Well, they all come to my office, not necessarily to me

but to the Chief Secretary at least. I think there have only been two or three cases in the nine years that we have been in this job, that I am aware of.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Do the industrial workers have the option to either go at 65 or 60?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Non-industrial staff must go at 60 and may go at 55. Industrial staff must go at 65 and may go at 60.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The Chief Minister in answering my question referred to the criteria applied to industrial staff and to non-industrial staff. Am I therefore to assume that the exceptions in respect of the industrial staff would only kick in when asking to stay on after 65 not 60?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**NO. 510 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**AIR MILES**

What is the Government's policy on the use by Ministers of "Executive Club" miles accumulated by them when flying on Government business with British Airways?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

We have not formulated any policy in relation to this matter and the system in place is therefore still the one operating when we arrived in office in May 1996, which by the way applies to everybody, Ministers and everybody else that are publicly funded to fly, and that is that the Government do not take the view that this is a public asset. In other words, the Government do not control this in any way. I have recently been told that in fact that practice has changed in the UK where it used to be so some time back and that now in the UK, since they changed their practice several years ago, air miles earned on journeys paid for with tax payers funds can only be redeemed when travelling on official business. But that has never been the practice in Gibraltar and is not the practice now.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 510 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I understand in any event that the air miles system came into effect after 1996. Be that as it may, the Executive Club air miles system came into play after 1996, I think in 1998. In its present incarnation certainly, it may be that there was a precursor of it which also allowed the accumulation of miles. Does it not make sense that if the tax payer is funding the ticket that gives rise to the miles, it should be the tax payer that is entitled to redeem it? Perhaps the Chief Minister could tell us whether in fact any of his Ministers have travelled privately using air miles accumulated when paid for by the tax payer, and whether he will look into changing that policy so that there is a very clear policy from now on, and I accept that there might not have been guidance to prevent that in the past, from now on so that we adopt the attitude in the United Kingdom that if the tax payer has paid for the ticket that has given rise to the miles, the tax payer should take advantage of those miles as well.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, taking his first point first, the hon Member is wrong when he says that the Executive air miles system was introduced in 1996. It is extraordinary how everything starts in May 1996, air miles, MRSA, everything starts on 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996 which is rather peculiar. I do not know where the hon Member gets the view that air miles, in fact from personal memory I can tell him that when I was.....

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Point of order. Just to make it easier for the Chief Minister, I am not talking about air miles, he must not fall into the trap about talking about air miles because air miles are one particular type of frequent flyer mile and they are accumulated in many different ways. We are talking about Executive Club miles with British Airways and the One World Alliance which are different, and I think those are the ones that came into existence, I am not saying on 17<sup>th</sup> May 1996 I think it was actually after that, but not air miles although they have the same effect.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think anything in terms of what we call them, I assume that the hon Member's whole point relates to whatever it is called, whatever the scheme is, however it develops, he is referring to the mechanism whereby if one flies with an airline they give free miles that are then accumulated, and if he calls them Executive Club air miles it does not really matter. What he is asking me is, and it is a perfectly proper question, when Ministers and other public officials for that matter I suppose he means to include, earn air miles by virtue of journeys undertaken which have been paid for by the tax payer, who gets the benefit of the free travel for which those air miles can be redeemed? Is it the tax payer or is it the person that flew to earn them? If that is what he means, which is what I had assumed he means, he is wrong to suggest that that started in May 1996 because as I was about to explain to him when he got up to try and correct me, I well remember when I was the Leader of the Opposition flying to the Bahamas with the then Minister for Government Services and having to deviate to some desk or other because he wanted to check whether his air miles had been punched in to the card. So he is not right, I know he is not right and there are instances to demonstrate that he is not right. That said, the issue of whether air miles should only be, in other words whether we should now like the UK has done, make this one of those things which would be an indirect financial benefit from tax payers funds is moot for debate. Ultimately, it is not so much a matter of Government policy, the Government could adopt a policy politically against it but actually it is a matter for the Principal Auditor to decide whether it is a proper or an improper use of public funds. To my knowledge the Principal Auditor has neither before or after 16<sup>th</sup> May 1996 expressed a view on this issue one way or the other. Whether that is because he does not know that the practice exists, or whether it is because he knows that it does exist and has formed a view I cannot say to him. His final question was whether I would look into the possibility of considering adopting a policy to that effect. Well, I am willing to consider it, I mean if somebody makes a case to the Government that is persuasive on the question that it is an improper advantage derived from the use of public funds, then of course I will certainly be willing to very strongly consider the possibility of changing the policy. Let me say that it would be useable by the tax payer, in certain cases yes and in certain cases no, because these air miles are not usually transferable away from the individual. So, for example, if I earn air miles when I go to New York to the United Nations, I suppose it

is possible to say 'well look, next time you go to New York you could fly on air miles'. Yes, that is possible. On the other hand if some official flies on air miles it may not be redeemable until he flies again, those are all the details that would have to be looked into if the Government were to adopt the policy that the hon Member is at this very belated stage recommending to us.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Well, I do not see why it is that the Chief Minister thinks that it is at a very belated stage, given that I have only been elected for a year and this is, I think, my fourth Question Time. If every time I raise issues that I did not raise in the first meeting I am going to be told that it is belated, then.....

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Only because I assume that before recommending this policy to the Government he has checked to see whether his Leader approves of it, and is belated in the sense that it was not the case when his Leader was in this chair.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I think one of the things which the Chief Minister will find if he makes the enquiries which I am urging him to do, is that the Executive Club One World Alliance has changed and enables one now to hold a corporate account so that a corporation that is paying for tickets can accumulate those miles. Therefore, the Gibraltar Government as a corporation, that Gibraltar plc that we often talk about, could accumulate those miles in the corporate fashion and then would make the miles interchangeable within the organisation, but even then, I would accept for example if an individual were to have been a Senior Civil Servant who has accumulated a lot of these miles, or a Minister who then retires and has a lot of these miles, the Government may not be able to take advantage of them and then he may be entitled to fly on them after his retirement or losing his seat in the House not as a Minister. Should we not really be agreeing to look into this in such a way that when the tax payer has paid for the flight, in simple terms a tax payer may pay for four or five flights and then be entitled to a free flight, say a Minister who goes to London four times would then be entitled to the fifth flight free of charge, does it not make sense, whatever the Principal Auditor may say, as a matter of policy for all of us in this House that in future we should be looking at ensuring that the tax payer gets maximum value for money in that respect and that the miles are not used for any other purpose. I think that there may, to a very great extent, be a large measure of consensus across the floor of this House. I know that a previous Government Minister also of the Government side and not the Opposition side, has been known to move around the desks of airports to ensure that his air miles are on the clock and even fly with a particular air line even if it means going as far as Siberia or Alaska in order to ensure that miles are not lost. Let us concentrate on the fundamental issue which is how can we make use of these miles for the future for the good of the people of Gibraltar. I think we have an obligation to the tax payer to ensure that.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As I do not detect a question there I will not rise.

**NO. 511 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**SPECIAL REPORT – THE TIMES**

What was the cost to Government, either in direct subsidy or advertising, of the special report on Gibraltar published in The Times on Wednesday 15 December 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There is no cost to the Government of the report published in The Times Supplement Report on Gibraltar. The Times does not sell its editorial content or its editorial freedom in exchange for a sum of money from anybody, not openly so. [INTERRUPTION] Well one could be very surprised and I will convey to the Editor of The Times the hon Member's rather cynical view on that. Let me tell him that in fact it does not work like that, there may be publications of a less radical nature that allow their editorial content to be purchased so to speak in exchange for subsidies or the placing of advertisements, but I can assure the hon Member from my personal experience in relation to now several Gibraltar Supplements found in The Times, that the The Times certainly does not lend itself to that. One cannot get The Times to print something with which it does not agree, simply because one places an advertisement in their pages. So on the basis of that caveat, it is nevertheless a commercial operation. I mean, one of the newspaper's lines of business is doing these reports on places and issues and companies and things of that sort, and the viability of it depends very much on the advertisements that they can detract. So against that background the Government, I can tell the hon Member, took out two full page advertisements in the Special Report, one on behalf of the Gibraltar Tourism Board and one on behalf of the Finance Centre. These were at a cost of £10,500 each.

In addition, the Government took the opportunity, because it happened to coincide in time, to place a one quarter page advert in the Special Report advertising the sale of one of the MoD properties, I think it was Loquat House, which was then just put out to tender, and because we thought that it was a property that might have appealed to wealthy people in the United Kingdom, the opportunity was taken to put the advert there instead of putting it in The Times property section which is where it would otherwise have gone.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 511 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Government say whether the feature of the Special Report would have gone ahead without the Government advertising?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, whether The Times does a report on a particular territory, and hon Members will have seen these about Jersey and the Isle of Man and about many places around the world, depends on whether they get sufficient advertisements, not sufficient advertisements from the Government of the territory in question but whether they get sufficient advertisements. So for example, if the Government had placed no advertisements but the Sales Office of The Times Advertising Department had got sufficient advertisements from banks, insurance companies and hotels and things of that sort, they would still have gone ahead with it. It does not depend on advertisements from the Government but it does depend on sufficient advertisements from the territory.

**NO. 512 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**CM's VISITS OVERSEAS**

Can the Government give a breakdown of the cost of all travel by the Chief Minister since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005 to date stating:

- a) what the purpose of travel was;
- b) who travelled with the Chief Minister;
- c) who the Chief Minister met on each of the journeys undertaken; and

a breakdown of the travel expenses incurred?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

On 16<sup>th</sup> March 2005 I travelled to the United Kingdom in connection with MoD contractorisation proposals. I was accompanied by the Chief Secretary and I met with the Secretary of State for Defence, the Rt Hon Mr Geoff Hoon and the Minister for the Armed Forces Adam Ingram. The air fares and travel costs were £1,615, the accommodation expenses were £508 and other expenses were £102.

On 5<sup>th</sup> April 2005 I again travelled to the United Kingdom in connection with MoD contractorisation proposals. I was accompanied on that occasion by my Private Secretary for Legal Affairs. The purpose of that meeting was to meet with the All Party Gibraltar Group in Parliament and the costs of air fares were £1,625. Accommodation has not yet been billed so I cannot give an accurate figure, but it is presumably of the same order as in the previous answer, and the other expenses were £209.

On 7<sup>th</sup> April 2005 I attended Rome accompanied by my wife and my Principal Private Secretary at the funeral service for the late Pope John Paul II in the Vatican City State. I met with nobody on official business. The costs of air fares and travel were £2,945, accommodation expenses were £1,014 and other expenses were £789.

On 14<sup>th</sup> April 2005 I again travelled to London for meetings at the Foreign Office with a number of officials led by the Director for Europe and the Americas, Mr Dominic Chilcott, and that was on a wide range of issues. I was accompanied by the Chief Secretary. The air fares and travel costs were £1,629, accommodation expenses were £557, others were £51 and I have no doubt that I earned air miles on at least three of those four trips.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 512 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The question asks for a breakdown of costs of all travel by the Chief Minister since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005. Am I to take it that there was no travel before 16<sup>th</sup> March 2005?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

If that is what has been asked and that is what he was told then obviously it is a logical deduction to make.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Is this question being answered without regard to other questions which I ask in respect of travel for specific purposes, like Finance Centre travel et cetera, and these are all the travels that do not fit within those criteria?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

These supplementaries do not arise from my answer. The question was 'can the Government give a breakdown of the cost of all travel by the Chief Minister since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2005 to date, stating (a), (b), (c), (d), (e)?'. The answer that has been given, unless it is erroneous which I have no reason to believe, is the answer to the question asked.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In effect, he has not been out of Gibraltar before 16<sup>th</sup> March, that is what the Chief Minister is telling the House? Not just from the answer prepared for him but because it relates to him directly also from his recollection. He did not travel in January, February or March? There was no travel involved?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Questions in the House is not an examination of my powers of memory. This is the question that he has asked, this is the answer that has been given and until I come to this House saying that the House has been inadvertently given inaccurate information, that is the answer to his question.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The House has obviously been given inaccurate information because simply by reading the headlines that were referring to something that we were referring to yesterday, it is clear that the Chief Minister travelled to Algeciras. On one occasion he was frustrated from doing so and subsequently did so and that has not been referred to. This Question did not refer to air travel or anything like that. We know that the Chief Minister has been abroad on other occasions and that is travel, it is

outside of Gibraltar. It may be that I am going to be told that it is impossible to quantify that cost and we are talking about a tank of petrol and that there are no other expenses. Let me also say that it is unusual for the Chief Minister not to be on a plane for two and a half months from 1<sup>st</sup> January to 16<sup>th</sup> March, but let him address that other point that he has certainly travelled to the hinterland on other occasions.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I suppose then in future when he asks me a question I will have to have a glossary of terms from him to decide what it is. Look, on the basis that travel means physical conveyance from one place to the other, if that is the interpretation that he is going to give, no but the question does not say outside Gibraltar see. The question says 'travel'. Historically in Gibraltar the concept of travel has not included nipping across the border to Algeciras which involves no cost except the cost of the petrol. On the basis of the question as asked and as now interpreted by him as to what the word 'travel' means, I would have to include every time I get into my official car to be driven from home to the office and back, because that is travel. The question does not say 'travel outside Gibraltar'. Presumably the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom travels when he goes from London to Edinburgh, or when he goes from London to Newcastle, that is travel even though it is not abroad. Whenever these questions have been asked in the past it has been assumed that they apply to travel of the sort that I have included in the answer, because I have frequently gone to Algeciras in the Campo area, I have never included it in answers as he well knows to similar questions that he has asked in the past, and he has never taken the issue in the past.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I have actually never asked this question before. I have always asked him before where he has travelled for Finance Centre business et cetera, and for that reason I am now saying the real reason of concern to me is that I am sure there is something between 1<sup>st</sup> January and 16<sup>th</sup> March, and that is why I was simply saying to him does he remember, I was not for one moment suggesting that he was trying to hide it.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Why should I want to hide from the hon Member, all of my visits outside of Gibraltar are the subject matter of publicity in the press and through Government press releases. Whether I was inclined or not to hide my travelling from the hon Member I certainly would not achieve it by carefully worded answers to questions in the House after the event. They are the subject matter of publicity before they take place, my travels. The fact of the matter is that if the hon Member has asked the question he has been given the answer in accordance with the previously established understanding across the floor of this House, of what constituted travel and what does not constitute travel. Now that we know that travel means any movement, in the future he has got to be careful to say travel abroad, which he does not say here, he says travel, which would include travel within Gibraltar as it means travel within other countries which are bigger. So if he wants to know the occasions on which I have left the territory of Gibraltar on official business and the cost of it then he must word his questions more carefully.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

What I want to know is whether in fact he has travelled, under the historic definition, before 16<sup>th</sup> March, and I am telling him that perhaps inadvertently it is very likely that he travelled in the months of January, February or March, but as he says that all his travel is the subject of spin and press release, I shall make sure that I check the position for myself.

ORAL

NO. 513 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**IMPORT DUTY – BUILDING MATERIALS**

What was the amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since December 2004 inclusive?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 514 of 2005.

**NO. 514 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**IMPORT DUTY**

How much import duty has been collected from persons entering Gibraltar through the non-commercial gate at the land frontier on a monthly basis from December 2004 inclusive?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The amount of import duty paid on building materials on a monthly basis since December 2004 inclusive is as follows:

December 2004	£31,429.12
January 2005	£22,798.29
February 2005	£24,733.73
March 2005	£39,695.81

The amount of import duty collected from persons entering Gibraltar via the Land Frontier since December 2004 is as follows:

December 2004	£23,478.02
January 2005	£11,789.32
February 2005	£12,026.57
March 2005	£12,871.69

**NO. 515 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government say why the number of planned hotels in the Eastside Project was reduced from two to one after negotiations started with the preferred bidder?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

It is the Government's requirement that at least one hotel is built. It is not that the number of planned hotels has dropped from two to one but rather that the second hotel is at the developer's option.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 515 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether that is in fact a new requirement, because in the original statement they issued in 2002 in relation to this tender, the reference was to hotels in the plural. Then in 2003 when the preferred bidder was actually awarded the preferred bidder status, again the Government said the project under negotiation consists of a 500 yacht marina and at least two hotels. So is that therefore a new requirement?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No the hon Member has got to distinguish between what the Government were happy to see there, and therefore the tender was for hotels, leisure activity, residential, commercial, and what were the Government's minimum content requirements. So every bidder would have been told that the Government wanted to see at least one hotel et cetera. It has never been a requirement that anybody builds more than one hotel but some people have and the developer now appointed and contracted may indeed build more than one hotel but he is obliged to build at least one of a certain agreed number of rooms with a certain agreed number of beds. Now, he is free to build more than that if he wants to but is not free to build less. The position, wherever he may be reading from, has never been intended to mean that two were obligatory.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

They may not have been obligatory but definitely what they said in 2003 was at least two.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

That was what they proposed at that time.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The Government's position now is at least one. To me there seems to be a change.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not a change. All of those earlier remarks, statements, were publicity material. In fact this chap was the only bidder that indicated that he might build two hotels. When it has come to negotiating the deal that has now been the subject, as he knows, of heads of agreement and all of that, the agreement says that he must build one and the size of it is described but he is free to build more than one. It is not a change and in any event, even if there had been a change nothing has ever been set in stone in this matter. Remember that the original tender was 'Government wants to see developments of this sort on this site, bidders show your interest and tell us what you would like to build there'. So people were always free to suggest whatever they wanted and then the Government, it is not as if the tender was for two hotels, see what I mean, that was not how the tender was advertised in the first place.

**NO. 516 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

On what basis was the area of the Eastside development increased from 60,000 sq metres to 185,000 sq metres?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The increase is due to a combination of the following factors:

- the area of the large marina projection arm sweeping from North to South;
- the area of the three finger jetties, on both of these buildings will now be constructed;
- some additional reclamation at the Catalan Bay end but only to straighten and clean up the existing reclamation.

The figures are approximate at this stage, until the detailed marine engineering design is completed and necessary studies carried out. In other words, there is no expansion of the reclaimed land itself equivalent to the figures in his question, but of course if they build arms on the marina which serve not just to enclose the marina but to have buildings built on them for residential accommodation, that is part of the development footprint even though it does not sit on the presently existing reclamation land that is a rubble tip.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 516 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Are Government saying that the 185,000 square metres includes sea, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have no recollection without any papers of what this figure of 185,000 square metres refers to. I do not know where it is that he is reading it from. I therefore cannot tell him whether it is just the surface area of land or whether it includes the

waters enclosed within the arms, I would need notice of that question, unless it is apparent from wherever he is reading from.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

When the tender originally came out and the Government issued that statement that I referred to earlier in 2002 it was about the development and the tender and different requirements and conditions, it then mentioned the rubble tip. It said the rubble tip is about 60,000 square metres. The 185,000 square metres was actually mentioned on the website of the developers themselves. It could be that perhaps this includes sea as well as land but the rubble tip itself, according to the original tender, was 60,000 square metres and not 185,000 square metres so that is why we were asking the question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, well then I cannot tell him whether the figures quoted by the developers includes the sea. The answer that I have given him is the additions to the land that the Government knows is planned. Outline planning has still not been granted, they are still free to play around with the design. The latest design that the Government have seen has finger jetties and the marina arm enclosing the water, and within that marina there are jetties with buildings on it, so it is part of the development footprint that the Government would certainly regard, even though it is not currently existing, would regard as developable land even though they are creating it. Whether the figure of 185,000 square metres in addition to that includes the water embraced where the boats are actually going to float around, I could not tell him but I will ask the developer and let him know if he is particularly interested.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there a specific clause providing for reclamation by the developer, and if so, is there a limit to the reclamation they can undertake at their own cost and for their own benefit?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, there is a limit. The agreement is done on the basis of a certain number of square metres of developable land on the basis of the outline plan which is the one that they presently intend to submit for planning permission which demarcates the site, and they are not at liberty to reclaim outside of that site. Now, if they were to make a proposal to the Government and I do not know whether the Government would consider it but I do not think they have any intention of doing so because there are issues of economic viability by reference to the depth of water and I think the site is already delineated after the end of the negotiating process to the point where it is realistically viable to develop without incurring huge engineering cost by virtue of the depth of the water that has been reached. That is going out. Going north and south really there is no room for expansion because of Eastern Beach and Catalan Bay.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

But the Government are not in a position to confirm whether that in fact happens to amount to 185,000 square metres?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Without notice of the question I cannot but of course there are those in the Government who can tell me, if asked. There is a plan attached to the agreement with a sort of red dotted line and people do know how many square metres there are inside that red line, but I cannot tell him from memory.

**NO. 517 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EAST SIDE DEVELOPMENT**

Can Government now confirm whether the relocations costs of commercial activities occupying 11,700 sqm of the proposed Eastside Development will be met by the developers?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

They will be met by the developer up to a specified amount.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 517 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

How does that feature in the figures that were made public when the announcement was made on the agreement, which produced lots of figures of how much money was going to be spent by the developer? Is that figure identified there?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, I cannot remember or recall exactly the press release but I am almost certain that it is included in the figures mentioned in the Government's press release, because they have got to pay that amount whether it costs in relocation or not. It is not as if they pay relocation costs up to that, there is an amount of money which they are paying to the Government for relocation costs. If the Government can secure those relocations for a sum less, the Government retain the balance. In a sense it is premium earmarked for relocation or otherwise for the benefit of the Government if it is not required for relocation.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can Government say how much?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, given that the Government have got to negotiate with a number of parties it would not be in the tax payer's interests for those parties to know what is the fund that the Government have for that purpose.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well can I ask is it included in the initial amount of money that has already been paid or is there something else that still has to be paid?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I cannot answer that question because the amount of money that has already been paid has been disclosed publicly and therefore people would know that the sum is more or less, depending on what answer I give him, than that sum. I really do not think it would be in anybody's interest except those whom I do not want the information to reach that I answer him the question. It is a significant and substantial sum of money and when the relocation exercise negotiations have been concluded I will be happy to give the hon Member all the information, the amount of money as it originally was and how much of it has been spent in actual relocation and how much of it has been saved and therefore pocketed by the Government.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Can I ask the Government if there is a date by which the relocation has to be carried out by the Government in terms of their commitment to the developer?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am not willing to answer that question either as that is also commercially valuable to the tenants. If the tenants know that the Government have committed to deliver vacant possession by a given date, it strengthens their hands in the negotiation because they think that by allowing time to pass they strengthen their negotiating position against the Government as that date approaches. Again, I think all of this information is commercially sensitive and I am not willing to reveal it publicly.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The question which is in relation to the relocations gives me the opportunity to raise the issue of the relocating of maritime and waste collection again.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Oh, we got to the bottom of the mystery.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

If I can just explain to the Chief Minister what it was then there will not be anything to right because perhaps I can go back and check. I understand they had a meeting with the Minister for Trade and Industry, who unfortunately is not here this afternoon, in February and the business was moved there eight years ago to the area of the East Side reclamation they actually do not have any water or electricity, they have been requesting to be moved from there to somewhere else, it has or deals in things like tippers, fork lifters, lorries et cetera, and they were moved eight years ago and they simply wanted to know when they were going to be relocated. Unfortunately the Minister is not here but that was the original question.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have to say to the hon Member that that, which actually does not add anything to the information he was able to convey yesterday, still does not, at least me personally, does not enable me to identify the business. Is the hon Member going to write to me?

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

There is one new piece of information which is that they met the Minister in February.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Right, well I will certainly tell him that and ask him to examine his diary to see who he met in February in relation to this matter. Can the hon Member say whether the individuals concerned have a surname beginning with the letter 'r' followed by the letter 'a'. Yes, they are on the list. They are on the lists under that name and I am aware that they have met the Minister and I understand that there is no difficulty.

**NO. 518 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HOUSING – LOQUAT HOUSE**

Can Government say whether Loquat House has any heritage constraint which requires the existing structure to be retained and refurbished as opposed to being demolished?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There are no proposals or need to demolish Loquat House. The question is therefore hypothetical. However, Government consider Loquat House to have very significant heritage value and would hope that DPC takes the same view if any application to demolish, or even to alter it significantly, were ever to be received by it.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 518 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In fact when tenders for the purchase were invited no condition was attached reflecting that view of the Government, was it?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, on that and on no other property there is no need to do so because whether it has heritage value or not the Government cannot impose restrictions simply by alerting to those heritage values in a tender notice, and whether it has heritage value or not, any alteration to a property requires planning permission and the place where the heritage value of buildings in Gibraltar is safeguarded is in the Development and Planning Commission as part of the planning process. There is no other, we do not have a system of listed buildings. Well, we do but as he knows it is limited to very few, Moorish Castle and things of that sort. One of the pieces of legislation that is somewhere in the pipeline at a very early stage, is a more sophisticated system of listed buildings in Gibraltar and at some degree of listing, at some tier of listing, this is the sort of building that would find itself listed, this and many hundreds of other buildings in Gibraltar. But at the moment the Development and Planning Commission and the planning legislation is the only statutory mechanism available for the protection of heritage because we do not have a more sophisticated listing legislation, which legislation would contain all the things that the Government would want to be able to prevent people from doing to listed buildings regardless of the

planning process. My understanding of the way it works in the UK is that depending on the grade of listing, it is not that one cannot do anything to the building, it is that there are various I suppose at one level it is absolutely no touch and then as the grading goes down there is more and more that one can do to it with particular types of permission, particular types of styling and things of that sort. That is how it would work.

**NO. 519 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**HOUSING – LOQUAT HOUSE**

Were any tenders received for 25/6 South Barrack Road and Loquat House which were judged not to be valid, and if so how many were there and for what reason were they so judged?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

In respect of 25/6 South Barrack Road, all tenders were accepted as valid.

In respect of Loquat House two tenders were deemed not valid as they involved construction of additional houses on the site. In fact this is a problem that we have had in quite a few of those tenders although the question only relates to those two, where the Government offer for sale the plot with the house built on it, Lind House or whatever, and people send in tenders for the demolition. In the case of Lind House I recall that for the demolition of Lind House and the building of a block of flats. This is not what was offered for sale. Those tenders are disregarded and very often they are much higher in value than the tender that, the house was given to the first compliant tender and in the case of Loquat there was a tender for a higher sum than the winning tender, but it involved the construction, permission to construct three additional houses on the site. Of course the Government sell as vendor not as planning authority. The Government cannot sell the right to build three houses, even if they were willing to see the houses built, which they are not and it was not advertised in the sale.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 519 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

We were told yesterday that Lind House was actually one of the ones that was being demolished.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No that is a different matter. Lind House bought the property then had it surveyed, convinced the DPC that the house could not be saved for any reasonable sum of money and they were given permission to demolish and to reconstruct one house on the same footprint. There is a difference between getting planning permission to

demolish the one house on the site and rebuilding it, which to boot he was required to do in the same style as the house that was being demolished, there is a difference between that and taking advantage of the demolition to use it as a development site for a much larger project. It is two completely different things.

**NO. 520 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**BOTH WORLDS**

Can Government say what action they have taken in respect of the representations they have received from the Residents Committee of Both Worlds Retirement Homes?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Both Worlds Retirement Homes is a privately owned property and Government have no role or say in any disputes between its owners and residents, many of whom are themselves long-leasehold owners.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 520 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the answer then that they have taken no action and that they intend to take no action?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well yes, we are aware because I have received a long letter from one of these residents that there is a dispute between I am not sure the name of the company, well I think I do recall the name of the company but I do not think it is appropriate to mention it, between basically the developers/owners of Both Worlds and some people who have bought "long leases" of properties there, who are of the view that the property is not being run in a way that they approve of, or in a way that they were led to believe by the glossy brochures would be the case. This is a private dispute. His hon Colleague has rejoined the law firm that he has, I seem to recall that they represent the other party, I am sure he can tell what the dispute is. The Government have taken the view that the disputes, the issues that were raised in that letter, obviously if there were issues that related to the public highway or to rock falls or things like that there are public issues of that sort in that area, that would be a Government business, or the state of the beach down below, those are issues for the Government but disputes between the under lessor and the under lessee is no more the Government's business than in any private property transaction. I hope the hon Member appreciates despite the name of this organisation, this is not a residential home where there would be issues of whether the Government should regulate the

provision of residential home services, these are retired people who buy a property there. Therefore there is no issue of service provision to the elderly, this is not a case of 'are the Government not concerned about the behaviour in a senior citizens home' or something like that. It is not a case of that sort. These are purely property commercial property transactions. At least the letter that I received raised no other type of issue other than that.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see. Have the people that wrote to the Chief Minister been told that?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes I believe so.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is it not the case in fact that when this property became available the Government had an interest in it because they owed a lot of money to the Government in rates and stuff, and that in fact it was marketed as a conversion into retirement homes with very much Government involvement in a supportive role?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, certainly the second half of that is not true. It is certainly true that they needed Government consent to change the use from an apart hotel to things that they could sell, and the Government agreed to give permission for properties to be sold and negotiated a higher premium from the developer, as they would with any developer that asks for a change of user of Crown properties.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Was that not in relation to the fact that it was going to be developed as a kind of new activity which was retirement homes, and at the time this was announced as one of the new economic activities the Government were promoting?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not think so. Look, what is a retirement home? A retirement home is a home that somebody buys to retire in. It is not a different type of home, it is normally occupied by elderly people because elderly people normally retire. I suppose it is possible to retire young and therefore the house that one buys to retire into is still I suppose a retirement home even though one might have retired at the age of 45, but this is all that there is. From the Government's point of view it is an ordinary real estate transaction, the Government had no part in the promotion or in the creation of the opportunity or in the conceiving of the idea, it was one of many requests that the Government get from holders of leases of Crown lands, (a) to extend the lease; (b) to obtain change of user so that they can apply it to a different purpose and/or sell it on better terms, and the Government's policy is to agree to that unless there is a

particular reason why it should not be agreed to, but in exchange for a negotiated capital premium to reflect the increased commercial value to the other party of what they are asking the Government to give them.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact when the change of use was approved by the Government and the premium charged it was not on the basis that the houses that were going to be built there were going to be marketed to retirees wanting to make their home in Gibraltar, as opposed to being sold like any other property development anywhere in Gibraltar. They did not have any restrictions.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not acknowledge that there is any qualitative distinction between the two scenarios, whether property is to be marketed to retirees or whether it is properties to be marketed to other types of purchasers who are not retirees, neither increases nor reduces the Government's interest in the matter nor the Government's powers in the matter, nor the Government's role in the matter. So I just do not understand or accept the formulation of the questions. If there are issues in relation to Both Worlds which are the Government's business in the sense that it is something that the Government can statutorily address, then of course the Government are concerned about adverse situations that affect all citizens in Gibraltar, but there are many citizens in Gibraltar, whether they are retirees from abroad or long-standing residents of Gibraltar, who had problems with which the Government cannot help because they are just not in the Government domain, they are not in an area of life where the Government have powers or a role. It does not mean that the Government are disinterested in them, it simply means that the Government have no powers of intervention in them. When we got a letter from a gentleman whose name I do not remember, it was a very long and detailed letter, and obviously they had gone to a lot of care to make sure that the Government were aware of the full extent of the situation down there, I remember thinking to myself 'well, if everything that this gentleman says is indeed the case, then this is a pretty undesirable state of affairs', but notwithstanding that there is nothing the Government can do. Therefore, there is no use in the Government pretending that they can do anything. Governments do not have a reach into every corner of people's lives and private, commercial transactions which are not regulated by statute, here or anywhere else, or in the United Kingdom, is one of those areas and the degree of Government sympathy with one party or another in a situation described in a letter, and I receive many such letters, the degree of Government sympathy is not the issue. It is whether it is any of the Government's business at the end of the day, governmentally speaking.

Now, there are cases in which the Government can informally speak to developers and say 'well how about it?' It is none of my business and my understanding is that it is already well beyond that and that the parties have had recourse to solicitors. If anybody thinks that by the Government speaking to the parties the Government are capable of acting as some sort of broker, if all that is required of us is our time to see if the parties cannot be persuaded to deal with each other, certainly I am perfectly happy to devote some time in that sense, but there is no point in anybody thinking that the Government have any solutions that they can deliver because at the end of the day these are a matter of the civil law rights of the two parties in contract and leases, and that is a matter that has to be settled between the parties in Gibraltar, as would be the case anywhere else in the Anglo-Saxon world. I do not think Gibraltar

is any particularly unusual situation, and that this is a retirement home and that the purchasers responded to internationally placed advertisements. Well, look, I do not think it does Gibraltar's international reputation any good that local property developers should behave in that way and I am very glad to say that this situation, if it is indeed as was described in that letter and it is not for me to arbitrate on that, then it is deeply regrettable. From the Government's point of view it is not that we would take more interest in that situation because there is an overseas purchaser dimension than we would take for example, if it were a more local development for more local purchasers. As far as the Government are concerned there is public activity and there is private sector activity and I think that it is not for the Government to decide when they can interfere in people's private sector activities, unless there are laws that permit the Government to do so. So I just do not understand the hon Member's focus on this matter and I can only pass the issues on behalf of these concerned persons.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

For somebody that does not understand the question it is a hell of a long answer. I am not asking for his sympathy or his time or his anything, I am being quite specific and in the whole of that length of the answer I still have not had a straightforward yes or no to my original question which is 'is it not the case that when the Government decided to change the use, the use was not open market development to sell at whatever price you want but a development to sell for a defined segment of the market', which effectively meant that it was sold at a given price. Just like as if was said 'look, tomorrow we are going to make land available for home ownership and we are not going to charge a premium for the land because it is for that purpose'. Then the developer subsequently does something else differently. Now I am asking the Government is this the case or not? Is it the case that when they agreed the change of use, the use that they agreed to change it to was not luxury housing available to anybody but specifically houses to attract a new type of client to Gibraltar at a given price and presumably that was reflected in the level of premium they charged. If that is indeed the case I would have thought they would have some interest then in what is happening in the place. The answer is yes or no? He does not know, okay.

ORAL

**NO. 521 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**FREIGHT FORWARDING SERVICES**

How many tenders have been submitted for the provision of freight forwarding services to Government departments and agencies, who was the successful tenderer, in what amount, and was this the lowest bid?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Five tenders have been received for the provision of freight forwarding services to Government departments and agencies.

The Treasury Tender board has not yet met to consider this tender. The closing date for this tender was 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2005.

**NO. 522 OF 2005****THE HON J J BOSSANO****IMPORTS**

Can Government explain what caused the drop of £49.4 million in the value of imports in 2002 compared to 2001?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The drop of £49.4 million in the total value of imports in 2002 compared with 2001 is mainly attributable to a decrease in the value of the following imports in 2002 as follows:

		<b>£ million</b>
<b>1.</b>	Vehicles and Accessories	29.9
<b>2.</b>	Tobacco	6.5
<b>3.</b>	Machinery and Mechanical Appliances	2.9
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>39.3</b>

ORAL

NO. 523 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**HEAD 12 – 1A – PAY SETTLEMENTS**

Can Government confirm whether there was a need for additional funding for wage and salary related expenditure beyond the £1,000,000 provided under Head 12, Sub-Head 1a – Pay Settlements in the last financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 524 and 525 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 524 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**HEAD 12 – 1B**

Can Government state whether the balance of £875,000 available at 30 November 2004 under Head 12, Sub-Head 1b has been sufficient to meet departmental supplementary funding requirements in the last financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 523 and 525 of 2005.

**NO. 525 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 12 – 1A – PAY SETTLEMENTS**

Can Government confirm that the 3 items of expenditure which required supplementary provision from Sub-Head 1A – Pay Settlements – are the results of increases in rates of pay, and if not, can Government state how much is in respect of pay increases related in each case?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government published a Supplementary Appropriation Bill (2004/2005) 2005 on Thursday 29 April. This provides for additional spending over and above the Supplementary Provision in last year's Estimates. The Bill also provides for the reclassification of exceptional expenditure items, such as the Government contribution to the Tercentenary Trust Fund and Clinical Governance Review, to be funded from the Consolidated Fund-Reserve and not Departmental Votes. This is being done to better distinguish recurrent Departmental expenditure from exceptional one-off spending and will require the reversal of some supplementary funding reallocations made to date.

The balance of the Supplementary Funding provision is not £875,000 as at November 2004, but £339,000 as at January 2005. In February of this year the Financial Secretary laid a statement in the House allocating £536,000 of the balance which is referred to in Question No. 524 of 2005. The further statements laid at this meeting of the House reduces the available Supplementary Funding balance to £32,350.

The Pay Settlement vote is expected to be sufficient, with some £968,200 allocated to date. Should this turn out not to be the case as a consequence of Departmental or Treasury year end adjustments, then it could be topped up from the Supplementary Funding vote. That is not expected to be the case.

With regards to whether the three items of expenditure from the Pay Settlements subhead result from pay awards, there have been seven reallocations as at 31 March 2005. These all concern pay awards with one exception. This is the £300,000 reallocated in Statement No. 1 from Head 12, Subhead 1(b) to Police Overtime. This was a partial payment towards the settlement of a historical Police claim for underpayment of overtime arising since 1994. The full amount required for 2004/2005 is £440,000 and is to be funded directly from the Consolidated Fund Reserve, as part of the Supplementary Appropriation Bill to which I referred earlier. Consequently, the pay settlements allocation made for this item is to be reversed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 523 TO 525 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the figure in subhead 9 – 6(a) that he has quoted, before or after the reversal?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think it is before the reversal.

**NO. 526 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**HEAD 8 – E – 4(b)**

What was the nature of the banking services in respect of which the Government had to provide £46,767 more than the sum approved by the House in the Budget 8 - E, sub-head 4 (b) for the financial year 2003-2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The banking services provision relates to the introduction of bank charges on cash deposits and withdrawals and revised Corporate Banking Tariffs which apply to the running of the Government's main bank account.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 526 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I take it then this was something that was introduced by the banks after the Estimates were put together. Is that the reason why they were not there originally?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I understand that this is something called Corporate Banking Tariffs Business Advantage Service, which was introduced in October 2003.

ORAL

NO. 527 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government identify which companies were charged by Treasury a commission on property sales, was payable by wholly owned Government companies, which sold the 50 per cent or lesser share of co-ownership homes, in the financial year 2004/2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 528 of 2005.

**NO. 528 OF 2005****THE HON J J BOSSANO****PROPERTY SALES**

Can Government explain how it is that in answer to Question 2462/04 they stated that Brympton Co-ownership Company had paid £62,137.86 in respect of 5 per cent commission on sales in February 2004 yet in the table presented in answer to Question 2467/04 they stated that a payment of £19,793.42 was made in December 2003 and no payment in February 2004?

**ANSWER****THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER****Answer to Question No. 527**

I hand the hon Member a statement giving the information required.

**Answer to Question No. 528**

The first 5 per cent charge in respect of Brympton was for the period April 2002 to January 2004. This payment, amounting to £62,137.86, was made in February 2004.

However, Question No. 2467 of 2004 referred to the commission for the financial year 2003/2004. The table supplied for 2003/2004 therefore shows monies received in respect of Brympton for the period April 2003 – December 2003, and the element of charge for this period which forms part of the £62,137.86 was £19,793.42. A breakdown of the 5 per cent charge is as follows:

	<b>Amount received</b>	<b>5% Charge</b>
<b>April – Dec 2002</b>	£303,803.33	£15,190.16
<b>Jan – Mar 2003</b>	£543,085.50	£27,154.28
<b>April 2003 – March 2004</b>	£395,868.33	£19,793.42
		£62,137.86

**Answer to Question 528**

**Answer to Question 527**

		GRPI	BCOC	WS2COC	GCOC	TOTALS
Apr-04	Monies Received	£ 86,099	£ -	£ 55,743	£ 28,622	£ 170,465
	5% charge paid	£ 4,305	£ -	£ 2,787	£ 1,431	£ 8,523
May-04	Monies Received	£ 181,329	£ 57,600	£ 154,693	£ 101,385	£ 495,007
	5% charge paid	£ 9,066	£ 2,880	£ 7,735	£ 5,069	£ 24,750
Jun-04	Monies Received	£ 187,842	£ 17,280	£ 94,364	£ 226,152	£ 525,637
	5% charge paid	£ 9,392	£ 864	£ 4,718	£ 11,308	£ 26,282
Jul-04	Monies Received	£ 32,148	£ 72,041	£ 93,611	£ 61,528	£ 259,327
	5% charge paid	£ 1,607	£ 3,602	£ 4,681	£ 3,076	£ 12,966
Aug-04	Monies Received	£ 11,296	£ 29,813	£ 13,410	£ 69,396	£ 123,914
	5% charge paid	£ 565	£ 1,491	£ 670	£ 3,470	£ 6,196
Sep-04	Monies Received	£ 9,544	£ 36,444	£ 37,228	£ 101,611	£ 184,827
	5% charge paid	£ 477	£ 1,822	£ 1,861	£ 5,081	£ 9,241
Oct-04	Monies Received	£ 18,737	£ -	£ -	£ 154,562	£ 173,300
	5% charge paid	£ 937	£ -	£ -	£ 7,728	£ 8,665
Nov-04	Monies Received	£ 184,387		£ 281,275	£ 325,012	£ 790,674
	5% charge paid	£ 9,219	£ -	£ 14,064	£ 16,251	£ 39,534
Dec-04	Monies Received	£ 71,810	£ 28,800	£ 181,518	£ 229,023	£ 511,151
	5% charge paid	£ 3,591	£ 1,440	£ 9,076	£ 11,451	£ 25,558
Jan-05	Monies Received	£ 43,629	£ -	£ 91,114	£ 267,732	£ 402,476
	5% charge paid	£ 2,181	£ -	£ 4,556	£ 13,387	£ 20,124
Feb-05	Monies Received	£ 26,441			£ 47,815	£ 74,256
	5% charge paid	£ 1,322	£ -	£ -	£ 2,391	£ 3,713
Mar-05	Monies Received	£ 56,254		£ 22,293		£ 78,548
	5% charge paid	£ 2,813	£ -	£ 1,115	£ -	£ 3,927

	GRPI	BCOC	WS2COC	GCOC	
2004/05 Total Monies Received	£ 909,516	£ 241,977	£ 1,025,250	£ 1,612,838	£ 3,789,582
2004/05 Total 5% charges paid	£ 45,476	£ 12,099	£ 51,263	£ 80,642	£ 189,479

ORAL

NO. 529 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

Can Government confirm that the interest on investments held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank reached £10.2 million in the financial year 2004/2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The Gibraltar Savings Bank accounts for the year ended 31 March 2005 have not yet been finalised. However, on the basis of the tentative figures at hand, the interest received during the year on investments held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank amounts to about £10.3 million.

ORAL

NO. 530 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

Can Government state whether the maximum holding of £100,000 applies to investments in Government Debentures as well as to investments in Gibraltar Savings Bank Debentures?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 531 to 534 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 531 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

What is the total value of the special issue of Government Debentures offered to Pensioners in April 2005 for reinvestment of the 7% Maturing Debentures and what has been the amount taken up by the closing date of 15<sup>th</sup> April 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 530 and 532 to 534 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 532 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GOVERNMENT DEBENTURES**

As at the end of March 2005, what was the value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 530, 531, 533 and 534 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 533 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

What is the final figure for Government Deposits in the on-call investment account with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 530 to 532 and 534 of 2005.

**NO. 534 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR SAVINGS BANK**

What is the final figure for non-Government deposits with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 530**

The maximum holding of £100,000 applies to investments in Government of Gibraltar Pensioners' Debentures as well as to investments in Gibraltar Savings Bank Pensioners' Debentures.

**Answer to Question No. 531**

The total value of Government of Gibraltar Special Issue of Pensioners' Monthly Income Tax Free Debentures 2010 offered to pensioners in April 2005 for reinvestment of the Gibraltar Savings Bank 7% Tax Free Pensioners Bond 2005 is £28,348,700.

As at 21 April 2005, the sum of £26,220,200 had been taken up. There may however be some applications still to be received from debenture-holders. This debenture issue takes effect on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2005. As of today they are still pre-applications because the existing one does not yet mature until Sunday.

**Answer to Question No. 532**

The value of Monthly Income Debentures and Pensioners' Monthly Income Debentures issued by the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005 is as follows:

Monthly Income Debentures	£32,870,700
Pensioners' Monthly Income Debentures	£70,079,700

**Answer to Question No. 533**

As mentioned previously, the accounts of the Gibraltar Savings Bank for the year ended 31 March 2005 have not yet been finalised, however, the tentative figure for

Government deposits held in the On-Call Investment Accounts with the Gibraltar Savings Bank is £53.84 million.

**Answer to Question No. 534**

The tentative figure for non-Government deposits with the Gibraltar Savings Bank as at 31 March 2005 is £159.22 million.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 530 TO 534 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the answer to the first question which was the £100,000 where the Chief Minister said both, is it £100,000 in respect of each or is it an overall £100,000?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Each, in other words, one may have £100,000 in each making £200,000 in total. I hope the hon Member understands and may even agree with the reason for the limit and that is that these are pretty favourable terms.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

There is no residential requirement so actually anybody can invest.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**NO. 535 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GOVERNMENT LOAN STOCK**

Can Government state whether they have now decided how they propose to re-finance the £50 million Government Bond which matures in May 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The £50 million Government Loan Stock which matures on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2005 will be re-financed through the issue of Government Debentures.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 535 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Government Debenture that is being re-issued in respect of the 7 per cent maturing debenture part of that refinancing exercise?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not initially. Initially the paper will be held by the Gibraltar Savings Bank and by Community Care Trust. Not initially, the word initially is important there.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Let us see if I understand this. The Government will be issuing a replacement stock of £50 million face value to replace the maturing stock of £50 million, is that the position?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I see, and it is being issued to the Savings Bank and to Community Care. Presumably the small amount that is still out in the market is what is being redeemed in cash?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is there any amount still in the market held by private investors?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, the small bit that the hon Member is already aware of, £3.562 million. Nominal, remember nominal at this stage.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Nominal yes of course, and the holders of those are also being offered the replacement stock?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is being redeemed in cash but not from Government existing resources cash, so it is coming from the proceeds of the Government Debenture issues that I have just described to the hon Member. Yes, I suppose one could therefore say yes. I thought the point that he was trying to get at was whether the Government were going to put their hands into their existing reserves to pay up that element. That is the question that I was answering but actually what is happening still requires his first question to be technically answered yes, because it is in cash as far as the holders of the £3.5 million. The fact that it is coming from the issue of a new Government Debenture to somebody else does not alter the fact that it is cash in the hands of the person who receives it.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Given that I think that the existing public debt is the £50 million and money owed to the bank, how is this £28 million being issued? Is it that the bank lending is being reduced so as not to exceed the ceiling?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Correct.

ORAL

NO. 536 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**ABSTRACT OF STATISTICS**

Can Government state when they expect the 2003 Abstract of Statistics to be made electronically available on the website?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 537 and 538 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 537 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**ABSTRACT OF STATISTICS**

Can Government state whether the correct figure for the value of imports from Spain in 2003 was the £55.788 million given in Table 52 of the 2003 Abstract of Statistics or the figure of £57.184 million given in Table 53 of the same document?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 536 and 538 of 2005.

**NO. 538 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**ABSTRACT OF STATISTICS**

Can Government state which was the main country of origin that accounted for the bulk of the increase from £57.699 million to £99.134 million from "Other Countries" shown in Table 53 of the 2003 Abstract of Statistics?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 536**

I am informed, although I have not seen it myself, that the Abstract of Statistics has been available on the website since August 2004.

**Answer to Question No. 537**

The correct figure is that shown in Table 53 of the Abstract of Statistics 2003, that is, £57.184 million. The total value of imports from EU countries should read £160.399 million.

**Answer to Question No. 538**

The increase in the value of imports under "Other countries" of £41.4 million between 2002 and 2003 was due mainly to an increase of £30.7 million in exports, which are included as part of the imports figure, and to an increase of £9.9 million in the value of imports from Gibraltar bonds. In either case, it is not possible to determine from data provided by Customs, the original country of origin of the goods in question, extraordinary as it might sound.

ORAL

NO. 539 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state the Net Property Income from Abroad and Net Factor Income from Abroad values in Income Method of the 2001/2002 GDP estimates?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 540 to 542 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 540 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state the Net Property Income from Abroad and Net Factor Income from Abroad values in the Expenditure Method of the 2001/2002 GDP estimate?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 539 and 541 to 542 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 541 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state in respect of the 2002/03 GDP calculation how much of the amount attributed to Gross Trading Profit was obtained by grossing up Corporation Tax received and how much was in respect of an estimated amount in respect of profits not yet assessed to tax?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 539, 540 and 542 of 2005.

**NO. 542 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GDP FIGURE**

Can Government state what was the imputed rent element in the rent component of the Income Method of calculation for the GDP for 2002/03?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question Nos. 539 and 540**

Net property Income from Abroad and Net Factor Income from Abroad do not form part of the calculation of the GDP estimate. They are adjustments made to the GDP estimate itself to arrive at GNP. As such, they are common to both the Income and to the Expenditure methods of calculating GNP and are therefore identical under each approach.

The values for 2001/2002 are as follows:

Net Property Income from Abroad:	£ 2.31 million
Net Factor Income from Abroad:	£38.22 million

**Answer to Question No. 541**

The figures requested are as follows:

Grossed-Up Corporation Tax:	£76.82 million
Estimated Amount Outstanding:	£ 1.50 million
Total Gross Trading Profits for 2002/2003:	£78.32 million

**Answer to Question No. 542**

The value of imputed rent for 2002/2003 forming part of the Income Method estimate of GDP was £49.27 million.

ORAL

NO. 543 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**STAMP DUTY**

Can Government state what was the total amount collected in respect of Stamp Duty on property transactions in the last financial year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 544 and 545 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 544 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY**

Can Government state what was the total amount collected in respect of Stamp Duty on property transactions in March 2005 and the number of property transactions involved?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 543 and 545 of 2005.

**NO. 545 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**STAMP DUTY**

Can Government confirm that the total amount of Stamp Duty collected in 2002/03 and 2003/04 given in answer to Question 2470/04 was all due to property transactions?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Reluctant as the Leader of the Opposition is ever to give me credit for anything that I do, I hope that at least on this occasion he will. Put to shame by the answers that I have been sent into this House to give to him in the past when he has asked similar questions, I have done all that I have been able to be a little bit more forthcoming on this occasion by requiring apparently reluctant custodians of information to spit it up, however much may be required by way of effort.

**Answer to Question No. 543**

The total amount collected in respect of Stamp Duty on property transactions in the last financial year, that is 2004/2005, was £1,891,727.

**Answer to Question No. 544**

There were 156 property transactions that took place in March 2005, a buoyant boom in the property market. The amount collected in respect of stamp duty on these transactions was £105,613.

**Answer to Question No. 545**

The figures given in answer to Question No. 2470 of 2004 related to all Stamp Duty transactions. The total amounts in respect of property transactions in 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 were £1,084,419 and £1,279,030 respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 543 TO 545 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The answer that I was given previously in the House in Question No. 2470 of 2004, which gave the total Stamp Duty but said that it was all property transactions and therefore incorrect, what is the balance due between these figures and the ones I was given?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

They were the transaction types.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is right. I was told the last time it was all property but now it has been confirmed that it was not all property and that the property figure is a lower one than the one I was given in the previous answer. I am asking, what is the stamp duty that is the difference between this figure and the other figure due to if it is not all property?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I do not have that information but there are other sorts of transactions that generate liability to stamp duty, share transfers, and he ought to bear in mind so that he does not misread the information that I have given, I suppose we ought to be clear what the phrase "property transaction" means. It does not necessarily mean a purchase or sale of a property. Property transactions could cover mortgages, assignments, leases, underleases, other forms of grants, releases, further advances by a bank. In other words, a re-stamp duty of a mortgage or partial releases. In other words, any document which is subject to stamp duty which documents some transaction relating to real estate property. Purchase and sale, as he as a layman would understand it, is only one of those types of transactions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So it does not mean in fact that there were 156 properties sold in March?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No. For example, one sale on a mortgage would generate two stamp duty transactions. The original underlease or deed of assignment and if the buyer was financed by a mortgage, stamp duty on the buyer's mortgage, in fact it could be three because if the seller had a mortgage, he would release that mortgage and that is as I recall subject to stamp duty too. So a single transaction, a single purchase and sale could generate at least three, depending on whether both parties are mortgaged or not.

ORAL

**NO. 546 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD LAND**

Have Government made a decision whether the relocation costs and direct costs connected with the release of MOD land will be booked to the Improvement and Development Fund or to the Government Property Company?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 547 of 2005.

**NO. 547 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD LAND**

What has been the expenditure to date in the relocation costs connected with the release of MOD land in the last financial year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

**Answer to Question No. 546**

The relocation and other costs related to the release of MOD properties will be reflected in the Improvement and Development Fund. We have made this decision because the revenue is being taken in the Improvement and Development Fund, and in fact if he looks at the Estimates, Tabled today, he will see it reflected both in the Revenue and in the Expenditure side.

**Answer to Question No. 547**

The relocation costs connected with the release of MOD land in the last financial year is £345,217.54. That was paid by one of the Government's property companies and the provision made in the Improvement and Development Fund this year includes repaying that amount to the company so that the full picture is presented in the Improvement and Development Fund. Let me say that that expenditure of £345,000 relates mainly to the works that he may have seen taking place in Four Corners camp for the conversion of some MOD flats into higher grade officer accommodation, which is being done by JBS.

ORAL

**NO. 548 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**GIBRALTAR PROVIDENT TRUST (NO. 2) PENSION SCHEME**

Have any additional employers joined the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Scheme since November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No additional employers have joined the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Scheme since November 2004.

ORAL

**NO. 549 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

How much was collected in PAYE each month since November 2004?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 550 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 550 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

What was the amount of Company Tax collected in each month since November 2004?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

The information that the hon Member has requested in these two Questions is set out in the schedule that I hand to him.

## Answer to Question 550 of 2005

### Answer to Question No 549

The PAYE tax (net of refunds) collected in the months of December 2004 to March 2005 is detailed hereunder:

	<b>£M</b>
<b>December 2004</b>	6.0
<b>January 2005</b>	5.5
<b>February 2005</b>	6.6
<b>March 2005</b>	5.9

### Answer to Question No 550

The Corporation Tax collected (net of refunds) in each month since November 2004 is:

	<b>£M</b>
<b>December 2004</b>	3.1
<b>January 2005</b>	0.9
<b>February 2005</b>	2.3
<b>March 2005</b>	10.7

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 549 AND 550 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

In respect of the company tax, I know that the March figure and the December figure seem to be very high compared to the same months in 2003, 2002 and 2001 financial years. Does this reflect a higher level of collection of arrears or the fact that in fact higher profits are being assessed in this financial year?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, this is something that I will be referring to at the debate on the Estimates. Mainly it is one-off payments of tax due, the largest one is a long-standing dispute between one particular corporate tax payer, a bank, and the Commissioner of Income Tax going back several years as to the proper tax treatment of certain transactions. That was settled at that time, the payment was made, so it does not relate to anything in that year. It was collected during that year but actually related to several years before. Of course that will not reproduce itself, that is one-off and there were one or two other payments the nature of which I am happy to explain to the hon Member privately, which also will not reproduce themselves and I think those are about £3.5 million in total in addition to the one of the bank. So they should not be regarded as indicating anything at all. It indicates nothing about trends or profitability or tax collection or anything like that.

ORAL

**NO. 551 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Can Government explain the increase of 350 in the number of Government employee PAYE deduction cards in the Tax Year 2002/2003?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

On the assumption that what the hon Member seeks is to understand why the number of Government 2001/2002 Employees/Deduction Cards was approximately 5,700 as at 6 January 2004 (Question Nos. 547 of 2004 and 2490 of 2004) and approximately 6,050 as at 6 October 2004, in 2002/2003 (Question Nos. 1879 of 2004 and 2491 of 2004) I hand the hon Member a schedule providing the information requested in this question. That is the explanation for the increase in 350 which is the result of net pluses and net minuses in various departments listed there.

**Answer to Question 551 of 2005**

EMPLOYERS REF	PAYING OFFICES	NO. OF DEDUCTION CARDS		
		2001/2002	2002/2003	+/-
G004	Education Department	155	142	-13
G010	Gibraltar Health Authority	682	721	39
G011	Industrial Employees	791	789	-2
G012	Pensioners (Treasury)	1,345	1,373	28
G013	Royal Gibraltar Police	238	242	4
G015	Post Office	59	68	9
G016	Prison Department	6	6	0
G018	Treasury	1,430	1,526	96
G024	Employment & Training Board	317	366	49
G026	Overseas' Pensioners (Treasury)	361	360	-1
G317	Gibraltar Development Corporation	194	194	0
E149	Elderly Care Agency	128	130	2
S416	Social Services Agency	-	167	167
		-----	-----	-----
		5,706	6,084	378
		=====	=====	=====

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 551 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The figure that has been provided in fact includes the pensioners, because in fact I was looking at the breakdown given by the Chief Minister in answer to Question Nos. 2490 and 2491 of 2004, where it showed that the employees deduction cards as opposed to the pensioners, had been 4,000 in one year and 4,350 in the subsequent year. So I take it that the information provided today means that in those figures are people in employment and people who retired having worked in those departments?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I have not got that information but by looking at the size of the figures I would imagine that the pensioners are included in the Treasury figure. So the pensioners are clearly included in the schedule attached to the question, the fourth item "Pensioners (Treasury)" and then further down there is something called "Overseas Pensioners (Treasury)". So it must contain the pensioners but not on a departmental basis because the Gibraltar Health Authority's figures more or less reflect their establishment, so all the pensioners must be in those Heads and not spread around the various departmental headings.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

So in fact the change in numbers ought not to involve pensioners but people at work, the last column.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, correct. In fact a large chunk of them is actually attributable to the Social Services Agency, 167 of them, which were previously paid by Milbury and therefore were not included in the Government totals before. The balance is spread around the other departments so we can see the very bottom figure of 167 in the schedule under the heading "Social Services Agency" and the rest up to 378 is the net pluses and minuses of the departments on the issues above. So it is not all, there is one pensioner in the fourth-last item "Overseas Pensioners", for some reason there is one that distorts the figure and "Pensioners (Treasury)" is actually 28. So it does not relate exclusively to people in post.

ORAL

**NO. 552 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – PAYE**

Based on the 2003/04 Employers Annual Statement Declaration and Certificate submitted to date what was the PAYE payable by area of employment and the number of employees as follows:

MOD;  
Gibraltar Government;  
Government Owned/Joint Venture Companies; and  
Private Sector Employment?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule containing the information he requests.

**Answer to Question 552**

Based on the 2003/2004 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted up to 21<sup>st</sup> April 2005 the information sought is as follows:

	£M	Approximate No. of Employees/Deduction Cards
(a) MOD	4.7	2,650
(b) Gibraltar Government	22.3	6,100
(c) Government owned & Joint Venture Companies	2.6	600
(d) Private Sector Employment	34.2	17,500
	-----	-----
	63.8	26,850
	====	=====

ORAL

**NO. 553 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2005 how many companies, in each tax year 1995/96 to 2003/04 had been assessed for company tax, and what were the amounts of tax payable and paid in respect of each tax year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 554 and 555 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 554 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2005 how many companies had been assessed by the Commissioner of Income Tax without having made a return of taxable profit:

- a) above £35,000; and
- b) below £35,000

for each of the tax years 1998/99 to 2003/04, what was the tax assessed and paid in each case and for each category and each year and what were the amounts assessed and paid by qualifying companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 553 and 555 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 555 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INCOME TAX – CORPORATION TAX**

As at the end of March 2005 how many companies had declared taxable profits;

- a) above £35,000; and
- b) below £35,000

for each of the tax years 1998/99 to 2003/04, what was the tax assessed and paid in each case and for each category and each year and what were the amounts assessed and paid by qualifying companies?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I hand the hon Member a schedule giving the information he requests.

**Answer to Question 555 of 2005****Answer to Question 553**

	1995/96 £m	1996/97 £m	1997/98 £m	1998/99 £m	1999/00 £m	2000/01 £m	2001/02 £m	2002/03 £m	2003/04 £m
Assessed	15.8	15.6	19.8	25.8	88.9	27.5	30.4	35.0	32.3
Discharged	<u>5.8</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>9.2</u>	<u>11.0</u>	<u>75.0</u>	<u>14.1</u>	<u>15.6</u>	<u>18.3</u>	<u>10.8</u>
	10.0	10.5	10.6	14.8	13.9	13.4	14.8	16.7	21.5
Paid	<u>9.5</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>14.4</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>13.9</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>19.5</u>
Outstanding	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.9	1.4	2.0
No of Companies	1445	1418	1466	1456	1540	1570	1510	1444	1330

**Answer to Question 554****COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Year of Assessment	1998/99 £	1999/00 £	2000/01 £	2001/02 £	2002/03 £	2003/04 £
<b>Under £35,000</b>						
No of Companies assessed	771	597	321	361	441	541
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	1.5m	1m	0.6m	0.7m	1.1m	1.3m
Total Paid	1.3m	0.7m	0.2m	0.3m	0.3m	0.3m
<b>Over £35,000</b>						
No of Companies assessed	43	33	7	12	24	36
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	2.7m	2.5m	0.1m	0.3m	0.6m	2.2m
Total Paid	2.7m	2.5m	0.1m	0.2m	0.4m	2m
<b>QUALIFYING COMPANIES</b>						
<b>Under £35,000</b>						
No of Companies assessed	3	6	11	8	14	14
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	4k	5k	11k	5k	21k	9k
Total Paid	2k	-	-	-	-	-

Contd..

**Cont Answer to Question 555 of 2005**

**Over £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	1	4	3	8	10	-
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	2k	12k	15k	0.2m	0.2m	-
Total Paid	2k	10k	6k	-	0.1m	-

**Answer to Question 555**

**COMPANIES OTHER THAN QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

Year of Assessment	1998/99	1999/00	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04
	£	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Under £35,000</b>						
No of Companies assessed	209	286	348	387	353	304
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	0.5m	0.6m	0.8m	0.9m	0.9m	0.7m
Total Paid	0.5m	0.6m	0.8m	0.9m	0.8m	0.6m

**Over £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	69	84	107	119	122	116
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	5.5m	8.6m	10.5m	12.1m	13.6m	17.1m
Total Paid	5.4m	8.5m	10.5m	11.9m	13.4m	16.9m

**QUALIFYING COMPANIES**

**Under £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	5	7	4	6	1	2
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	2k	4k	1k	4k	3k	2k
Total Paid	2k	4k	1k	3k	1k	-

**Over £35,000**

No of Companies assessed	8	15	22	25	16	6
Total assessed (i.e. total tax payable)	0.9m	0.9m	1.4m	1.4m	1m	0.5m
Total Paid	0.9m	0.9m	1.4m	1.1m	1m	0.5m

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 553 TO 555 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The information that the Chief Minister provided in answer to the question on the amount collected in March in terms of company tax, was this relating to some past disputed amount, does he know if that has been reflected in the breakdown by years that there is here where there are assessments that have been discharged and altered as a result of agreements?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I could not tell the hon Member because I do not know if it was ever the subject matter of an assessment. If it had been the subject matter of an assessment there would have been a pretty large figure appearing in the assessed but not paid column, therefore in the outstanding column. Quite a large figure, it would certainly have attracted the hon Member's attention, but I cannot say whether it was the subject of an assessment or not. In other words, the accounts and the issue of the assessment, this is not the sort of tax payer that would normally need to be assessed in the absence of submitting a return, it is a very reputable tax payer, it was a genuine difference of opinion as to the treatment and I would be very surprised if the Commissioner of Income Tax had been quite so aggressive in the case of a tax payer of this kind as to issue an assessment in respect of a disputed fact. So my guess would be that it is not reflected in any of the previous years but I cannot tell him that for sure.

**NO. 556 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**MOD CONTRACTORISATION**

Can Government state when they expect to have completed their report on the economic impact of the MOD's contractorisation plans, should these be implemented and have they now decided to make the report public?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The report is complete and will very shortly be forwarded by me to the Secretary of State for Defence, which is the person I promised to do it for not actually as reported in the press and I think mentioned by him in the press, the Committee, the All Party Parliamentary Committee, as I agreed with him at my recent meeting with him. Government do not intend to publish the assessment at this stage.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 556 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the Government making the assessment available to anybody else other than Mr Hoon?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes, one of the reasons why the Government are not making it publicly available is that the Government have been requested to have it provided to the people who are going to litigate against the MOD on this subject, as evidence in their case, basically the Trade Unions.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Are the Government prepared to provide a copy to the Opposition on a confidential basis?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not willing to circulate the document to the Opposition but I am willing to provide a copy to him as Leader of the Opposition on a confidential basis.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I am grateful.

**NO. 557 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX EXEMPT COMPANIES**

Are Government planning to take any action, and if so what action, to ensure that a product to replace the exempt status company is in place before 30<sup>th</sup> June 2006, the date by which, under the new arrangements with the EU, it will no longer be possible to provide new exempt status certificate?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The future of our finance centre will not be based on the existence of a particular thing called a product, but on the existence of an attractive environment in which to do business. Foremost amongst the elements of such an environment must be fiscal competitiveness, not just for service providers but indeed for their international customers.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 557 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Yes I agree. Therefore what action, if any, are the Government taking to ensure that we preserve that fiscal competitiveness beyond 30<sup>th</sup> June 2006, in terms of corporate fiscal competitiveness?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am surprised that the hon Member is asking me this question but if he insists on asking me then I will have to decline to answer. He must know, or perhaps he does not, that the Government are working closely with Committees of the Finance Centre and it would be foolhardy to put this information in the public domain.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I will not press him on the basis that the Chief Minister's answer seems to suggest that it is a working progress rather than any definitive action yet determined, but I would be grateful if perhaps he could give me a brief of what it is that is happening even if it is not across the floor of this House.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, it is not that sort of thing. The firm of which the hon Member is now a partner is well represented on the Committee and I suggest he inquires of one of them.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am not asking though in my capacity as a member of that firm, I have had to endure several quips the only one of which I enjoyed was the congratulations when I made my statement. I am asking him as a Member of this House, as a politician not as a lawyer, whether he would brief me in that capacity. I do not intend to go and pollute those of my partners, who may be dealing with him, with requests for information of things that they may have been asked to keep confidential in their relations with him. I would not intend to do so that is why I am asking him to brief me if necessary confidentially.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, I am not willing to brief him at this stage.

ORAL

**NO. 558 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORM PROPOSALS**

What stage has been reached in the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission following the latter's rejection of the Government's tax reform proposals after the service of the Commission's Defence and the Government Reply?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 559 of 2005.

ORAL

**NO. 559 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**COURT PLEADINGS**

Will the Government agree to provide the Opposition with copies of the formal pleadings in the legal proceedings (Court of First Instance register number 240836 and allocated case number T-211/04) against the EU Commission, either openly or in confidence?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The written part of the proceedings will very shortly close. The Court will, thereafter, take steps for the further organisation of the case. The Government will give consideration to the request to provide the Opposition with copies of the Pleadings.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 558 AND 559 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I am grateful for that and in fact I think it is best if we proceed to the next question before I ask the supplementary which is perhaps relevant to all three of them if the Chief Minister will agree.

**NO. 560 OF 2005**

**THE HON F R PICARDO**

**TAX REFORM PROPOSALS**

When will Government agree to provide the Opposition with the details of the tax reform proposals they submitted to the EU Commission and which the latter rejected?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

I have on a previous occasion made a statement in this House setting out, in outline, the main and essential elements of those proposals. Government will not publish further details unless and until they are legally in a position to proceed with their implementation and decide so to proceed.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 560 OF 2005**

**HON F R PICARDO:**

In answer to Question Nos. 558 and 559 of 2005, he said something which he has said already before in relation to the answer he has given now in respect of Question No. 560 of 2005, which is that he will give consideration to brief the Opposition or to give the Opposition that proposal in confidence. In fact, in answer to Question No. 1985 of 2004 he told me that I had been able to persuade him to give consideration, I know that is a couple of hurdles away from actually giving me something, I have been able to persuade him to give consideration to actually giving me the proposals, the Gibraltar Government proposals black-lined if necessary to exclude reference to the UK proposals in respect of which it was not yet clear whether the UK had agreed that they should be disclosed to us. Given that I was able to persuade him to consider that when he gave me the answer to Supplementaries in Question No. 1985 of 2004, have I been able to persuade him that that consideration should be favourably determined in favour of at least giving them to us in confidence?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, the Government need to consider this. This is a slightly different request, I mean, this is not the same as the request to give out the proposals themselves, the threshold is actually lower, as far as the Government are concerned in the case of litigation because after all it is just formal pleadings. There would have to be a very clear understanding of what the word "confidential" means. The hon Members could

put the documents or the information that they glean from it to no use whatsoever. I will consider it and write to the hon Member but he has got to understand that even if the Government were to agree, following their consideration to give them copies of the pleadings, they should understand that it is going to be on conditions which they would have to accept in advance that they make no reference in any circumstances to the contents of those documents, at least I suppose until the case rules, until the Court rules.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Of course I understand that and these documents are sought on that basis. I would understand that the confidence would be in every capacity in which I would have that knowledge, so I would neither be free to refer to any aspect of them in an interview attacking the Chief Minister for his folly, if that were to be a particular issue, or in advising a client as to how the structure of a particular tax product in the next two or three years, I would understand that, of course I would understand that, but it has been some time since we have been requesting this information and we would really be grateful if the Chief Minister would, however tight the bounds are that we are to be subjected to, at least give us sight of them so that we stop studying in the dark. In fact, there are instances in which very tight Parliamentary secrecy is enforced, for example, advance copies of the Hartsman Report. Indeed, the Estimates are given stamped confidential on a particular basis. I would have no difficulty with that at this stage because I would understand that if they are advanced to us confidentially then that document to which the Chief Minister referred to this morning, the abridged Oxford dictionary, has only one definition of confidential and he can trust that we will keep it confidential.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The length of time that it takes the Government to consider and to come to a decision that he would regard as favourable, really does reflect the unusualness of the request. It is not usual for Governments anywhere to give to the Opposition, confidentially or otherwise, pleadings in litigation of the companies involved and which are not publicly available. It is not normal for Governments to share this sort of information and documents with Parliamentary Oppositions. So this is not a normal request that the Government are taking a long time to process. It is an abnormal request which the Government are taking a long time to try and reach a decision to give the documents, even though it is most unusual for these sort of documents to be handed out.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

I was not actually referring to that, I accepted the Chief Minister's answer in relation to Question Nos. 558 and 559 of 2005 that he was going to give consideration and I was not pressing him in that respect. I was pressing him in relation to Question No. 560 of 2005, where we are asking for the details of the Tax Reform proposals, where at the last meeting of the House, well in Question No. 1985 of 2004 the Chief Minister said that I had persuaded him to give consideration to releasing them.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

At best we are at cross purposes, I have just said in answer to his Question No. 560 that Government will not publish further details, by which I mean give to him.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Exactly, that is why we are at cross purposes because the answer I have been provided with is published and in the previous answer the Chief Minister at least appeared to me to insinuate that he might have been persuaded to let us have them in confidence, even though I accepted of course that they were not going to be published which was really the main answer, the first answer to that Question No. 1985 of 2004. That is what I am pressing on. Will we please have, at least in confidence, those proposals?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member should read, however open to misinterpretation the word "publish" is, he should read my answer to his Question No. 560 now as meaning that the consideration has produced an unfavourable decision.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

The difficulty that I have with that is that these tax reform proposals have been submitted and a number of bodies have had an opportunity of reviewing them. In fact, what is oft said in the industry, in fact I hesitate to put these words into the Chief Minister's mouth but it may be that even he said them, that the tax reform proposals had actually now been adopted by a number of other jurisdictions like Jersey, Guernsey and the rest of the Channel Islands, they have been seen by the Madrid Government, they have been seen by the Government in London, they have been seen by the Commission. All of those parties have given consideration and perhaps even the Governments of the other 15 or 25 Member States have had an opportunity of considering and assessing them, certainly all the Commissioners of the College of Commissioners have had an opportunity of assessing them but the Opposition do not know what it was that was being proposed for Gibraltar and that had a fairly wide dissemination and publication. It is for that reason that I would insist that the Chief Minister consider granting the Opposition sight of that documentation, and I say granting sight because if he does not want to give me a copy I am quite happy to sit in an office and read through them so at least I have some understanding of them. That would not be, necessarily, unusual.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I know all this, he has put all this to me before on various occasions privately and publicly, inside of this House and outside of this House. I know all of that. He can see by a comparison of the public statement that I made in this House outlining what those proposals were, and what Jersey, Guernsey and the Isle of Man have done, that what they have done is that. He does not need to see the details of that thick of draft legislation which is all that is left to show him, which is legislation that was drafted because it had to be drafted because the process of obtaining clearance from the EC Commission requires the submission of legislation, and it has only been seen

by people who are required to be allowed to see it for the purposes of that EU clearance. Therefore, it has not been seen by anybody other than the people for whose benefit it was drafted, which are the people who have a role to play in the internal EU process of considering and approving or disapproving, disapproving as the events turned out, and the State Aid rules that process. They had not had any wider circulation than that and there are people locally who know it, the draftsmen, the people who drafted it, some of whom are partners in his firm, the one that he has just rejoined today.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

None of which are sharing it with me.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, professionally I have no objection to them showing it to the hon Member. If he is a partner in a firm that has acted for the Government in this particular matter, as far as I am concerned this is not a Chinese Wall issue. If the hon Member then uses that information publicly or politically I will have things to say to his firm but I have no difficulty with the hon Member seeing it in that context, because then no one from anywhere else can suggest that I have circulated this locally to the Opposition or to anybody else, despite the knowledge that it was disapproved by the Commission. So if the hon Member likes I will give a wink and a nod to his new partners, it is not that I do not want him to see it.

**HON F R PICARDO:**

Then what is it? The reason I rise to ask that question is this, because the destiny of those proposals now must be either into the shredder, because we are moving on from that, or after what we all hope will be a successful legal action against their disapproval, that they will once again rise from the ashes as the future corporate tax project for Gibraltar, unless of course we are going to abandon them altogether even if we win in the Commission. So if they are for the shredder then there is no problem, I imagine, in publishing them. If what we are being told is that they are not for the shredder and they are very much alive and post success in the European Court we are going to consider implementing them, then let us be told that. But one of the things that the Chief Minister has said is that he does not want anybody else saying that he has disseminated them more widely. Is it that there is an obligation on the Government not to disseminate them more widely whilst the approval process is ongoing, and by extension of that, the Court action which has now resulted from the disapproval process?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I am making my position quite clear, the hon Member has made a request to the Government, the Government have considered it and have said that they are not willing to provide him with the information that he has requested, and I am not willing to be drawn any further as to the reasons. I have gone so far as to suggest to him a means by which he may clap eyes on them, to which I would not object, and I think he should settle for that.

ORAL

NO. 561 OF 2005

THE HON DR J J GARCIA

**EU DIRECTIVES**

How many EU Directives were pending transposition into Gibraltar law as at 31 December 2004 and how many of these were required to be transposed before that date?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question No. 562 of 2005.

**NO. 562 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU DIRECTIVES**

Can Government list the EU Directives which required transposition into Gibraltar law before 31 December 2004 and which were not so transposed before that date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government have no reliable, comprehensive list of all directives which require transposition in Gibraltar and may not yet have been transposed. The UK has never provided this to Gibraltar and appears to be unable to do so despite repeated requests from us that it would be very helpful to know. In recent years, since the formation of the Legislation Support Unit, the Government of Gibraltar now keep a list of new directives which they draw up from their own sources and research. Of the directives on this list there are about 80 directives outstanding which required transposition by 31 December 2004. These are listed in the schedule that I hand the hon Member. The reasons for non-transposition yet, vary from item to item.

**Answer to Question 562**

**Answer to Question 561 and 562**

<b>Directive No</b>	<b>Name of Directive</b>
91/439	Driving licences
98/23	On the extension of Directive 97/81 on the framework agreement on part-time work.
2000/34	Amending Directive 93/104 concerning certain aspects of the organisation of working time to cover sectors and activities excluded from that Directive.
2001/34	Admission of securities to official stock exchange listing and on information to be published on those securities.
2000/54/EC	On the protection of workers from risks related to exposure to biological agents at work (seventh individual directive within the meaning of Article 16 (1) of Directive 89/391/EEC)
77/486	Education of children of migrant workers
87/54	Legal protection of topographies of semiconductor products.
88/599	Checking system for tachographs
86/613	On the application of the principle of equal treatment between men and women engaged in an activity, including agriculture, in a self-employed capacity, and on the protection of self-employed women during pregnancy and motherhood.
87/102	* Protection of consumers entering into credit agreements (consumer credit)
88/361	Implementation of Article 67 of the Treaty
89/104	Trademarks
91/670	Safety Requirements and attestation of professional competence for cabin crews in civil aviation.
97/26	Driving Licences
90/88	* Consumer credit (APR) see 87/102
2408/92	Third Air Liberalisation.
92/6	Installation and use of speed limitation devices in certain categories of motor vehicles
96/47	Driving Licences
85/3	Weights, dimensions & certain other technical characteristics of certain road vehicles
96/53	Max . dimensions/weights in traffic
96/67	Access to groundhandling market at Community airports
98/59/EC	On the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies
97/52	Public procurement - public service, supply and works contracts
97/36	Broadcasting
97/67	Liberalisation of Postal Services
98/4	Procurement Procedures in water, energy, transport and telecommunication sectors
97/5	Cross Border Credit Transfers
98/76	Admission to the occupation of road haulage operator and road passenger transport operator

**Cont'd Answer to Question 562**  
**Cont'd Answer to Question 561 & 562**

97/74	European Works Council.
97/81	Framework Agreement on part-time work concluded by UNICE, CEEP and ETUC, to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
98/6	Pricing of Goods.
98/7	Consumer Credit
98/84	Legal protection of services on conditional access.
97/7	Distance Contracts
98/33	Amends Directives 77/780, 89/647 and 93/6
99/35	Systems of surveys for the safe operation of regular ro-ro ferry and high-speed passenger craft services.
98/27	Consumer injunctions
2001/78	Amending various Directives on the use of standard forms in the publication of public contract notices.
2001/44	Amending Directive 76/308 on mutual assistance for the recovery of claims resulting from operations forming part of the system of financing the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, and of agricultural levies and customs duties and in respect of value added tax and certain excise duties.
2002/39	Amending 97/67 with regard to the further opening to competition of Community postal services
2001/11	Adapting to technical progress Council Directive 96/96 on the approximation of the laws of Member States relating to roadworthiness tests for motor vehicles and their trailers functional testing of commercial vehicles' speed limitation device
2002/94	Laying down detailed rules for implementing certain provisions of Council Directive 76/308 on mutual assistance for the recovery of claims relating to certain levies, duties, taxes and other measures.
99/44	Consumer guarantees.
2001/23	Approximation of the laws relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights in the event of transfers of undertakings, businesses or parts of undertakings or businesses.
2002/19	On access to, and interconnection of, electronic communications networks and associated facilities (Access Directive).
2002/20	On the authorisation of electronic communications networks and services (Authorisation Directive).
2002/21	On a common regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services (Framework Directive)
2002/22	On universal service and users' rights relating to electronic communications networks and services (Universal Service Directive)
2002/77	Competition in the markets for electronic communications networks and services.
2001/107	Amending 85/611 on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS), with a view to regulating management companies and simplified prospectuses.
2001/108	Amending 85/611 on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to undertakings for collective investment in transferable securities (UCITS), with regard to investments of UCITS.

**Cont'd Answer to Question 562**  
**Cont'd Answer to Question 561 & 562**

2002/6	Reporting formalities for ships arriving in and/or departing from ports of the Member States of the Community.
2000/56	Commission Directive amending Council Directive 91/439/EEC on driving licences.
2002/58	Concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications)
2003/93	Amending Council Directive 77/799/EEC concerning mutual assistance by the competent authorities of the Member States in the field of direct and indirect taxation.
2003/26	Adapting to technical progress Council Directive 2000/30 as regards speed limiters and exhaust emissions of commercial vehicles.
2003/27	Adapting to technical progress Council Directive 96/96 as regards the testing of exhaust emissions from motor vehicles.
2003/49 2004/66	On a common system of taxation applicable to interest and royalty payments made between associated companies of different Member States.
2002/7	Dimensions of Road Vehicles.
2004/66/EC	Adapting Directives 1999/45/EC, 2002/83/EC, 2003/37/EC and 2003/59/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Council Directives 77/388/EEC, 91/414/EEC, 96/26/EC, 2003/48/EC and 2003/49/EC, in the fields of free movement of goods, freedom to provide services, agriculture, transport policy and taxation by reason of the accession of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia.
2004/79/EC	Adapting Directive 2002/94/EC in the field of taxation, by reason of the accession of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia
2001/24	Reorganisation and winding up of credit institutions.
2004/37	On the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to carcinogens or mutagens at work (Sixth individual directive within the meaning of Article 16(1) (codified version)
99/37	Registration of documents for vehicles.
2002/83	Concerning life assurance.
2004/69/EC	Amending Directive 2000/12/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the definition of 'multilateral development banks'.
2002/49	Relating to the assessment and management of environment noise.
2001/45	Concerning the minimum safety and health requirements for the use of work equipment by workers at work.
2002/87	On supplementary supervision of credit institutions, insurance undertakings and investment firms in a financial conglomerate and amending Council Directives 73/239/EEC, 79/267/EEC, 92/49/EEC, 92/96/EEC, 93/6/EEC and 93/22/EEC and Directives 98/78/EC and 2000/12/EC.
2002/96	Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment.
2001/86	Supplementing the Statute for a European company with regard to the involvement of employees.
2002/65	Distance Marketing of Consumer Financial Services. Amending Council Directive 90/619 and Directives 97/7 and 98/27.
2003/6	Insider dealing and market manipulation (market abuse)

**Cont'd Answer to Question 562**  
**Cont'd Answer to Question 561 & 562**

2003/124	Implementing Directive 2003/6 as regards the definition and public disclosure of inside information and the definition of market manipulation
2003/125	Implementing Directive 2003/6 as regards the fair presentation of investment recommendations and the disclosure of conflicts of interest
2004/72	Implementing Directive 2003/6/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards accepted market practices, the definition of inside information in relation to derivatives on commodities, the drawing up of lists of insiders, the notification of managers' transactions and the notification of suspicious transactions
2003/25	Specific stability requirements for ro-ro passenger ships.
2003/24	Amending Council Directive 98/18/EC on safety rules and standards for passenger ships.
2003/8	To improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes.
2003/30	On the promotion of the use of biofuels or other renewable fuels for transport.

## SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 561 AND 562 OF 2005

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Is it not ultimately surely in the interests of the United Kingdom to provide Gibraltar with a list of what needs to be done?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I am not saying that they decline to provide it, I am saying they appear unable to provide it because they themselves do not maintain a list of directives in the whole acquis. When they joined the European Community they did not say 'well here is a list of all the things, these are the ones that apply to the UK and Gibraltar, these are the ones that apply only to the UK and not Gibraltar', and over the years they have not been checking this off, it is all spread over all sorts of Government departments. In other words, they have no record of the directives, that part of the Community acquis, in this case directives, which require transposition and which Gibraltar has not yet transposed. If we had that list we could work systematically through it. In the event what happens is that usually we get three weeks notice of an infraction because that is how the UK has discovered it. The Commission suddenly writes to the UK 'you are in breach because you have not transposed in Gibraltar some 1978 directive or something', and then all of a sudden it is all hands to the punt, when actually what we would like is to say 'look this is the body of directives and we can dedicate resources to go systematically through it and not always be reacting to infractions'. Many of these infractions relate to directives that nobody has ever told us we are due to transpose, and then it appears in the press as if we were very naughty and very non-compliant, and it is not that we are non-compliant it is that we had never been told in a timely manner that we needed to transpose it. So eventually all the very historically old ones, all the sort of pre 1990s directives, will disappear and then the current system will be the list which we have maintained since 1996 through the LSU, and then we should ourselves be doing for ourselves what we have long thought the United Kingdom should be doing for us, and that is providing us with a full list of what are the international obligations that they think we need to be compliant with. So it is not that they have got it and decline, it is that they just do not have the record themselves, they do not have the information.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

The list I have been supplied with is the list which should have been transposed before 31<sup>st</sup> December 2004? There are probably more which have a later transposition date.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Of course, there are more that have a transposition deadline which has not yet been reached and there are a number of reasons why, some of them are just disputed as to whether they apply to Gibraltar or not, some of them the UK have not themselves transposed and the UK hates us transposing directives before they do because it shows them up. So the whole series of different reasons why these directives, I mean he will see an aviation measure there, well that is not transposed, there is a variety of reasons and he should not assume that all the items on that list have not

been transposed because we have not got round to doing it. Some of them there is another explanation for.

ORAL

**NO. 563 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**EU SINGLE EUROPEAN SKY**

Are Government in a position to say whether they have now considered the legal advice they received on the feasibility of mounting a legal challenge to the exclusion of Gibraltar from the EU Single European Sky, and have they now decided whether they are going to mount such a legal challenge or not?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

No decision to proceed with legal action has been taken yet.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 563 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether there is a time limit within which any proceedings have to be started?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I think the answer to that question depends on the nature of the relief sought in the action but I cannot be absolutely certain of that. The position is simply this, if it does prove possible to arrive at an Airport Agreement, which does unlock the aviation suspensions, then of course there will be no need for litigation.

ORAL

**NO. 564 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU PENSIONERS**

Can Government state how many male non-EU pensioners over the age of 65 and how many non-EU women pensioners over the age of 60 were in possession of annual residence permits as at 31 March 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question No. 565 of 2005.

**NO. 565 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**EU PENSIONERS**

Can Government state when the policy was introduced that non-EU pensioners should be provided with monthly residence permits, how many such persons currently have such permits and under which provision of the Immigration Control Ordinance have such permits been issued?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

There were a total of 32 male non-EU pensioners over the age of 65 and 46 female pensioners over the age of 60 who were in possession of annual residence permits on 31 March 2005.

There is no policy under which non-EU pensioners are provided with monthly permits of residence. Therefore, there are no such persons who currently hold monthly permits.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NOS. 564 AND 565 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Is the Chief Minister saying then that when he answered the question in the previous meeting of the House the information he gave me was incorrect?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I think that is consistent, is it not, with the information I gave him last time.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Does the Chief Minister recall that the last time, when he said that there were no permits, he said that if I had put 'monthly' instead of 'annually' in my original question the answer would have been yes instead of no?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, I do not recall. Does the hon Member have the Hansard in front of him? How can I possibly recall what I said to him six months ago?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Well, the Chief Minister seems always to be accusing me of amnesia when I cannot recall something that happened 20 years ago. I do not think six months is too much. Is the Chief Minister in a position to confirm that there was a policy decision taken in respect of non-EU pensioners which would allow them to register as seeking employment and be given monthly permits? That is what he told me the last time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Sorry, what does he think I told him last time?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

What I know he told me last time. that a policy had been introduced under which, it was in answer to Question No. 2472 of 2004, and having been told originally that the answer was no, he said, 'persons of the sort that he has described are issued with monthly residence permits as opposed to annual', which is what the question sought. Therefore I said to him, 'well, is the Chief Minister saying that in Question No. 2472 of 2004 the answer would have been yes if I had put monthly permits instead of annual, is that correct?', and he said 'yes'. I now put the same question with the word 'monthly' instead of 'annual' and he is still says no.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would need notice of the question and of the answer.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I have given notice of the question. The question that I am asking is the question of which I have given notice, and that is to say, I am asking how many non-EU pensioners have been given monthly permits and when was the policy decision taken? He has just told me none because no policy decision has been taken. The last time the question was drafted in exactly the same way, Question No. 2472 of 2004 reads the same as the question that I have put now, except that it asked the number of annual permits as opposed to monthly permits, and the Chief Minister finished telling me in respect of this exchange where I said to him 'if Question No. 2472 of 2004 had the word 'monthly' instead of 'annually' would the answer have been yes instead of no?'. He said 'yes'. Well can I then ask him when the policy was introduced and he did not tell me when the policy was introduced, that is why I am putting the question again. What he said was there had been an administrative concession whereby if an unemployed Moroccan looking for work is actually too old to work, and everybody understands that this just for the purpose of getting his monthly residence permit, then they go and register every six months. I think there are about 35 of the sort that I have just described, monthly. So, I have been putting

the question again to get the bits of the answer to the questions that were not given the last time, but now he seems to have given me a completely different answer.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

I would need to analyse the questions and the answers on both occasions and be advised, because both questions and answers have been drafted by the same people in the same department. So without sight of the debate on the previous occasion I cannot just from what he is telling me even acknowledge that there is a discrepancy, let alone explain the discrepancy or acknowledge that there is a discrepancy. I have just got insufficient sight of, I am not going to look at it now. No. The hon Member thinks that this answer is inconsistent with the answer given last time, I will have Immigration Department officials look at it. Can he just remind me what the number of that question was?

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

Question No. 2472 of 2004 is identical to the question which I have put today, which is Question No. 565, except that the word 'monthly' has been substituted for the word 'annual', which is what he told me I had to do when I asked the question the last time.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Yes I understand all that, I just asked him to give me the number of the Questions so that I can refer to it.

**NO. 566 OF 2005**

**THE HON J J BOSSANO**

**INTERNATIONAL DIALLING CODE**

Are Government now in a position to provide the information of the technical problems and economic cost associated with the possible use of the 0044 international dialling code for calls to Gibraltar?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A possible interim solution to the numbering issue is currently under discussion with the Spanish Government and it would not be in Gibraltar's interests to provide, at this stage, the information requested by the question. I can however say that Government are now confident that all such problems can be overcome, including the cost issues, and that the use of 0044 for calls from Spain only to Gibraltar is viable. That is currently the Government's preferred interim solution.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 566 OF 2005**

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

That is all very interesting, but has the Chief Minister also forgotten that in that same meeting of the House he promised he would write to me giving me the information?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, if I have agreed to write to him and I have not done so, nor has he reminded me until now and that was at least a year ago.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

No, this is not a year ago, this is December last year, three months ago. The Chief Minister has got lots of people on his pay roll to remind him. If he offers across the House to give me the information and can I remind the Chief Minister, maybe that will trigger his memory, that this arose because he had offered to provide the information to the President of the Chamber of Commerce in a debate on television where I participated with him, and when I asked him why was he more willing to share the information of the technical problems with the Chamber of Commerce, he said it was

a very big document and that he would write to me and let me have a summary of the points. I said okay and it has not happened so that is why I put the question again.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

As the hon Member can see I am not supported by officials here, and there is one easy way to avoid this from happening again. In future I will not make any offers to him across the floor of the House, in future when he wants information from me he writes to me and asks me for it, then my staff in the office will have it in their systems and they will make sure that he will not forget. It really is quite simple.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

The Chief Minister can do what he likes, but what he cannot do is tell me what I have to do and I am under no obligation to write to him asking for information. I have got a right to ask him for it in the House. He can either say he will give it to me or he refuses to give it to me because he does not want me to know but if he offers not to give it to me in the House but to write, then I do not think that it is my responsibility to be chasing him to get the answer. He has made a commitment, he volunteered the commitment, if he has decided that he will not give that commitment in future in respect of any information because attached as a codicil to the commitment is that I must keep on reminding him to do what he has promised to do, then I am afraid we do not see things the same way. Everything that is said in this House is broadcast and I would have thought that on many occasions, the Chief Minister must admit, he has made sure that somebody has made a note of what he has said and it has happened. It has not happened on this occasion, I am not sure now from the latest answer whether it is that he overlooked it or that he has changed his mind.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

The hon Member's last intervention is wholly off the point. This is not a question of the information that he is entitled to ask for or not, I know that he is entitled within the Rules of the House to ask what he likes and that I am entitled within the Rules of the House to give it or not. That is not what I am referring to, we now have to stand here stating the obvious to one another. The fact of the matter is that the hon Member complains that at some past meeting of this House I agreed to write to him on something and that through oversight, although he does not attribute it to oversight, I appear to have forgotten to do so. I am saying to him so that in future I do not find myself in this position, given that I have no clerical support here to take notes of the commitments that I give, in future I will not make him offers across the floor of the House to write to him, I will say to him what I have said on two or three occasions already today to the Hon Mr Picardo and the Hon Dr Garcia I think on one occasion, that is to say to them 'if you would like me to provide that information to you, write to me'. Not because writing to me and asking me across the floor of the House is quantitatively any different, but because if he writes to me it then enters the administrative systems of No 6 Convent Place and there is much less prospect that I can forget to do it. If on the other hand I just say it here and I take a note on a little piece of paper and I mislay the piece of paper, there is every prospect that I might forget to do it. So if he would like that information, and he says that I have already committed myself to write to him, I will check the Hansard of that meeting, if he is right in respect of that commitment I will honour it, in respect of future commitments I will make no further commitments to provide him with information across the floor of

the House. When the requirement for it arises across the floor of this House, I will ask him please to write to me so that there is a record of the request which can then be followed up at an administrative level.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

I was not asking him to write to me and the Chief Minister on this particular issue and in this particular occasion was not suggesting that it was information that could not be provided here, because he said 'well I will write to the hon Member setting out the arguments and the relevant aspects of the issue'. There is nothing confidential about the issues themselves, that is what he said, so he could have given me the answer today, and all that I expected to happen today was that since I am repeating the same question of December 2004, page 604, that I would not find any difficulty in being given the answer today. Rather than write giving him a reminder, I repeated the question on the basis that when he had to answer the question he would remember what he said to me three months ago and he would give me the answer today, that is what I expected to happen.

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

Well, unlike him I do not have time to remember what I said to him three months ago in answer to one of 563 questions, and I do not plough through Hansard of every previous relevant question to see who I can catch out and who I cannot. I know that that is how he spends his time, I do not. So it might surprise him to learn, or not, I am completely indifferent to which, it will surprise him to learn that I do not necessarily recall the detail, I can remember the issues that we discussed but I cannot necessarily remember the detail of a discussion that I had here with him four months ago, or whether I agreed to write to him or did not agree to it. He says that I agreed to write to him, I am not disputing it, I am simply saying to him that I do not recall it, which does not mean I did not do it. I have already said to him that if it is true that I did, I will honour that commitment without the need for him to write to me, but that in future, so that my lack of recollection of these administrative details, does not happen again, in future I will not say to him 'I will write to you giving you the information', I will say to him 'write to me asking me for the information'. Then he will get the information in a response, that is what I am saying. It is mechanical not substantive.

**HON J J BOSSANO:**

All I can say to him is that certainly I do not think that being busy is necessarily something that affects one's memory. At least that is not my experience and as far as ploughing through Hansards, well he may not plough through the Hansards of December but he seems to plough through all the Hansards between 1988 and 1996. I suppose since he spends so much time on the Hansards of those eight years, he has no time left to look at the Hansards post 1996.

ORAL

NO. 567 OF 2005

THE HON J J BOSSANO

**VALUATION LISTS**

Can Government state how many residential units were a) added and b) removed from the Valuation List for Rating Purposes in the financial years 2001/02 and 2002/03?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

A total of 124 were added in 2001/2002 and four were deleted. A total of 45 were added in 2002/2003 and 11 were deleted.

**NO. 568 OF 2005**

**THE HON DR J J GARCIA**

**NEW HARBOURS INDUSTRIAL PARK**

Do Government have any plans to sell their various interests in the New Harbours industrial park?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

The Government are considering a proposal which nevertheless leaves Gibraltar Commercial Property Limited, the present owner which is wholly owned by the Government, as the landlord of the estates' tenants. However, the Government's property company would certainly consider proposals for the outright sale of our interest in the New Harbours Industrial Park if an offer was made which was in the public interest.

No such offer has been made to the Government and none is currently envisaged.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 568 OF 2005**

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Can the Chief Minister say whether the proposal which is being considered and which would leave the property company as landlord, as I understood it, would the Chief Minister be able to give details of that proposal and say what exactly the mechanics of the situation would be?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not at this stage.

**HON DR J J GARCIA:**

Might it be possible to say who it was that submitted the proposal to the Government?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

No, not at this stage.

ORAL

**NO. 569 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**EDUCATION – NEW SCHOOL – FLEET PAVILION**

Can Government state when will works start of the construction of the new school at the Fleet Pavilion site?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

This information is not yet available.

**SUPPLEMENTARY TO QUESTION NO. 569 OF 2005**

**HON S E LINARES:**

When the Chief Minister says it is not available, is there not any indication as to when the new In-town project development will start which this school is incorporated to?

**HON CHIEF MINISTER:**

When the Chief Minister says that the information is not yet available, he means that the information is not yet available. That is what he means. There has not yet been an agreement signed with the developer.

ORAL

**NO. 570 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

Can Government state what are the ages of the juveniles charged at the Juvenile Courts giving a breakdown by year from 1994 to date?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 571 to 574 of 2005.

ORAL

NO. 571 OF 2005

THE HON S E LINARES

**JUVENILE COURT**

Can Government state what are the 5 most common sentences in the Juvenile Courts from 1994 to 2005 giving a breakdown by year?

ANSWER

THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER

Answered together with Question Nos. 570 and 572 to 574 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 572 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

Can Government state what is the percentage of convictions verses acquittals in cases heard in the Juvenile Courts from 1994 to 2005?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 570, 571 and 573 to 574 of 2005.

**ORAL**

**NO. 573 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

Can Government state which are the 5 most common offences in all cases heard in the Juvenile courts from the years 1994 to 2005 to date giving a breakdown by year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

Answered together with Question Nos. 570 to 572 and 574 of 2005.

**NO. 574 OF 2005**

**THE HON S E LINARES**

**JUVENILE COURT**

How many cases were heard in the Juvenile Courts in the years 1994 to 2005 to date giving a breakdown by year?

**ANSWER**

**THE HON THE CHIEF MINISTER**

A breakdown of the ages of the Juveniles charged at the Juvenile Court is not available. However, I am advised that the ages of juveniles which appear in the Juveniles Court, ranges from 14 to 16 although occasionally younger children also appear.

The five most common sentences imposed in the Juvenile Court are Binding-over Orders, Conditional Discharges, Probation Orders, Attendance Centre Orders and fines. It is not possible to give a breakdown by years at such short notice as such statistics are not kept by the Courts.

The percentage of convictions as against acquittals in cases heard in the Juvenile Court is not available as such statistics are not kept by the Court. However, I am advised that the Royal Gibraltar Police try to ensure that they do not prosecute juveniles unless they have a strong case, and indeed very few juvenile cases are actually contested. Some cases which appear before the Court are subsequently withdrawn on the basis that the matter is dealt with by way of a caution or by way of a Voluntary Binding-over. That is a promise to the Court to be of good behaviour for a period and in a sum that the Court sets.

The five most common offences which appear before the Juvenile Court are possession of cannabis, theft and/or burglaries, taking of conveyances and driving under age. Also common assault, fights between juveniles and causing damage. It is not possible to give a breakdown by year at such short notice, such as these statistics are not kept by the Court.

The only statistics kept of the number of cases which appear before the Courts is the number of information or charges that the Court deal with in any one year. Therefore if a person is charged with three counts in respect of one incident and that matter has come before the Court on four different occasions due to adjournments, this will amount to 12 entries in the register.

The number of entries in the Juvenile Court Register from 1994 to 2005 to date is as follows:

1994	-	418
1995	-	412
1996	-	436
1997	-	485
1998	-	211
1999	-	1108
2000	-	682
2001	-	1522
2002	-	1249
2003	-	604
2004	-	853
2005	-	367

I would just urge the hon Member to recall the preamble that I have given him to that list, and that is that that is not the number of cases because every Court appearance in relation to a case and each charge is a separate entry in the Register of the Court.