



PROCEEDINGS OF THE GIBRALTAR PARLIAMENT

AFTERNOON SESSION: 3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Gibraltar, Thursday, 20th December 2012

The Gibraltar Parliament

The Parliament met at 3.00 p.m.

[MR SPEAKER: Hon. A J Canepa GMH, OBE *in the Chair*]

[CLERK TO THE PARLIAMENT: M L Farrell Esq RD *in attendance*]

Order of the Day

5

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

10

Standing Order 7(1) suspended to proceed with Government Statement

Clerk: Sitting of Parliament, Thursday 20th December 2012.
Suspension of Standing Orders, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

15

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, I beg to move, under Standing Order 7(3), to suspend Standing Order 7(1) in order to proceed with a Government Statement relating to the Experts' Report into Fishing in British Gibraltar Territorial Waters.

20

Mr Speaker: Those in favour? (**Members:** Aye.) Those against? Carried.

GOVERNMENT STATEMENT

25

**Experts' Report into Fishing in British Gibraltar Territorial Waters
Statement by Minister for Health and the Environment**

Mr Speaker: The Hon. the Minister for Health and the Environment.

30

Minister for Health and the Environment (Hon. Dr J E Cortes): Mr Speaker, the Report from the Commission of Experts on Fishing and Marine Conservation in and around British Gibraltar Territorial Waters has now been received by the Government. It will be assessed over coming weeks by the Department of the Environment and the Nature Conservancy Council, following which the Government will decide on what, if any, action needs to be taken in respect of the matters considered. The Report will

35

be published once this process is complete.

Clerk: Answers to... Sorry.

40

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, it seems to me the Statement is simply to the effect that they have a Statement, that they have the Report. Well, we read that in the press 10 days ago.

Questions for Oral Answer

45

TRAFFIC, HEALTH & SAFETY AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

50

**Clarification on Question 1039/2012
Tenants decanted from unsafe dwellings**

Clerk: Answers to Questions continue.

55

Mr Speaker: Before we proceed with Questions, the Hon. the Minister for Traffic, I think wants to say something, clarification of a matter that was left outstanding on Monday?

Minister for Traffic, Health & Safety and Technical Services (Hon. P J Balban): Yes. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

60

Mr Speaker, further to the reply given to Question 1039/2012, I would like to inform the hon. Member that one further case was erroneously omitted. Therefore the answer is that a total of five tenants were urgently decanted from their flats. The omitted case was that... or the case decanted on 8th November 2012 and they are expected to return to their flats on 20th December 2012.

65

CHIEF MINISTER

70

**Factories Inspectors
Chief Minister's statement to Health & Safety seminar**

Clerk: Question 1070/2012, the Hon. J J Netto.

75

Hon. J J Netto: Mr Speaker, given the answer to Written Question 234/2012, will the Chief Minister now take the opportunity to apologise to the attendees of the Health & Safety seminar organised by the local branch of IOSH and Unite the Union, for having misled them when he said:

'there has been a clear change in Health & Safety since the arrival of the new Government, which has seen the doubling of the Factories Inspectors from two to four'?

80

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, certainly not, as what I told the conference was correct.

85 **Hon. J J Netto:** Mr Speaker, what he did say to the conference is what I have just quoted in my original Question, which I am not going to repeat.

90 The fact of the matter is that he told the conference there were four Factory Inspectors and that is untrue. There are two Factory Inspectors, which have been confirmed by the Chief Minister indeed in last month's answer and indeed confirmed by the Minister for Housing... by the Minister for Health & Safety.

95 The fact is, Mr Speaker, he can wriggle out as much as he wants from what he actually said, but the fact is that he said that, given the enormous energy and push given by the new Government, there are now four Factory Inspectors, which, clearly, there are not. The number of Factory Inspectors today are exactly the same number there were when we were in Government.

What has happened is that the Government has transferred two Health & Safety officers from the Housing Agency to support the Factory Inspectors, but those two people transferred have neither got the role nor the status, nor been given that position by the Director in accordance with the Factories Ordinance.

100 So I put it to the Chief Minister, is his personal ego more important than saying the truth and will he rectify and push ego to one side and apologise to those people for misleading them?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, when people try and bring things like ego into something as simple as this, you know that they are in trouble.

105 There were two Factories Inspectors when the hon. Member was in Government; there are now four. There are two people, of those four, who have been seconded to the post and who have qualifications as Health & Safety inspectors. There are four people doing the work of Factory Inspectors.

It is not a question of ego, Mr Speaker; it is a question of simple mathematics. I said that we would double the number and we have.

110 **Hon. J J Netto:** Mr Speaker, the Chief Minister is actually wrong and if he cares to look back at previous questions, even the questions answered by his Hon. Minister on the matter, in relation to Question 785/2012, in the provisions of how many Factory Inspectors there are, it is two and then you have the two seconded Health & Safety officers, which has also been confirmed by the Minister last month.

115 So we have *not* had a doubling of Factory Inspectors. What we have had, to use a Spanish phrase, is: *desvestir un santo para vestir a otro santo*. That is what we have had. We have *not* increased Factory Inspectors. In any case, the Government, through the Director in accordance with the legislation, has not gazetted the appointment of any further factory inspectors.

120 So it is not a question of mathematics; it is a question that the Chief Minister is trying to wriggle out from being truthful to the facts and therefore the result of the matter is that his ego is more important than the facts.

125 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, I do not discern a question and I am not going to rise to answer the same point again.

Clerk: Question 1071, the Hon. J J Netto.

130 **Welcome to Hon. C A Bruzon
on return to Parliament**

135 **Mr Speaker:** Perhaps before we proceed, if the hon. Member will allow me, I had not realised when I was in the antechamber that the Hon. Charles Bruzon was in the House today. Therefore I am sure I am speaking on behalf of all Members when I say how delighted we are to see him here with us and to wish him every good health. (*Applause*)

140 **Minister for Housing and the Elderly (Hon. C A Bruzon):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker and I thank all the hon. Members for their good wishes for a speedy recovery. I am talking about every Member of this Parliament, including yourself, Mr Speaker, and the Clerk.

Thank you very much. (*Applause*)

**Moroccan workers
Hostel accommodation**

Clerk: Question 1071.

Hon. J J Netto: Yes, Mr Speaker, if I can also add that the general sentiment, I think with the whole House indeed, regardless of where we are sitting, we are all extremely glad to see the Hon. Charles Bruzon here in Parliament.

Will the Chief Minister consider abandoning his policy of transferring the Moroccan workers from the current hostels to the proposed floating vessel, and instead proceed with the GSD Government policy of providing a proper constructed hostel in the old Ready Mixed site in Devil's Tower Road?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, the use of a floating hostel on a temporary basis and the development of a new workers' hostel on land are not mutually exclusive.

Hon. J J Netto: Mr Speaker, they may not be mutually exclusive, but the point is that the new Government decided that they were not going to proceed, for whatever reasons, with the previous GSD Government in providing a properly constructed hostel on the old Ready Mixed site. The new Government is perfectly entitled to choose what options they decide to do.

But the fact of the matter, as I see it anyway, is that the Government finds itself in a situation today where none of the two Moroccan Associations are in favour of transferring the current Moroccan workers in the Buena Vista hostel to this floating vessel. My understanding is that the Moroccans themselves who happen to be in the Buena Vista hostel are not excited and they do not want to go to the floating vessel. Most people in Gibraltar think that it is quite degrading to treat the Moroccans in the manner in which the Government option is – meaning transferring them from a properly constructed hostel to a floating vessel – and in any case, quite apart from the moral issue, which is for me the most fundamental, important issue of all, most people in Gibraltar would think that a floating vessel berthed *anywhere* around the port of Gibraltar is a totally unsightly thing, which obviously does not go hand in hand with promoting Gibraltar as a finance centre.

So, in my supplementary question (*Laughter*) to the Chief Minister, given that there are more and more delays all the time – we have wasted now 12 months and we are exactly today, 12 months on, as we were 12 months –

Mr Speaker: Will the hon. Member ask a question, please? The preamble to justify the supplementary, I think is long enough.

Hon. J J Netto: Will he not consider his current plans, abandon the idea of a floating vessel and construct a proper hostel for the Moroccan workers? (*Interjections*)

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, I do not think the hon. Gentleman understood what it was that I have told the House on previous occasions and what I have reminded him of now. The whole point of the floatel was that it was to provide accommodation for an interim period, whilst a hostel was developed on land.

So it is not a question of abandoning the policy, because there is no policy to abandon. We are not saying that Moroccan workers should live on this floating hostel and not have something built on land. That is to deal with the premise of the question.

Second, Mr Speaker, I do not know how it is that he gets up in this House and makes statements of the sort that he does. He knows that he is responsible for his statements in this House. He has alleged that I have said something which is not truthful. I am not going to pursue that – in his previous Question. But I will tell him, Mr Speaker, that the Moroccan Community Association, the President of which I met yesterday, are very pleased with the possibility of this floatel coming into action. So I do not know where he gets it from, that he can make a statement in this House, as he has a moment ago, for which he is responsible, that both of the Moroccan workers' representative organisations are against this idea.

I also do not know where he gets it from to say that it is degrading to offer people the opportunity to move into what was a three-star hotel – a floating three-star hotel. It then became a prison for a while and if it is to be used, Mr Speaker, it will be subject to a refurbishment which will make it *much better* accommodation than Buena Vista *ever* was for the period when he was in Government, (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) than Devil's Tower Road has ever been for the period that he was in Government, whilst we develop the worthy hostel that workers who come to Gibraltar deserve – not just Moroccans, but many

205 different nationalities, because, as he will know, there is now a call for workers' rooms, not just for Moroccan workers.

Everything, therefore, on which he has premised this Question, Mr Speaker, is unfortunately wrong.

210 **Hon. J J Netto:** Well, Mr Speaker, if it is such a wonderful floating hotel that they are going to do, why is it, at the beginning of his answer just now, he said it is going to be an interim basis. I put it to him in the form of a question: is it that the Government's latest thinking on the matter is that whenever this floating hotel vessel becomes sufficiently good enough to perform the function of a floating hotel, it is going to be for a short period of time – 12 months, 18 months, 24 months – until eventually constructing a proper hostel on land, on a permanent basis?

215 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, yes, except that that is not the latest thinking on the matter. If the hon. Gentleman goes back and looks at the questions he has asked me on this very subject, that is exactly the answer I have given him previously – I think on two or three occasions.

220 **Hon. J J Netto:** So can I ask, Mr Speaker, what is the alternative site that the Government is thinking today, in order to construct a hostel on land?

225 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, there are a number of options and we have not yet identified the one which we will determine is the appropriate one.

Hon. J J Netto: Does the Government have a timetable as to when they think they will determine what is a suitable site?

230 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, when the Government determines a suitable site, it will make an announcement.

Mr Speaker: Next question.

235
Petroleum products
Imports and exports during last 12 months

240 **Clerk:** Question 1073, the Hon. D A Feetham.

Hon. D A Feetham: Mr Speaker, can the Government state the value of imports and exports of petroleum products for the last 12 months?

245 **Clerk:** Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, figures in respect of the imports and exports of petroleum products are provided to the Statistics Office by the importers and are requested on an annual basis at the end of the calendar year. These figures are therefore not yet available.

250 **Hon. D A Feetham:** So effectively, they will be available by the end of this year. Will the hon. Gentleman undertake to provide me with the figures, as and when the Government has it?

255 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, I do not know whether they will be available immediately at the end of the calendar year; it may be at the end of the first month of next year.

For the reasons that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition used to give when he was standing here, in order not to fail in an undertaking, I am not going to undertake to do that, but if the hon. Gentleman writes to me in January, then I will make sure that the person who collates the information does provide it to him.

260 **Hon. D A Feetham:** I am much obliged.

**Public and private sector employment
PAYE payable and numbers employed**

270 **Clerk:** Question 1074, the Hon. D A Feetham.

275 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Mr Speaker, based on the last Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted to date, what was the PAYE payable, and the numbers employed by area of employment as follows: (a) MOD; (b) Gibraltar Government; (c) Government-owned/joint venture companies; and (d) private sector employment?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

280 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, based on the 2011-12 Employers' Annual Statement, Declaration and Certificate submitted to date, the PAYE tax payable by area of employment is as follows (in millions): (a) MOD, £2.88 million; (b) Gibraltar Government, £30.17 million; (c) Government owned/Joint Venture companies, £3.43 million; and (d) Private sector employment, £66.94 million; giving a total of £103.42 million.

285 I will give the hon. Gentleman a copy of this, if he likes. I have not been given a handout.

The Employers' Annual Statements for the tax year 2011-12 are currently being processed and it is not possible at this stage to provide details of numbers employed by area of employment.

Mr Speaker: Next question.

290

**EU Directives pending transposition
Details**

295 **Clerk:** Question 1075, the Hon. D A Feetham.

300 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Can the Government list the EU Directives which are pending transposition in Gibraltar, showing the name and number of the Directive and the date by which they were to have been implemented?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

305 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, all of these questions seem remarkably familiar. I recall Members on this side of the House asking them when we were over there – quite right too!

Mr Speaker, at present, there are five EU Directives pending transposition in Gibraltar. I will now hand the hon. Member a table with the information requested.

ANSWER TO QUESTION 1075

Directives pending transposition in Gibraltar

as at 17 December 2012

Directive name and number	Transposition Deadline
Directive 96/53/EC on maximum dimensions/weights in traffic amended by Directive 2002/7/EC.	17 Sep 1997 09 Mar 2004 09 Mar 2005
Directive 97/81/EC concerning the Framework Agreement on part-time work concluded by UNICE, CEEP and ETUC, extended to the United Kingdom amended by Directive 98/23 (on the extension of Directive 97/81/EC).	20 Jan 2000 07 Apr 2000
Directive 2002/8/EC to improve access to justice in cross-border disputes by establishing minimum common rules relating to legal aid for such disputes.	30 Nov 2004 (30 May 2006 for Art 3(2)(a))
Directive 2002/74 amending Directive 80/987/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the protection of employees in the event of the insolvency of their employer. See now codification carried out by Directive 2008/94/EC on the protection of employees in the event of the insolvency of their employer.	08 Oct 2005
Directive 2004/80/EC on compensation to crime victims.	01 Jan 2006

Mr Speaker: Does the hon. Member have any supplementaries?

Hon. D A Feetham: Are there any infraction proceedings in relation to any of these at all?

Hon. Chief Minister: Not as far as I am aware.

**Legal services
Fees paid by Government**

Clerk: Question 1076, the Hon. D A Feetham.

Hon. D A Feetham: Can the Government give a breakdown of the amounts paid since 9th December 2011 to date to each law firm or barrister in respect of legal services, giving a breakdown by firm and showing what are legal fees and what are disbursements?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, I now hand the hon. Member a schedule with the information requested.

The hon. Gentleman and I spoke in the antechamber, Mr Speaker, about whether this information was on the website. I am asking the Statistics Department to provide this data on the Government website from now on and update it monthly. At present, I am advised that only the fees for legal drafting services are already on the site. These fees are in addition to any fees paid in respect of drafting services. Clearly the sums reflect amounts invoiced and paid and some firms may have unbilled work in progress.

ANSWER TO QUESTION 1076

<i>Law Firm / Barrister</i>	<i>Legal Fees</i>	<i>Disbursements</i>
Andrew J Hayes	£1,200.00	
Beloff QC, Mr M	£1,600.00	
Brick Court Chambers	£7,750.00	
Charles Gomez & Co	£22,212.00	
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton	£197,840.53	£1,915.64
Cramer-Salamian Avocats	£34,973.85	
Hassans	£267,967.00	£62,362.77
Isolas	£13,280.00	£45.00
Jean-Christophe Diserens	£3,551.07	
Lewis QC, Mr A	£3,225.00	
Saini QC, Mr P	£6,000.00	
T&T	£31,760.00	£70.00
TSN	£140,353.00	£83,824.91
Verralls	£9,800.00	£285.00

Hon. D A Feetham: Yes, thank you very much for that.

As I recall, when he used to ask these questions, he always used to split the question up between legal services and legal drafting. I never understood why, because, of course, legal services include legal drafting. So what the Hon. the Chief Minister is saying, really, that that practice of splitting the drafting of legal services, that will continue by putting assistance on the website.

Could I ask the Chief Minister, also, if I were to send him a list of questions that certainly are statistical in nature, that perhaps he might also consider putting that information online – a commitment, of course, he cannot give, because he has not seen the questions – but he might consider putting the information, statistical in nature, also on the Government website, so that I do not have to ask the questions? Certainly I would not ask them on a monthly basis, but certainly every six months.

350 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, I have indicated that this particular statistic will now be published. I have just suggested to the Hon. Deputy Chief Minister that in fact the statistic that the hon. Gentleman asked about a moment ago, which was the importation of petroleum products, which used to be given across the floor of the House, when the now Minister for Employment used to ask the now Leader of the Opposition is another one that I think should be put on the website.

355 I am quite happy to look at a list of questions which the hon. Member is proposing should be put on the website, so that we can add more information to that already transparently available.

360 **Community Care
Funding**

Clerk: Question 1077, the Hon. D A Feetham.

365 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Can the Government confirm how much funding has been provided to Community Care since 9th December 2011?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

370 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, from 9th December 2011 until the financial year-end contributions totalling £5,350,000 have been made to Community Care. The total contributions of the financial year 2011-12 were as per the approved estimate, that is to say £16 million. Contributions to Community Care during this financial year to date – that is to say, April to November 2012 – total £9,165,000.

380 **Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Fund
Employees electing to join Provident Fund**

Clerk: Question 1078, the Hon. D A Feetham.

385 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Can the Government list the entities that were contributing to the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Fund as at the end of November 2012 and in respect of each, state the number of eligible employees on that date and the number that had elected to join the Provident Fund?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

390 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, I will now hand the Hon. Member a statement with the information requested on the list of entities contributing to the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 2) Pension Fund and the number of members that have joined.

He will see that there is not *all* the information that he has requested in what I am giving him and this is the reason for it.

395 All public sector employees are eligible to participate in a pension scheme. Those employees who are not eligible for a pension under the Pensions Act are eligible to join either the Gibraltar Provident (No. 2) Pension Scheme or the Guaranteed Superannuation Fund Pension Scheme. In some cases, employees have been given the option to retain their own private pension arrangements and there are also some employees who receive a gratuity in lieu of a pension under the terms of their contract of employment.

400 An analysis of the number of persons who may be eligible to join the Gibraltar Provident (No 2) Pension Scheme and who may have elected to have other pension arrangements, or indeed who may have elected not to participate in any pension scheme, is not therefore readily available.

I have asked nonetheless that such information should be collated. I expect it will take some months to collate. I will provide the hon. Gentleman with the information when I have it.

Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 3) Pension Fund
Participant employers in private sector

410 **Clerk:** Question 1079, the Hon. D A Feetham.

Hon. D A Feetham: Can the Government state, as at the end of November 2011, which employers in the private sector were participating in the Gibraltar Provident Trust (No. 3) Pension Fund and in respect of how many employees each?

415 **Clerk:** Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, I will now hand the hon. Member a statement with the information requested.

Answer to Question 1079 of 2012

Gibraltar Provident Trust No 3 Pension Scheme
Membership as at November 2011

Company Name	No of Members
Aquagib	3
Baker Tilly (Gib) Ltd	15
Change Management	2
Companies House	12
Fidux Trust Company Ltd	1
Financial Services Commission	32
Gala Casino	1
Gedime Motors Ltd	3
Gibraltar Chronicle Newspaper Ltd	12
Gibraltar Chronicle Printing Ltd	19
Gibraltar Duty Free Shops	1
Gibraltar General & Clerical Association	2
GM International Homes Ltd	2
Grant Thornton (Gibraltar) Ltd	12
Grant Thornton Fund Administration Ltd	4
GT Fiduciary Services Limited	1
Helvetic Fund Administration	2
HFFT Limited	2
James Molinary	2
Ladbrokes International Ltd	18
Lemma Europe	1
Lewis Stagnetto Ltd	31
Marine & Industrial Services Ltd	1
Marr Co. Ltd T/A The Paint Shop	5
Master Service (Gib) Ltd	28
Newcastle Building Society	5
Robvia Ltd	2
Saccone & Speed (Gibraltar) Ltd	12
Serco Limited	105
SM Seruya Ltd	1
Sterling Travel Ltd	1
TCMS Ltd	3
Turner Group	15
Willis Management (Gibraltar) Ltd	9
Xanthos Asset Management Ltd	1
York Ltd	16
Total 36 Companies	Total 382 members

Gibraltar Provident Trust No 3 Pension Scheme
Membership as at November 2012

Company Name	No of Members
Aquagib	4
Baker Tilly (Gib) Ltd	14
BDO	3
Change Management	4
Companies House	12
Fidux Trust Company Ltd	1
Financial Services Commission	38
Gala Casino	2
Gala Interactive	7
Gedime Motors Ltd	3
Gibraltar Chronicle Newspaper Ltd	11
Gibraltar Chronicle Printing Ltd	20
Gibraltar Duty Free Shops	1
GM International Homes Ltd	2
Grant Thornton (Gibraltar) Ltd	13
Grant Thornton Fund Administration Ltd	5
GT Fiduciary Services Limited	1
Helvetic Fund Administration	2
HFFT Limited	2
Hillside Ltd	16
James Molinary	2
Ladbrokes International Ltd	18
Lemma Insurance	2
Lewis Stagnetto Ltd	33
Marine & Industrial Services Ltd	2
Marr Co	5
Master Service (Gib) Ltd	32
Newcastle Building Society	4
Robvia Ltd	2
Rock Motors Retail Ltd	3
Saccone & Speed (Gibraltar) Ltd	12
Serco Limited	99
SM Seruya Ltd	1
Sterling Travel Ltd	1
TCMS Ltd	3
Turner Group	14
Willis Management (Gibraltar) Ltd	8
Xanthos Asset Management Ltd	1
York Ltd	17
Total 39 Companies	Total 420 members

425 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Mr Speaker, these two questions are certainly the type of questions that lend themselves, statistical, to the provision of information on the actual website – not of course on a monthly basis, but certainly, if the Chief Minister would consider on a calendar year basis or at the end of the financial year – and I would ask him to consider actually putting these statistics on the website.

430 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, I am quite happy to consider that. I do not think there is any reason why this should not be available. It is now available in *Hansard*. It should be more easily available on the internet – although of course, *Hansard* is now available on the internet and people can find the information – but I am quite happy that this information should be put into the public domain without the need for there to be a question in this House.

435

Mid-Harbour Estate
Maintenance

440

Clerk: Question 1080, the Hon. P R Caruana.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, can the Chief Minister say why the Government has not properly maintained the Mid-Harbour Estate during the last 12 months?

445

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, the Question is based on a false premise. The estate in question has been properly maintained in the last 12 months. The problems now being experienced in that estate do not relate to a lack of maintenance. Cracks do not appear as a result of a lack of

450

maintenance. Flooding of a garage, as occurred before the General Election, does not occur through any lack of maintenance.

Perhaps the question should be ‘Can the Leader of the Opposition say why his Government allowed the estate to be handed over to tenants despite the problems inherent in the building?’ (*Applause*)

Hon. P R Caruana: He certainly can and has every intention of doing so, Mr Speaker – now, so he does not have long to wait.

Mr Speaker, before I do that, can the hon. Member say how he reconciles his answer that there has been no lack of maintenance with the Government’s public statement that:

‘There has been no cleaning and maintenance of the Aco Drain, the walkway gargoyles are full of muck and sludge and they get blocked with standing water. The roof gutters, the Government has been told, have not been cleaned since handover in March last year and the presence of seagull nests, due to lack of maintenance, has resulted in rainwater overflowing into the roof and creating water penetration issues to the apartment below.

This is not the first of the previous administration’s projects where a clear lack of planning has meant little or no attention has been paid to maintenance issues’,

said Number 6. I presume that when the hon. Member said that a few days ago, he was not referring to seagulls that had been found on 8th December, that he was referring to seagulls recently found and that he was referring to roof gutters that were blocked now, not blocked on 9th December. It is a little bit late, a year later, to say, on 9th December last year there were blocked drainpipes.

The Government has put out a press release listing a litany of things which they have now found, which they attribute to lack of maintenance. Mr Speaker, whatever might be the issues that they found on 8th December, about which we also differ, 12 months seems to me enough for the hon. Members to have put in place whatever system of maintenance they claim the previous Government did not have in place.

So given that he has just claimed that there is now a system of maintenance in place, and by implication has been for some time, why has there been, during the last 12 months, still gargoyles full of muck and sludge that have got blocked with drain waters and roof gutters etc, and seagulls in drainpipes?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, the hon. Gentleman knows that there is going to be a meeting between the Hon. the Minister for Housing and representatives of this estate, I think, in January, the House was told earlier during the course of this session, which will be to address a lot of the issues which are relevant to the estate.

The position is simple, Mr Speaker: of course there is a maintenance programme in respect of Mid-Harbour Estate, but it has not addressed these issues which have caused problems at the estate.

But I thought the hon. Gentleman was going to answer for the cracks, etc that I referred him to. Is it that he is not going to deign to provide an explanation?

Mr Speaker: I think I should tell hon. Members that it is not for the Opposition to be answering questions and if the matter is going to reach that situation, what hon. Members should do is to debate the matter properly and not during questions and answers. They have an opportunity to do that. I have more than once drawn the attention of hon. Members to Standing Orders and Rules and this is a very appropriate matter to do precisely that.

So whilst this is an issue of a certain public importance, I am not going to allow a debate on the pretext of a question and answer session.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, so far I have asked one question and one supplementary. Presumably, Mr Speaker’s [*inaudible*] –

Mr Speaker: No, I am not stopping the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition –

Hon. P R Caruana: – is addressed to the Chief Minister –

Mr Speaker: I have intervened because the Chief Minister has said that the Leader of the Opposition has not answered a question. It is not for the Leader of the Opposition here in the House to answer questions. That can be done in a debate, certainly.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, is the Chief Minister not aware that at the time of the last Election, the Government had in place an arrangement whereby GJBS would deal with the maintenance of this estate, as it does for example, the Edinburgh House estate and that his Government cancelled that arrangement immediately on coming into office. Therefore, far from there having been no maintenance arrangement in place and subsequent maintenance by them after the Election, it is the reverse.

There *was* a maintenance arrangement in place before the Election, which they cancelled and have failed to replace with anything else as a result of which failure to replace our arrangement with anything else, all these things that they themselves have highlighted in their statement have happened: namely, the litany of things that they attribute to lack of maintenance in their public statement have all occurred during the last 12 months as a result of *their* failure to put into place any arrangements for maintenance, having cancelled our arrangements for maintenance, which was the GJBS model. Is the hon. Member aware of that?

Hon. Chief Minister: I am told, Mr Speaker, that that is a tissue of lies. (*Interjection by Mr Speaker*) For a simple reason, I am told that there was *no such contract*, that there was therefore nothing to cancel and what the hon. Member has just told the House is untrue.

Hon. P R Caruana: Well, Mr Speaker, so we are accepting the use of the word ‘lies’, are we across the floor?

Mr Speaker: No, no, no.

Hon. P R Caruana: So you will call him to order?

Mr Speaker: He has now said ‘untrue’. I *thought* I had heard ‘lie’ –

Hon. P R Caruana: Well, you did.

Mr Speaker: I did correctly and therefore I asked him to repeat... to clarify that matter.

Hon. P R Caruana: No, Mr Speaker. The use of the word ‘lie’ for clarification is not permitted –

Mr Speaker: He has said he did not. I would prefer that hon. Members should say that ‘that is not correct’ and leave it at that. So would the Hon. the Chief Minister withdraw ‘untrue’?

Hon. Chief Minister: [*Inaudible*] put it like that, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker: Right.

Hon. P R Caruana: No, Mr Speaker, the hon... it is not a question of what the Speaker prefers. The use of the word ‘lie’ is either permitted or not permitted, regardless of what the Speaker prefers. My understanding of the Rule is that it is *not permitted* and it is not permitted subject to clarification or whether the Speaker prefers this or prefers that.

Mr Speaker: Would the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition listen to me clearly? Please, sit down.

Hon. P R Caruana: Yes, I will, of course.

Mr Speaker: Sit down. The use of the word ‘lie’ is unparliamentary. (**Hon. P R Caruana:** Exactly) Right, he then altered that and said ‘untrue’. I am not making a ruling at this stage of whether ‘untrue’ is unparliamentary or not, but I asked him to amend that and I said that my preference is I do not like to hear the word ‘untrue’ – is it correct or not? That is sufficient.

So forget about the question of lying, because that is unparliamentary and I do not need to rule any further on that.

Hon. P R Caruana: Well, let me tell the hon. Member that whoever told him it was untrue was lying to him (*Laughter*) and let me further tell the hon. Member that *he* has misled this House in the last three minutes.

I did not say in my own intervention, as he has just attributed to me in his last one, that there was a *contract* with GJBS. So in order to accuse me of lying, he says, he is lying because there was no contract to cancel – as if I had said there was a contract! I did not say there was a contract; I said there was an *arrangement*. Even a lawyer of his calibre should know the difference between an arrangement and a contract.

Mr Speaker, there was an *arrangement*, an arrangement the existence of which has been confirmed to me on the telephone very recently by people who would know about it, as indeed I knew about it at the time. Therefore, there was an arrangement that GJBS Ltd would deal with the maintenance of this estate as is the case with Edinburgh House and that they, on coming into office, told GJBS that they were not

575 required to continue with any such arrangement that the previous Government may have intended them to operate.

580 That is why I put it to him there is a lack of maintenance in... and not what he has *incorrectly* – to use the Speaker's preferred word – told the public that they were left with no arrangement and that the lack of maintenance subsequently is the result of that.

Hon. Chief Minister: Well, Mr Speaker, I have not heard a question. I have heard a statement, but I thought the hon. Gentleman was not here to answer questions and I have heard a snide remark about what calibre of lawyer I am, which I can reply to, because I am obviously –

585 **Mr Speaker:** I would rather you did not.

Hon. Chief Minister: Indeed, Mr Speaker –

590 **Mr Speaker:** The quality of barristers is not a matter of concern to this House.

Hon. Chief Minister: Indeed, Mr Speaker, indeed! (*Laughter and applause*)

595 (**Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment**) **Hon. J J Bossano:** Or to most of the human race! (*Laughter*)

Hon. Chief Minister: Absolutely right, Mr Speaker! (*Laughter*) But in fact there are two in this House who have become Chief Minister, so they must be of the same calibre and I do not intend to take it further than that.

600 **Mr Speaker:** Fortunately, there are another two in this House, who, without being barristers, have also been Chief Ministers! (*Laughter*)

605 **Hon. P R Caruana:** I should add, Mr Speaker, with the same degree of humour – whatever degree that might have been, about which I make no comment – as the Hon. Chief Minister has made his remark about barristers and indeed the Hon. Speaker has made his about barristers, then of course the same is true about the qualities of universities which Members of this House have attended, which did not prevent the hon. Member from being perfectly snide about the difference between a degree from Oxford University and a degree from a university... without the Speaker interfering or even sighing.

610 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, I detect in the hon. Gentleman a desire to talk about things which are totally irrelevant to Question Time. So I am going to resist having to get up and deal with issues like this, because my experience is that that is how we get ourselves into the sort of behaviour that people outside this House then come to think is not befitting of this Parliament.

615

Income Tax Act 2010 Issues of concern to Ecofin

620 **Clerk:** Question 1081, the Hon. P R Caruana.

Hon. P R Caruana: Thank you. Mr Speaker, can the Chief Minister say which are the issues about the Income Tax Act 2010 that have been of concern to Ecofin?

625 **Clerk:** Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, the Code of Conduct Group has found that the non-taxation of foreign sourced intra-group interest is a harmful aspect of the Income Tax Act 2010. This is based on a *de facto* assessment of the measure.

630 I am happy to tell him more, perhaps not across the floor of the House.

Hon. P R Caruana: Foreign group?

635 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Foreign sourced intra-group interest.

Hon. P R Caruana: Subject to there not being some other reason to recommend discretion, given that the Commission already know what the proposed solution is – I do not know if there is anybody else that he does not want to discover what the proposed solution is – is he able to say in this House what the Government’s proposed solution is, which he has indicated in the press the Government has for this?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, the Government has consulted quite widely with relevant heads of chambers and heads of accountancy practices and has chosen not to make public what the proposed solution is more widely, because although the Commission will be made aware of that proposal, there are, as the hon. Gentleman knows, other forces at play here, so I am quite happy to brief him as others have been briefed, or have those technicians that advised him and are now advising me brief him on the detail of this, but I would rather not do it at this moment across the floor of the House.

**Western Beach reclamation
Government intentions**

Clerk: Question 1082, the Hon. P R Caruana.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, will the Chief Minister say whether the Government intends to proceed with the Western Beach reclamation?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, Government is assessing the cost of this reclamation before making a final decision on how to progress it.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, is it not the case that much of the cost of the reclamation is in fact not borne by the Government and that therefore the question of cost to the Government is secondary?

Implicit in the Hon. the Chief Minister’s answer is that at present the Government is not proceeding with it, but reserves the right, subject to review, to proceed with it?

Hon. Chief Minister: No, Mr Speaker, because there is active consideration of a number of options actually progressing.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, would that be with the support of and agreement of the important commercial entity in Gibraltar who was to be a principal user of that reclamation?

Hon. Chief Minister: Indeed, Mr Speaker.

Hon. P R Caruana: And can the hon. Member confirm that it is the policy of the Government, as indeed it was the policy of our Government, when we were on that side of the House to proceed with such reclamations as it considers to be in the best interests of Gibraltar regardless of external opposition, either from our immediate neighbours or from further away?

Hon. Chief Minister: Absolutely, except that for this one on the western side, none are presently planned.

Hon. P R Caruana: Sorry, I did not catch: none of what is presently planned?

Hon. Chief Minister: Presently planned.

Hon. P R Caruana: What isn’t?

Hon. Chief Minister: Reclamations.

Hon. P R Caruana: Well, this one. This is on the western side.

Hon. Chief Minister: Except for this one on the western side, none are presently planned.

**Gibraltar public relations in Spain
Recent appointment of lobbying firm**

Clerk: Question 1083, the Hon. P R Caruana.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, can the Chief Minister say how the firm recently appointed by the Government to lobby and conduct public relations for Gibraltar in Spain was selected?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, they specifically offered their services to the Government's Media Director in early 2012. The proposal was considered by the Government to have merit. The advice of the Media Director, having researched the market, was that the proposed cost was appropriate and that the company in question had the background and client base to merit their appointment.

Hon. P R Caruana: So, Mr Speaker, is it the policy of the Government that, in relation to public procurement, they are content not to undergo a process of public tendering for the delivery of public services, if a private supplier approaches the Government privately, makes them an offer which the Government evaluates and considers good, without comparison, without market testing – with or without market testing – and therefore just allocates it? Does the hon. Member not agree that that would circumvent the public tender process for what is a public service?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, not so much as it has been circumvented in the past, but given the very sensitive nature of the service to be provided here and the fact that it is a service being provided to the Government in Spain, not in Gibraltar, then in these particular circumstances, it was thought appropriate to proceed in this way – in these *very particular* circumstances.

Hon. P R Caruana: But would it not have been more appropriate, and indeed more usual, if the Government – and I do not quibble with the underlying desire to have public relations consultants for use in Spain, but is it not a more appropriate and normal way of procuring services of that sort to launch a sort of beauty contest/public tender process to ensure (a) that we are getting the best company for the job and (b) that the price is the keenest for the job? That is what public tendering is for. Why would the Government not have done it that way in this case? What are the particular reasons?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman can sustain that it would have been usual, because, of course, given the many millions expended by the hon. Gentleman on contracts which were awarded directly and which were not put out to public procurement processes at all – and he knows that he and I have a long-standing dispute as to whether, in fact, there was a requirement under EU legislation that particular consultancy agreements were required to go out to public procurement procedures of the European sort – I cannot see how, for *this* contract, it would have been usual to go out to public procurement.

In fact, Mr Speaker, to tell you the truth, given what I have said, I think the hon. Gentleman should be reading between the lines. There is a very sensitive service being provided to Gibraltar here. It is not one where the Government felt it was appropriate to publish a tender asking Spanish companies that provide this service to give us keener prices. There are going to be many more soft issues there than just prices.

I think the hon. Member, if he were not keen to make a political point and were sitting where I am sitting today, would have seen it exactly the same way as I do.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, of course I am very keen to make political points; it is my job as Leader of the Opposition to make them, so I make no apology for the fact that I am trying to make political points. Whether he enjoys them or not is a different matter.

But Mr Speaker, look, I do not accept the hon. Member's constant implication in these statements that we used to contract willy-nilly and without justification, without tender. But even if he were right in levelling that accusation against me, given that he was so critical of it when he was on this side of the House, does he not think that people would expect him not to do the same? Or does he really expect people to accept that what he does is okay, because he thinks that we used to do it too, even though he won office by promising to do things differently?

So, I do not know how long he is going to carry on defending public procurement without tendering, because he alleges that we used to do it as well. But it would seem to me that he should acknowledge that, given that he criticised it, he ought not to incur in it himself.

760 All that said, Mr Speaker, can he tell this House whether there is any connection between this company in Gibraltar, any individual, linked by family to anybody in Gibraltar, any Gibraltarians involved in this company? Is there any link of any kind between this company and Gibraltar?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, he asks questions, pretends to answer them himself and then asks another one.

765 This is not about us doing what we said was wrong when they did it. The hon. Gentleman said in his first question, the question that I answered, would it not have been *usual* for the Government to go out to public procurement tender? Mr Speaker, it could not be usual, given that, for the time that he was in office, these things never went out to tender and contracts worth tens of millions of pounds of consultancy services did not go out to tender, even though there were EU rules that did require them to go out to tender.

770 So this question that we alleged that things did not go out to tender: it is not an allegation; it *happened*. Whether it was usual for something like this to go out to tender: Mr Speaker, it cannot be usual, if it was not done for the past 16 years.

775 Now, the final sting in the tail of the question: is there any connection to Gibraltar, or any Gibraltarian family relevant to this company? As far as the Government is concerned, the answer is no and the reason why this company was chosen had nothing to do with connection with Gibraltar. It had to do with the quality of the work that we are recommended to believe that they can do.

780 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, I have not asked him, whether the decision was made because of any such connection, so it is not a question of as far as the Government is concerned. Really I am asking as far as the Government is *aware* – it is a factual question. Is the Government aware of the existence of any family or other link of any kind with Gibraltar, regardless of whether they took it into account in their decision-making process. Yes or no?

785 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, I think it would have been implicit in what I have said that the answer is clearly no.

Mr Speaker: Next question. Sorry – yes?

790 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Yes, Mr Speaker. Can the Chief Minister answer this? As far as he is aware, he has indicated that the introduction was made by the media manager officer there at No. 6 Convent Place, I presume – Media Director at No 6. Convent Place. Is he aware that there was any other intermediary involved, other than, obviously, the Media Director, who acts in an official capacity? Was there any third party involved in the introduction at all?

795 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, as far as I am aware there was not and the Media Director did not report that there was. If the hon. Gentleman believes that there was, I would like to know.

800
**Lobbyists/political consultants engaged by Government
List and costs since 8th December**

805 **Clerk:** Question 1084, the Hon. P R Caruana.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, will the Chief Minister provide to this House a list of all persons engaged by the Government as lobbyists and political consultants at public expense, and provide the total cost since 8th December 2011?

810 **Clerk:** Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

815 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, the amount paid by the Government in respect of lobbyists and political consultants since 8th December 2011 amounts to a total cost of £170,221. The Government will follow the practice of the previous administration and will give no further breakdown of that sum.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, the hon. Member has now said in two successive meetings of this House that it was the practice of my Government not to give this information, and I do not think that that is true. It may be the case that we were never asked, but certainly, I do not recall ever having being asked

to give details of who public expenditure was incurred with by way of lobbyists and refused to identify the lobbyist or the amount of money paid to him.

So these repeated statements upon which the hon. Member opposite seeks to justify his complete lack of transparency is, as far as my recollection goes, untrue.

However, given that it is already known that Mr Glyn Ford, a GSLP member activist and indeed General Election campaigner, is a paid lobbyist of the Government of Gibraltar, how does it reduce his effectiveness with those that he lobbies, for this House simply to know how much he is paid for the service?

I suppose the damage to the credibility comes from it being known of you that you are a paid lobbyist, not by knowing how much it is that you have been paid to be the lobbyist.

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, he is completely off the mark, even on that. It is very simple. Luckily, we do not rely on the hon. Gentleman's recollections in this House of these debates. There is something called *Hansard*, where he can check what he was asked and the answers that he used to give. Because the hon. Gentleman's recollections, I have learnt, are designed to advance the argument that he is making at any particular time.

Mr Speaker, I am actually not badly disposed – apart from the fact that the hon. Gentleman wants to make a partisan political point and wants to try to use that somehow to make party political capital across the floor of this House. We are not here just to make party political points. He is the Leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition and should be making points which are good for Gibraltar, even if they are political points, not just points which are good for him. (*Interjections*) Not just points that are good for him, Mr Speaker.

But I am actually quite disposed to look at this question with the hon. Gentleman, if he likes, in a different way, but he does not seem interested. He *never* gave a breakdown of the head in the Estimates Book which relates to this, and he refused to do so.

I actually believe that it is not in Gibraltar's interests that we should be bandying this information across the floor of the House, because it could blunt the effectiveness of the service that Gibraltar is paying for. In other parliaments, there are select committees that meet *in camera* that look at details like this, so that public expenditure is exposed in detail to both sides of the House without it being done in a way that results in the effectiveness of what the money is being spent on being lost.

I am quite happy to consider that with him, if he is serious in the issues that he is raising.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, several things: first of all, again he challenges my recollection that what he is attributing to me about my past practices is not true, but he invokes *Hansard*, hoping that people will assume that *Hansard* said what he says it does – but he does not actually produce *Hansard* to demonstrate that what I am saying is incorrect. I am telling him that his allusion to *Hansard* is as inaccurate as his allusion to the fact that I have refused to give this information in the past. It would not have crossed my mind in my recollection and in my knowledge of what our attitude to public transparency was, to have denied this House information about how much a publicly paid consultant was getting, or even to admit that he was a publicly-paid consultant.

But, Mr Speaker, be that as it may, does he not accept that the *blunting*, as he calls it, of the effectiveness of Gibraltar's lobbyists derives not from the people and Parliament of Gibraltar knowing how much they are paid, but it derives from the knowledge that they *are* paid lobbyists and that is already known? That is already in the public domain. Therefore, I put it to him that the logical conclusion to which people will come, hearing him, is that they do not want the people of Gibraltar to know how much of their money they have used to reward Mr Glyn Ford for services rendered to the GSLP.

And the reason why I will not accept his offer of dealing with this in private is because I do not think this is a matter that should be dealt with in private. I do not want to know how much Mr Glyn Ford has been paid as a matter of curiosity; I want to know how much it is he has been paid to see if it is justified in all the circumstances and, if it is not, to be able to bery publicly, which I cannot do, if I accept his offer to be told privately.

Hon. Chief Minister: It is incredible, Mr Speaker, that the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition – Her Majesty's *Loyal Opposition* – has actually accepted on his feet that what he has done by his analysis is, in effect, to blunt the work that could have been successful for the people of Gibraltar being done by a gentleman of the political experience and calibre of Glyn Ford in the European Parliament. He has accepted that himself. It is incredible that he actually seems, from his snigger, to be proud of it.

Hon. P R Caruana: I am.

Hon. Chief Minister: It could be, Mr Speaker, for all he knows, that Mr Ford was doing something very important indeed for the Government and people of Gibraltar, *not* for the GSLP, as he pejoratively

tries to paint it, but then again, I have been at the sharp end of his pejorative painting, he can paint pejorative anything that he likes. The fact is that this Government would not spend a penny of taxpayers' money to advance its party political cause.

885

But of course, Mr Speaker, as we now know, before 8th December, the position was very different. The hon. Member spent taxpayers' money on designs and drawings – taxpayers' money – which he then put into the GSD manifesto for party political ends –

890

Mr Speaker: I think –

Hon. Chief Minister: – and I see him grab his head, Mr Speaker, because he does not want to face up to it.

895

Mr Speaker: With all due respect to the Chief Minister, I think that between the Chief Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, you are both widening the ambit of the original question and I am not going to have any more. Either we return to the specific matter, or we move on to another question.

900

Hon. Chief Minister: Well, Mr Speaker, I am grateful for your indication, because I think that issues like this are what bring Question Time into disrepute, but the hon. Gentleman has been allowed a very wide berth to make very wide allegations against the Government and against the political party that I represent. I have nothing more to say to him on the issue that he raises so pejoratively and contrary, in my view, to the public interest of Gibraltar.

905

Mr Speaker: Next question

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker –

Mr Speaker: No. Next question.

910

Hon. P R Caruana: With respect, Mr Speaker, I wish to raise a Point of Order.

Mr Speaker: We are having no more on this matter.

915

Hon. P R Caruana: But the hon. Member has misled the House in his statement.

Mr Speaker: And you will say something and then he will come back to the charge and the matter never ends!

920

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker – if Mr Speaker does not care –

Mr Speaker: No! If hon. Members want to debate this issue, they can raise it at another time of the agenda – *not now!*

925

Hon. P R Caruana: It is not a question of debating this issue. If Mr Speaker is going to adopt the position of not allowing the Leader of the Opposition to raise a Point of Order –

Mr Speaker: *I am allowing both of you!* I have allowed both of you –

930

Hon. P R Caruana: – without even knowing what the Point of Order is, you should know that we will bring a substantive motion on the subject.

Mr Speaker: If the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition thinks that he can scare me with that threat, he has got another guess coming!

935

Hon. P R Caruana: It is neither a scare, nor a threat. It is my right to bring a motion.

Mr Speaker: And it is my right under Question Time to decide that the matter has been sufficiently aired and to invite hon. Members to have a debate whenever they so wish.

940

Hon. P R Caruana: Well, Mr Speaker, I can tell the hon. Chair this: I have been in this House *only* since 1990 and I have *never*, however spurious it might have turned out to be, *never, never* come across an incident in which a Speaker prevents a Member from raising a Point of Order *without even knowing what the Point of Order is! Never!*

945 **Mr Speaker:** What is your Point of Order?

Hon. P R Caruana: No, Mr Speaker, now I will raise it by substantive motion.

Mr Speaker: Very good.

950
**Overseas Territories Joint Ministerial Council
Joint statement on Gibraltar**

955 **Clerk:** Question 1085, the Hon. P R Caruana.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, can the Chief Minister say why he believes that the recent joint statement agreed by the Overseas Territories Joint Ministerial Council represents a step forward for Gibraltar?

960 **Clerk:** Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

965 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, it represents a step forward, because there is no fetter on the exercise of our right to self-determination referred to, or on the nature of our future decolonised status.

970 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, the *Gibraltar Chronicle* attributes to the hon. Member – I invite him to express a view now, as to whether it *correctly* attributes to him or not – but attributes to the hon. Member statements – I was going to say to the effect, but it is actually explicitly – which convey the meaning that the alleged huge step forward – which I would accept and acknowledge was a huge step forward, if it were correct, and therefore my question is designed to establish whether or not it is correct – that in the hon. Member's view, the UK's withdrawal or non-articulation on this occasion of the words 'where it is an option' amounts to a reversal by the United Kingdom of its position on Utrecht; that it amounts to a denial to the people of Gibraltar of the right to opt for independence.

975 'Asked if this meant that the UK had turned its back on the Treaty of Utrecht, Mr Picardo said'

– that is the attribution that, you know, it may or may not be accurate after it – Mr Picardo said.

980 'he thought it means that the UK recognises that it "cannot curtail our right to decide not to be British".'

985 Of course, which the UK has never curtailed, except that it has said, 'If you want to stop to be British, you have got to be Spanish.' That is the consequence of the UK's position on Utrecht. It is not that you cannot – (*Interjection*) Yes, Mr Speaker. The UK's position on Utrecht is that independence is not an option. You can only cease to be British, either by being independent – which the UK said is not a possibility – or by joining Spain, which the UK says *is* a possibility, but then you become Spanish.

But he added that that would not mean that Britain would concede.

990 'We have moved forward massively',

and then he continues in that vein.

995 If it is true that it can correctly be interpreted, that the correct interpretation of the UK's agreement on this occasion and in that Overseas Territories document, not to qualify – which was a qualification intended for Gibraltar, this business about whether it is an option – no, I am not sure it even is the Falklands; I think it is *just* Gibraltar – then that would be no step forward at all. Indeed, it would be meaningless, if it was just on the basis that it does no harm for the UK not to say it on this one occasion and this one paper, but if it meant – which is what is implicit in what the hon. Member is saying – if it were to mean that this is a signalling by the UK – which is the sense that these statements give – that it was the first indication by the UK of its abandonment of its long-standing position on Utrecht, namely that it operates to curtail the right of the people of Gibraltar to opt for independence – more than curtails; *denies* the right of the people – then that would indeed be a huge step forward, which I would wish to be the first to congratulate the hon. Member for achieving to the extent that he has achieved it, and which this House and indeed the whole of Gibraltar would wish to celebrate more widely.

1000 But what I do not think we can do in this House is... or what I am doing in this House, therefore, is
1005 just ascertaining that these press reports are either being misinterpreted by me or that the hon. Member

has been misquoted, or that they do not mean and are not intended to mean that the UK has reversed its position on Utrecht. But of course if the UK has not reversed its position on Utrecht, it is hardly a massive step forward.

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, the hon. Gentleman has seen not just the interview in the *Chronicle*, but also, I assume, in order to come to this House and make these points, the Statement of the Joint Ministerial Council, adopted by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and by the Minister for the Overseas Territories and placed on the website of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

If he has seen that, Mr Speaker, and he has seen in the report from the *Chronicle* that the draft that was initially put to us specifically carved out the possibility that Gibraltar did not have these rights; but the draft that was approved, because Gibraltar raised those points for those reasons – if he has seen it and as I am going to assume that he has – specifically leaves open those options, and Gibraltar made no secret that it believed it was achieving something, as a result of that, well then, Mr Speaker, either the Foreign Office has signed up to a document that is contradictory, on its face, to the position it has repeatedly taken, or the position is one that none of us would like to consider.

I would invite him therefore to celebrate the fact that there is at least a contradictory document alighting from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, which says specifically that the territories – all of the territories, including Gibraltar – have the right to determine for themselves whether they wish to sever the link. All of this debate, Mr Speaker, in the context... As the hon. Gentleman and I had the opportunity of discussing recently in a very convivial, for once, episode of ‘Viewpoint’, in the context of neither his party nor mine considering that independence is something that we want to pursue, but because of the long-standing theoretical position that Gibraltar was always, in the view of the United Kingdom, prevented from choosing independence – although I have to correct him, Mr Speaker, in this respect: only the *territory* of Gibraltar would become Spanish in the example that he gave, not the *people* of Gibraltar. I think that is an important distinction. We have always – (*Interjection by Hon. P R Caruana*) Well, we have always argued that the land and the people are inseparable, but of course the nationality would not run in that example. (*Interjection by Hon. P R Caruana*)

So, Mr Speaker, if the hon. Gentleman does not have the Statement of the Joint Ministerial Council, I am quite happy to give him a copy, but it is on the website.

Hon. P R Caruana: Well, Mr Speaker, I do have it and of course, it is implicit in what the hon. Member is saying that he is answering the question that I put to him in my supplementary, as yes, that is what I think it means. In other words, I think the UK *is* signalling a resilement from its traditional position on Utrecht, because if all that the step forward was, that the UK had, by eliminating the reference to where it is an option that we have acquired the right to sever the link, the same as all the other territories have the right to sever their link... That is not new. We have *always* had the right to sever the link.

The UK has always told us that we have the right to sever the link. Indeed, Mr Roy Hattersley, in his Hattersley Memorandum, positively *encouraged* us to sever the link and accept that our future was with Spain. The UK’s position in respect of Gibraltar has never been that we do not have the right to sever the link with Britain; it has been that, if we exercise the right to sever the link with Britain, it can only be by joining Spain, but the UK has never prevented us from severing. They have said to us, ‘You can either stay with Britain, or you can integrate with Spain.’ So, the UK’s position has always entertained our right to sever the link.

The massive step forward – which I would love to be the first to congratulate the hon. Member on, because I think it would be a *genuine* advancement for Gibraltar – is if the correct interpretation of the omission between the first draft and the final text of the words applicable to Gibraltar, ‘where it is an option’, were that the UK had abandoned its position with which every Gibraltarian disagrees in theory, even those who do not want independence, that somehow the people of Gibraltar... that the Treaty of Utrecht curtails the right to self-determination, including independence, *if* the people of Gibraltar were to want independence. That would be a massive step forward, because it would be to recognise that we have un-curtailed, unconditional moral rights of self-determination. That would be the massive step forward.

What I am trying to find out from the hon. Member is whether, in his view, that is what he meant when he said that this was a massive step forward – because that is not the impression that the *Chronicle* gives that he meant: namely, does he believe that what he achieved between the first draft and the final communiqué of persuading the UK to eliminate these five words... does he think that the UK was therefore abandoning and reversing its long-standing policy that the Treaty of Utrecht means that the option of independence is not an option for the people of Gibraltar without Spain’s consent?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, if they did not mean that, now they have got all the arguments why they should not. This statement in the *Chronicle* was on 8th December and I have not yet heard anybody from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office set out something contrary to what I said here.

The Treaty of Utrecht is 300 years old next year. I think that age may be starting to show and even the United Kingdom might be embarrassed to be relying on treaties 300 years old to curtail modern rights.

He says, Mr Speaker, that he would be the first one to congratulate me, if I had achieved something like that, but I have heard that before during the course of the Broadcasting Bill, when the hon. Gentleman was analysing how the power in respect of matters of moments of internal security was being dealt with in that Bill. He said, this is going back to the Governor and it should not go back to the Governor because in times of emergency, it should still be Ministers that are relevant, and then he realised that what he thought he had read as 'Governor', actually read 'Government' and he actually said in this House – and thank goodness, Mr Speaker, that we do not rely on his recollection, that there is *Hansard* to show it – that 'this must be a typographical error, this must mean Governor, because if it is "Government", then the hon. Gentleman has achieved a huge step forward and I will be the first to congratulate him.'

Well, Mr Speaker' (*Interjection by Hon. P R Caruana*) I corrected him at the time. I told him that actually it was not a typographical error, that we had achieved that, what he described, 'huge step forward' and yet when the Bill was published, no longer as a Bill but as an Act, I am still waiting for the chocolates or the flowers, let alone the congratulations.

Anyway, look, it is not true, Mr Speaker, that if we were to choose to become independent – an option that none of us considers is appropriate for Gibraltar – we would become Spanish. These things are much more sophisticated than that. The Treaty of Utrecht says that Gibraltar will not pass from under the British Crown to another sovereign. It is perfectly possible to remain under the British Crown and not be dependent on the United Kingdom in one of the models of dependency that is presently accepted.

So therefore, much of what the hon. Gentleman has said is lacking in analysis. But do I believe that we achieved something? I have said as much, Mr Speaker.

I do not know whether it is that the hon. Gentleman wants to set me up for a fall. I do not know whether it is that the hon. Gentleman would rather that we had not achieved anything and wants simply to provoke a response, but I have not been shy in saying what I believe happened, *if* it were that there was another form of words which expressed where independence is an option... but that is not the case, Mr Speaker. The form of words in its place is *explicitly the opposite*.

It says in the text of the press statement of the JMC:

'The people of *each* Territory have the right to choose whether or not their Territory should remain a British Overseas Territory.'

There are many things that we can be which are not a British Overseas Territory and are certainly not Spanish. I would have thought that the hon. Gentleman knew that much. I actually say repeatedly that I have a very high regard for his capacity, his intellect and the calibre of a lawyer that he is. It is a pity, Mr Speaker, that in analysing this issue, he simply wants to try and attempt to show that what I have said happened is not the case.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, I have not attempted to show *anything*! I have asked him a perfectly simple question, the last ten minutes of which can only be interpreted as an attempt to avoid the need to having answered a perfectly simple question.

Does the hon. Member believe that the consequence, that the effect of having persuaded the British Government to remove the words from the Overseas Territories Communiqué, 'where it is an option' that the effect and meaning of that is that the United Kingdom has abandoned or changed or altered or resiled from its long-standing position that the Treaty of Utrecht denies to the people of Gibraltar the right to independence. Yes or no?

I am not trying to achieve any other thing. I would have thought that he could tell me whether he thought that that is what it meant. He does not want to tell me whether that is, but that is what he has told the *Chronicle* he thinks it meant and I wanted him to confirm it to me in this House that that is what he thinks it meant – nothing to do with Spain or treachery or being a good lawyer or a bad lawyer or the Governor and the Broadcasting Bill and *Hansard* and recollections and memories and all this rubbish that he has used to pad out his answer.

The question is simple: is the massive step forward, to which he referred in the local media, is that massive step forward the fact that, in his view, the United Kingdom has abandoned its long-standing position about the implications of the Treaty of Utrecht in curtailing our right to self-determination? That is my supplementary. If he does not want to answer it, he can just say so, but he does not have to conceal his refusal to say so behind insulting or patronising words.

Mr Speaker, I do not know whether I am a good lawyer, a bad lawyer or a medium lawyer. The hon. Member professes to think that I am a brilliant one, but every time I express a view that he does not like, he more or less says that I am some sort of an idiot. Well, Mr Speaker, I cannot be a good lawyer except when I say things that the hon. Member does not agree with.

1130 Let us be clear about this, because I cannot imagine that the hon. Member means what he has said in
 this House just now and I ask him, therefore, whether he does mean it. The hon. Member has in fact said
 that you can be under the British Crown – if he had left out the adjective ‘British’, he would be right! Of
 course you can be under the Crown of Queen Elizabeth II and her successors and not be British. There are
 1135 the Australians and the Canadians and the New Zealanders and all the other Commonwealth Countries
 that recognise the Queen as the Head of State to prove it. You can be not under Britain, not British, but
 have the same Queen as Britain; but of course, when Queen Elizabeth is Queen of Australia, she is not the
British Queen of Australia. This is, she is not wearing the British Crown; she is wearing the Australian
 Crown, and the Queen is not Queen of Australia because she is the British Queen. Now Mr Speaker.
 1140 So therefore, to suggest – and I ask the hon. Member to consider whether this is what he is saying –
 that you can be, theoretically, both independent and under the British Crown is a manifest *nonsense*.
 There is no way of being independent under the British Crown. You can be independent under Queen
 Elizabeth II –

1145 **Mr Speaker:** Will you ask a question, please?

Hon. P R Caruana: Yes, I am asking the hon. Member – I am sorry if I am boring the Hon. Mr
 Speaker – I am asking the Hon. the Chief Minister to confirm whether that is what he said and whether he
 really does believe that you can be independent under the British Crown?

1150 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, I extend to the hon. Gentleman the professional courtesy of calling
 him a good lawyer even when I disagree with him, because I am, I consider, a professionally courteous
 person. Some others might only wish to consider somebody able, when they are in agreement with each
 other. I am not like that.

1155 Mr Speaker, the fact is that – and this is the first time, I believe, since the 1950s – that the United
 Kingdom has put its name, so to speak, to a document that does not draw the distinction in respect of
 Gibraltar that it has traditionally drawn before. So we consider, Mr Speaker, that just there, there is a huge
 step forward.

1160 But I have said what I have said to the *Chronicle* and I stand by every word of it. If the hon. Member
 just simply wants to come to this House with articles in the newspaper and get me to confirm my quotes, I
 am quite happy for him to do so.

The hon. Gentleman, Mr Speaker, will know that, at the time that he was Chief Minister, coins were
 uttered out of the Gibraltar Treasury that referred to Her Majesty the Queen as ‘Elizabeth II, Queen of
 Gibraltar’, much as she is Elizabeth II, Queen of Australia. So is he saying that, in those coins, he gave
 1165 the first hint of a streak of seeking independence that we had not discerned before in him, because they do
 not say the ‘British Queen of Gibraltar’?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I actually believe it is possible for us to be under the British Crown and not
 dependent on the United Kingdom, which is exactly what I said before and I know that his recollection
 may be different –

1170 **Hon. P R Caruana:** You are not answering the question.

Hon. Chief Minister: I know that his recollection may be different, but *luckily* we do not rely on it,
 Mr Speaker. There is *Hansard* to show that that is exactly what I said.

1175 **Hon. P R Caruana:** That is the answer to my question.

1180 **Hon. Chief Minister:** There is much more that we can read into what Utrecht would say, if we were
 to allow ourselves to be dragged back to the times when Utrecht fettered our right to self-determination. I
 invite him, Mr Speaker, to change his chip and to support the Government of Gibraltar in ensuring that
 we get the United Kingdom to stick to its ministerial JMC statement, which sets out the position as
 clearly as it does and to support the Government in taking what we believe is that great step forward. If he
 does not wish to, Mr Speaker, look so be it – he can answer to future generations of Gibraltarians. It will
 not be for want of *our* trying.

1185 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, how precisely does he not understand what I am trying to do? I am
 trying to see whether there is a position on which we can support the Government. What I am not willing
 to do is to give the hon. Member a blank cheque for his completely fantastic interpretation of what
 somebody else said, without that other person meaning what the hon. Member claims it meant.

1190 For a start, the statement that he says is so clear is not couched in the language of self-determination
 and independence and therefore there is not a statement that Gibraltar has the right to independence.

There is a statement about each having the right to choose whether or not their Territory should remain a British Overseas Territory. That is already a wholly different ball park. Or are we now going to –

1195 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Would the hon. Member give way?

Hon. P R Caruana: Yes.

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, we are delving almost into debate –

1200 **Mr Speaker:** Both of you are debating. I have allowed 25 minutes, because it is an important matter, but there is a limit.

1205 **Hon Chief Minister:** And Mr Speaker, this is the sort of thing that I believe we should be debating by motion, because I think it is not bad that Gibraltar should have a fixed position.

Hon. P R Caruana: I think I may have to bring a motion at the next opportunity.

1210 **Hon. Chief Minister:** But Mr Speaker, I asked the hon. Gentleman to give way, because he said this was not couched in the language of self-determination. The sentence that we are talking about is caught between two other sentences. The sentence before says this:

‘We share a commitment to the principle [...] of self-determination.’

1215 The sentence afterwards says:

‘Any decision to sever the constitutional link between the UK and a Territory should be on the basis of the clear and constitutionally expressed wish of the people of the Territory.’

1220 So I actually put it to him, Mr Speaker, that it is very much couched in the language of self-determination.

1225 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr. Speaker, I will just say one more thing, because I agree and it is clear that this is now a debate – and it is an important subject, so I will bring a motion just so that the House gets the opportunity to debate it. But, Mr Speaker, the UK has frequently said of itself that it is committed to the principle and right of self-determination, which is all it does here. There are a *million* quotes like this one!

Hon. Chief Minister: But not in this –

1230 **Hon. P R Caruana:** But when it applies it to Gibraltar, it does, as it does in the preamble to our Constitution, make the wretched exception. This juxtaposition of sentences:

1235 ‘We are committed to a modern relationship based on partnership and shared values. We share a commitment to the principle and right to self-determination. The people of each Territory have the right to choose whether or not their Territory should remain a British Overseas Territory.’

1240 The fact that the words, ‘except where it is not an option’, which do not arise, unless the word ‘independence’ is included in the sentence, which it is not – without including the word independence, they cannot have the omitted words – does not mean necessarily what the hon. Member says it means.

1245 But look, I want it to mean what the hon. Member says it means! But we have got to do – (*Interjection*) Yes, Mr Speaker, but what we cannot do is have another four years of building a castle on sand. (*Interjection*) If the UK genuinely means by this any indication of a change of position, then we should get them to confirm it to us, not build a whole jurisprudence about our future on the basis of a completely... of an interpretation of loose words which, at the very best for the hon. Member, are capable of not meaning what they say.

I am sorry my definition of loyalty and patriotism is not to help the hon. Member fly an unjustifiable kite.

1250 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, his definition of loyalty and patriotism is to pretend that everything that he achieved was great and to try and denigrate everything that anybody else may have achieved. That is *patently* clear.

If I can just tell him, Mr Speaker, if he reads this carefully, the next sentence is equally important because it says:

1255 'Any decision to sever the constitutional link between the UK and a Territory should be on the basis of the clear and constitutionally expressed wish of the people of the Territory.'

In *our* Constitution, there is no reference to Utrecht. There might be a reference in something which is *outside* the Constitution, but not *in* the Constitution. Somebody who wanted to support the cause of Gibraltarians and take them a step forward would be making *that* analysis and not the one that he is making.

1265 **Hon. P R Caruana:** If Mr Speaker will allow me – if not I will wait. I will not... Mr Speaker, even on that, I am trying to be as understanding and as helpful as possible of his interpretation (*Interjection by Hon. Chief Minister*) without allowing him to write gospels which are not the case.

Mr Speaker, even on the question of the final sentence that he has just quoted, the language is carefully selected. Any decision to sever the constitutional link between the United Kingdom and a Territory should be on the basis of the clear and constitutionally expressed wish of the people of Gibraltar. (**Hon. Chief Minister:** *Exactly!*) Exactly, what the Foreign Office will argue is that the constitutionally expressed wishes of the people of Gibraltar cannot include independence, because our Constitution says that our right to independence is curtailed by the non-availability of independence (*Interjections*) – or do you think that word is there by chance?

1275 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, our Constitution *does not* say that. How is it that we can have this debate or this exchange on something this important, Mr Speaker? This, although none of us want independence, is one of the central issues in our politics about the rights of our people. Our Constitution is a document that everyone can see. Some people have problems accessing *Hansard*: now they can see it on the Parliament website, or they can come here, because it is a public document. The Constitution everyone can check at home tonight. It does *not* contain what the hon. Gentleman says it contains about our right to independence. It does not.

1280 **Mr Speaker:** May I now intervene and bring matters to a close.

This is a very important subject. It is a matter that should properly be debated in Parliament, in which other Members of this House would also have an opportunity to participate in the debate. I do not think it is right and proper to abuse the Standing Orders of this House by having a debate following from a question on what is undoubtedly an important issue.

I invite hon. Members to endeavour to bring a motion to the House, have a proper debate, and in the interests of Gibraltar try to arrive at a consensus view. If they can, all well and good and I am prepared to be as liberal as is necessary, but we have had half an hour on this matter and we are moving on to the next question.

Spanish environment site in Gibraltar territorial waters Steps or actions available to seek removal

1295 **Clerk:** Question 1086, the Hon. P R Caruana. Question 1086.

1300 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, will the Chief Minister say what steps or actions are available to seek the removal of Spain's designation of a Spanish environment site in our waters?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

1305 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, the Government is pursuing various avenues in this respect. I do not believe it is in the public interest that I should at this stage divulge what actions are being considered. I am happy to brief the hon. Member today and to keep him briefed on 'Privy Council' terms in respect of this matter, which is in the national interest and one on which we should be entirely united.

1310 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, I accept, on this subject, the briefing on Privy Council terms, but I do not accept the last bit of the statement that we should be united on whatever actions the Government decides it wants to take. It is just that I do not agree with the last statement from the Chair that in the interests of Gibraltar we should try and adopt a consensus position. The important thing is to adopt the *correct* position and disagreements, as we have often agreed across the floor of this House, disagreements on matters, however important the matter is, are not bad in a democracy; it is good in a democracy. It is much more important to the people of Gibraltar that the Opposition does not support the Government on

1315 the wrong argument than it is in the interests of so-called unity for the Opposition simply to support whatever the Government decides is the right course of action.

That was a philosophy which I used to share when they used to utter it in this House, even though others did not, and I will continue to defend from this side of the House.

1320 But I accept that Privy Council rules for briefing are appropriate, given that obviously it is not in the interests of Gibraltar to expose publicly what action the UK Government or the UK Government may be contemplating, and thereby alert others and make the action less effective or less possible.

So I accept the hon. Member's offer.

1325 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Yes, Mr Speaker, I am grateful for that, I suppose. But it is also very important that when the Government puts the right argument, the Opposition, if it is loyal, should support the Government when those right arguments are put. (**Hon. P R Caruana:** Yes.) And should those arguments be tested and analysed? Of course they should, Mr Speaker, but when we reach the right conclusion, we would expect, or the people of Gibraltar, in my view, would expect that the Opposition would support the Government.

1330 In fact, Mr Speaker, it was he who used to say, when he was in Government, that having been elected if there was to be unity, it was around the arguments that *he* used to put. But, Mr Speaker, you know, people will have heard what was said in relation to the former question.

1335 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Yes Mr Speaker, can I just remind the hon. Member, or will he accept something, that the term 'Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition' alludes to loyalty to Her Majesty, not loyalty to the Government? (*Laughter*) (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) This idea that the hon. Member – this theme of the hon. Member this afternoon – that somehow the Opposition is disloyal for challenging the Government on certain matters because they are too important is a figment of the hon. Member's imagination!

1340 The Opposition of Gibraltar will oppose the Government on matters, however important they might be, domestic or external, when we consider that the interests of Gibraltar are not being properly served by their handling by the Government (**A Member:** Hear, hear.) (*Applause*) and our loyalty is to Her Majesty the Queen, not to her temporary Government of Gibraltar as it now likes to call itself.

1345 **Mr Speaker:** Next question.

Hon. Chief Minister: Well, no, Mr Speaker, if I might just deal with that, because I think it raises an important point... With your leave – (*Laughter and interjections*)

1350 I am waiting to hear whether you allow me to carry on, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker: I would rather we go on to the next question.

1355 **Spanish environment site in Gibraltar territorial waters**
Legal effects under EU law

Clerk: Question 1087, the Hon. P R Caruana.

1360 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, can the Chief Minister confirm that the United Kingdom Government has stated to him that all the legal... Mr Speaker, this question is intentionally carefully drafted to be accurate in terms of what can be attributed to the hon. Member.

1365 Can the Chief Minister confirm that the UK Government has stated to him that all the legal effects under EU law of Spain's designation of an environmental protection site in our territorial waters can and will be ignored by the United Kingdom Government and *can* be ignored by the Gibraltar Government?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

1370 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, this answer has been carefully drafted to answer the question.

Yes, sir. There could be no other position to take. In fact the UK Government's position has been clearly set out in the recent statement made by the Foreign Secretary in the House of Commons.

1375 The Foreign Secretary repeated that the designation of the Spanish environmental site does not confer any rights on Spain within British Gibraltar Territorial Waters and that the UK Government remains confident of the UK's sovereignty over British Gibraltar Territorial Waters (BGTW).

The Foreign Secretary also stated that it was equally clear to the UK Government that any attempt by a Spanish State vessel, or a vessel acting on behalf of the Spanish State, to exercise jurisdiction within BGTW is a violation of British sovereignty and that the UK Government will respond accordingly and will continue to take whatever action it considers necessary to protect British sovereignty and the interests of Gibraltar, its people and economy.

For the record, Mr Speaker, the European Court has not in any way recognised the Spanish designation as valid – despite repeated assertions to the contrary by Spanish politicians and commentators. All the EU Court did was turn down Gibraltar and the UK's cases on a technicality.

And finally, Mr Speaker, if I may just add this: it appears to me, Mr Speaker, that the hon. Gentleman sometimes when he speaks is not holding brief for the people of Gibraltar, but for others, and I would ask him to look back on some of the things he has said today and reconsider his position, because although we are, of course, all loyal to Her Majesty, I think our first loyalty should be to the people who put us here – the people of Gibraltar.

Hon. P R Caruana: Well, Mr Speaker, I think it is absolutely shocking and disgusting and typical of the hon. Member's presentational marketing bluster approach to life and to politics for him to stand up in this House to say that I hold a brief other than for the people of Gibraltar.

Mr Speaker, the people of Gibraltar have chosen to elect me to be their Chief Minister on four successive terms. They had no doubt about whose brief I was carrying. It remains to be seen on how many occasions they choose to take the same view of him.

The hon. Member, despite his instincts, should not assume that the interests of Gibraltar coincide with his views or his Government's position or his Government's view on any matter. Indeed, I think the people of Gibraltar think the opposite.

Now, Mr Speaker, so much for his completely uncalled for and outrageous and let me say –

Hon. Chief Minister: [*Inaudible*] mate!

Hon. P R Caruana: And let me say –

Mr Speaker: I really think hon. Members this afternoon are really getting carried away! May I please ask for a modicum of good sense?

Hon. P R Caruana: Yes, Mr Speaker. I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I –

Mr Speaker: Will they please try to lower the tone of the personal acrimony. It does not serve the House and it does not serve anybody any purpose at all.

Hon. P R Caruana: Well, Mr Speaker, I do not concede and I am sure neither does the Hon. Chief Minister that we have incurred this afternoon in bad sense. In other words, the judge of the good sense of Members of this House is for others to make.

The Hon. Speaker could, if he had wanted to, when he heard the hon. Member attribute effectively treacherous motives to me, have stopped him and said, 'That is a breach of Standing Orders. You cannot impute improper motives to a Member.' He chose not to, leaving it to me to incur his wrath –

Mr Speaker: I will now recess the House for ten minutes.

The House recessed at 4.40 p.m. and resumed its sitting at 5.00 p.m.

**Spanish environment site in Gibraltar territorial waters
Legal effects under EU law
Question concluded**

Clerk: Mr Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We were on Question 1,087.

Does the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition have, or any other Member of the Opposition side, have any supplementaries?

Hon. P R Caruana: Yes. I accept the Hon. the Chief Minister's invitation to be briefed on Privy Council terms.

**Gibraltar territorial waters
Freedom to protect**

1440

Clerk: Question 1,088 the Hon. P R Caruana.

Hon. P R Caruana: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

1445

Can the Chief Minister say whether it is the policy of the Government that, in any reconstituted forum of dialogue with Spain, the Gibraltar Government *must* be free to protect Gibraltar's sovereignty by adopting positions and making statements in relation to co-operation matters and initiatives that protect exclusive British sovereignty and Gibraltar jurisdiction over territorial waters?

1450

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, yes, sir.

I should add that the Government of Gibraltar remains strongly committed to dialogue as part of the trilateral process and that the United Kingdom has also repeatedly stated that it remains similarly strongly committed to the trilateral process.

1455

Hon. P R Caruana: Yes, Mr Speaker, I asked the question in order that our positions should be clearly known in public and on the record because *this* is what the Spanish Government means when it accuses me, in the trilateral process, of raising issues of sovereignty. Raising issues of sovereignty.

1460

Why would I want to *raise* issues of sovereignty with Spain? It is that raising issues of sovereignty took the form of *not agreeing* to particular forms of co-operation in relation to the waters because they would prejudice exclusive British sovereignty. I think it is important, Mr Speaker, that we agree that no one out there should think that there is any scope for redesigning dialogue, either inside or outside the trilateral forum, in a way that any Gibraltar Government could accept without being free to say, 'That is not acceptable to me because it prejudices British sovereignty.'

1465

I think it is important that this message is heard and that it is understood. Firstly, would he – and I had better convert this into a question – agree with me that the fact that you are not formally discussing sovereignty as an agenda item and that you do not want to speak about it and that your interlocutor does not want to speak to you about it, cannot be an impediment to you adopting positions on co-operation matters, which is wholly different, by invoking the need to protect sovereignty?

1470

Hon. Chief Minister: Yes, Mr Speaker, I have always understood that and that can also be expressed in another way, which is to say that one will *not* consider any issues of sovereignty in such a process and that, therefore, if something which arises touches and concerns sovereignty, in the same way as you can raise sovereignty in order to ensure that sovereignty is not affected, you can also say, 'Because it touches and concerns sovereignty, I am not prepared to go into it.' (**Hon. P R Caruana:** Yes.) Those are two sides of the same coin, if he will accept that.

1475

Hon. P R Caruana: I do accept that and when he has said, 'Because it prejudices sovereignty,' the other side cannot say, 'I am going away because he has raised questions of sovereignty.' That is the point, Mr Speaker: that they abuse the raising of the question of sovereignty, based on what is a discussion about co-operation, but in which you have also got to be mindful that co-operation does not become a Trojan horse through which sovereignty is prejudiced.

1480

The reason why I am asking this question is that it is a complete red herring. It is a complete red herring for either of the three parties to the trilateral forum – any of the three parties, by which I mean Spain – to think that they collapsed the trilateral forum for that reason and that any other process of dialogue is viable, quite apart from the trilateral aspect, in which we must not, we cannot, and we would not be free to do exactly the same. Every co-operation on waters which *they* say are disputed *necessarily* involves being on your guard and questions of potential sovereignty implications.

1485

1490

Hon. Chief Minister: Yes, Mr Speaker, and what I am asking him to consider and also put for the purposes of the understanding of the position of both sides of the House is that there can be not just a positive veto – and I would interpret what the hon. Gentleman has said as representing the positive veto – but also a negative veto.

1495

Therefore, those who say that they would not engage with the Government of Gibraltar, because their prejudice leads them to say that they do not consider us to be valid interlocutors in respect of the issue of sovereignty, might actually be more comfortable and Gibraltar might be just as protected, if Gibraltar was saying, 'We do not believe that there should be *any* room to discuss issues of sovereignty in a process where the relevant three sides are represented,' and where co-operation touches and concerns on those issues, where *one* of the parties is uncomfortable – ourselves being the relevant party in this respect – we

1500 can have a negative veto on the issue. I think that is two sides of the same coin. But it can help, perhaps, to get some people who might be comfortable with the *positive* veto, because the way that we would express the negative veto would be to say, 'Because it is sovereignty, neither of us believe that we should be engaging with each other on it,' and it may be that issues of co-operation then are not advanceable in some areas.

**Draft Ministerial Code
Presentation to House**

1510 **Clerk:** Question 1089, the Hon. P R Caruana.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, can the Chief Minister say when he expects to bring to this House the promised Ministerial Code?

1515 **Clerk:** Answer, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, the Government will shortly start work with the Hansard Society in the United Kingdom to produce a draft Ministerial Code. The work will also produce a draft Parliamentary Code to cover all Parliamentarians and a draft Civil Service Code to cover the work of Civil Servants.

1520 The draft Ministerial Code and the draft Parliamentary Code will be brought to this House for debate. The draft Civil Service Code will be considered with all representative bodies, including the Unions, in the Civil Service Review.

1525 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, I asked the hon. Member that because, in a pre-electoral press conference, he said that he had laid it down as one of his first priorities for Government, the drafting and adoption of a Ministerial Code by which all Ministers will have to abide, thereby underpinning the need for real accountability etc, etc.

1530 'If I am elected Chief Minister by our people, I would immediately instruct the drawing up of a draft Ministerial Code to meet the specific requirements of Gibraltar's modern Government.'

1535 Will he accept that, whatever it is that he intends to do now, he has *not* given the matter the immediacy, the urgency and the priority that he said in his pre-election statement that he would?

1540 **Hon. Chief Minister:** No, Mr Speaker, for this reason, because I have a draft Code on my desk which I am not happy with and that is why we are going to work with the Hansard Society in order to produce a better Code which will be brought to this House for consideration. It is, Mr Speaker, in my view an essential of the modernisation of the work of this House that there should be not just a Ministerial Code, but also a Parliamentary Code, as well as a Code in terms of the modernising of the work that is done by the public sector for Civil Servants.

1545 So, Mr Speaker, I am afraid I will not take the point, but it is an important thing which will be achieved shortly and I hope it will be something on which the House can work constructively when we bring the draft Codes here.

1550 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, given that the hon. Member said, pre-elections, that he was going to do it immediately, if the hon. Members were keeping a list of the electoral promises that they had not complied with, as well as the ones that they have complied with, does he accept that this would be on the first list? In other words, the ones that they have not complied with since, for whatever reason, the priority and immediacy as his *first priority for Government* has not materialised in that way.

And, secondly, can I ask him if he can put a timetable on this? Are we going to exhaust any sort of more significant part of this legislature of this term before we have a Ministerial Code?

1555 I asked somebody who said it was very important that we should have it. We did not have it because we did not attach to it the same need of priority; but *he* has given it a lot of priority. Therefore, I would be grateful if he is able to give this House any sort of indication of what he means by 'shortly' in terms of the fruits of the co-operation with the Hansard Society.

1560 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, no. I would not accept that it would be on the wrong side of the balance sheet - on the negative side of the balance sheet - for a number of reasons. First of all, I have told him there is a draft. I just did not consider it an appropriate draft.

Secondly, Mr Speaker, if he wants to look at where it is that we have ticked the boxes from and, perhaps more importantly, he might care to look at the manifesto which was what we put to the people during the course of the Election period, which says this, Mr Speaker, the Ministerial Code on Page 12:

‘We will adopt the Ministerial Code applicable to Her Majesty’s Ministers in the United Kingdom with such modification as may be necessary to adapt for the circumstances of Gibraltar and it will apply to Ministers. A Parliamentary Code will apply to all Members of Parliament.’

There is nothing there, Mr Speaker, to suggest when it would happen. In any event, Mr Speaker, given that I opposed him for many years when he used to tell us that the word ‘soon’ could mean as frequently as outside of the four years that make up one Parliament, then perhaps the word ‘immediately’ can also be interpreted as not necessarily meaning the week after.

But I will tell him this, Mr Speaker, in the hope of finishing this period of Question Time in a more convivial mode, I sincerely hope that we will soon receive the recommendations of the Parliamentary Commission, of which Mr Speaker is Chairman. This is an important part of the work of modernising the work of the Parliament as much as the consideration of the proposals of the Parliamentary Committee will be. I sincerely hope that this will be something that will be done, if not in the first half of the next calendar year then, at the very latest, in the context of the full calendar year next year, in time for it to be done half way through our Parliamentary term at the latest.

Hon. P R Caruana: Mr Speaker, can I ask the hon. Member why it should take so long to...

I take his point about quoting from the manifesto. I had made the mistake of relying on this sort of painting the panorama with a wonderful photograph of the then Leader of the Opposition and the then Leader of the Liberal Party, now the Deputy Chief Minister, convened expressly for the purpose of saying that it was one of his first priorities in Government, the drafting *and* adoption - not just the draft sitting on his desk.

So I am afraid I fell into the trap of thinking that what he tells the electorate *outside* of his manifesto is also something that the electorate can expect him to deliver on, but now I know that it is only what is in the manifesto that counts and I suppose people will have to remember that.

But can I ask the hon. Member, I am not aware of what the detail of the UK Ministerial Code is and, therefore, I do not know how appropriate or inappropriate it might be in its application to Gibraltar, but can he explain why the application of the UK Ministerial Code to Gibraltar, which is what he has now read out to me from his manifesto as being his manifesto commitment, as opposed to the press conference, why it should take so long? What is there conceptually about the UK Ministerial Code that takes, possibly from now, twelve months, twenty-four from the Election, to modify and tailor make for Gibraltar?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, there are a number of aspects of it that we think can be more appropriately worded for Gibraltar.

I am not going to answer the rest of what he addressed because I did hope that we would end this Question Time on a more convivial note! (*Interjection*) He used to tell us that the things which are conjectured in the Westminster Parliament are not necessarily the best in the world and that we should not just *slavishly* copy what it is that Westminster does.

Now, Mr Speaker, I will take the example, if he likes, of what it is that is wrong with that Code and why we have not adopted it by comparing it to whatever it was that was wrong with the Environmental Charter, Mr Speaker, where the hon. Gentleman told us repeatedly that he was working very hard on it because it was such an essential document and I remember the Hon. Mr Netto was then the Minister responsible for the Environment. That it was taking a hell of a lot of his time and the time of Mr Netto to ensure that we had a *better* draft than simply the one that had been adopted by *all* the Overseas Territories and thankfully, Mr Speaker, there is *Hansard* to vouch for that. (*Interjections*)

When it came, Mr Speaker, seven years later – *seven* years later – *one* word had changed from the draft adopted for all the other Overseas Territories. I will always remember it, Mr Speaker, as a one-word change and I am delighted *on this occasion*, Mr Speaker, I am so sure of my ground that I am delighted to take him the *Hansard* for Christmas so that he can enjoy reading it!

Hon. P R Caruana: No. Mr Speaker, the hon. Member may be able to do that with the Management Plan that *followed* the Environmental Charter, but the hon. Member must surely remember - if not he can refer to *Hansard* - (*Laughter*) that I said in this House that we were going to adopt the same Environmental Charter as the UK but in a way and a time that made it perfectly clear that, because the environment was a constitutional responsibility of the Gibraltar Government, that we were not doing it by directive and compulsion of the UK Government, like all the other Overseas Territories were doing it. In

the end, we changed just one word to make it clear, (*Laughter*) but I explained in this House what we were doing and why we were not doing it in the same way.

1625 The exchange to which he relates and invites us all to go to *Hansard* in the certain knowledge that nobody will - certainly nobody listening - is in relation to the Management Plan, which did take quite a long time to develop, which is the phase after the Charter.

1630 But the Charter *itself* was *unashamedly* to adopt the same standards and priorities as other Overseas Territories, but in a way which reflected the fact that this was *our* decision, because it was our constitutional competence and not something that the UK could decree in an Overseas Territories Consultative Council [*inaudible*]. That is how it happened, Mr Speaker, and I will go no further than that so as not to spoil the conviviality which the hon. Member seems keen to end today's proceedings on.

1635 **Hon. Chief Minister:** Mr Speaker, all I will say is that we have had a lot of arguments about what is or is not in *Hansard*. I am so sure of my ground on this one that I will bet him, double or nothing, all the other points of *Hansard* that have been raised today, because on this one he was *explicit*. He was explicit as to why we were taking so long, not on the Management Plan but on the Charter, to only see a one word change in respect of the Charter.

1640 I remember saying, Mr Speaker, at the time that even the penguins of the British Antarctic Territory had beaten us to it. But, Mr Speaker, I will leave it at that.

Mr Speaker: Next question.

1645 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Mr Speaker, may I ask...–

Mr Speaker: Sorry, I didn't realise ...

1650 **Hon. D A Feetham:** In relation to the Parliamentary Code that the Hon. the Chief Minister mentioned, does he have drafts in relation to that or is he waiting for the Report from the Committee before he embarks on the drafting of the Parliamentary Code?

1655 Also, whilst he is at it, could he also answer this: will the Opposition be consulted on the drafting of the Parliamentary Code or is it the intention of the Chief Minister to effectively bring a draft Code to Parliament to debate and then consider what views have been expressed and change it in the light of that because in our view – in my view, certainly – the Opposition ought to be consulted *pre* the debate in Parliament?

Hon. Chief Minister: Mr Speaker, there is as much a draft of a Parliamentary Code as there is a Ministerial Code, which has been an adoption of the English version, which I do not think necessarily works.

1660 Remember that the UK Parliament is a Parliament of 650 Members. This is a very different sort of Parliament that works in a very different sort of way. There are no backbenchers here, for example. There are simply Members of Government or Members of Opposition. So all of these issues, Mr Speaker, are relevant to what has been produced. (*Interjection*)

1665 Mr Speaker, I believe... there aren't today... But there aren't today.

1670 Mr Speaker, I believe it is incumbent on the Government to produce a draft of this and then to debate the issues with the Opposition. I will make sure that all Members of this House have advance copies of the draft as soon as it is available to us and we will receive representations from the Opposition once they have the draft. I believe it is important that those documents be *debated* and *adopted* by the House because they are documents, in my view, *of* the House that will regulate the behaviour *of* Members of the House and Members *of* the Executive.

If the hon. Member, when he has received the draft, wants to make any drafting points, wants to make any substantive points, in representations to the Government, then I assure him that they will be considered in good faith.

1675 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Will the hon. Member just consider in his own time – clearly, there is time for the hon. Member to think about this - that in the UK that is not how it would happen, and I think for good reason.

1680 I think once the Government brings the draft of the document to this House and we debate it in this House, there is a sense in which the Government wants to defend the content of what it brings to the House. Equally, I suppose, there is a sense in which the Government may think that it needs to resist any points that the Opposition makes and, indeed, might consider that the Opposition simply wants to, as he has suggested today, score political points. (*Interjection*)

Hon. Chief Minister: Would the hon. Member give way?

1685 **Hon. P R Caruana:** In the UK... Yes.

Hon. Chief Minister: Just for a moment. Perhaps, in setting out my position of what I think the process should be, I have not alighted upon the fact that the Hansard Society, of course, in producing the draft I think will be, rightly, in touch with the Opposition.

1690 That is not an issue that I see being in dispute, but it will be produced for the Government and the Government will then bring it here and there may be issues thereafter. So I do not know whether that deals with the point that the hon. Gentleman is putting.

1695 **Hon. P R Caruana:** In the UK legislation even, let alone... this would be taken in committee first and it would be scrutinised in a committee in which political input can be had before it gets into the glare of the adversarial environment of the floor of the House. It depends on what we want to do. Clearly, it is a Government proposal; the Government has chosen not to do it by means of a select committee of the House, presumably because it is not a parliamentary thing, it is for the executive and the opposite could have been argued, too.

1700 I do not know whether the hon. Member is willing to say if the Government considered making that project a parliamentary project, as opposed to a Government project, and allow a committee of Parliament to take responsibility. It is part of their manifesto, as we have now said.

1705 Certainly, if the Hansard Society will consult with the Opposition that, in large measure, serves the same purpose as the Government itself consulting; in other words, the Opposition will have a role, an opportunity to express views and influence what eventually reaches the floor of this House, before it is too late.

Hon. Chief Minister: Yes, Mr Speaker, that is how I see it.

1710 Even in the most convivial moments, I would not put a manifesto commitment or control of delivery of a manifesto commitment in a committee of the Parliament over which the Government would have no control.

Hon. P R Caruana: We did.

1715 **Hon. Chief Minister:** But that was not an issue that had to be delivered within a particular period of time and a constitution is something well above even the Parliament, Mr Speaker. So I do not necessarily think that a select committee of the Parliament is necessary for something like this. I think that, with the assistance of an entity like the Hansard Society, working as much with the Opposition as with the Government at the consultative stages, as much with Mr Speaker and the Clerk during the consultative stage, I think that that will produce a draft Code.

1720 As I have said, the Members will then be sent the draft, so that they can make representations before it comes to the debate. So I think we may be arguing over something where, perhaps – I do not whether I dare hold myself hostage to this – but perhaps we might all be agreeable, anyway.

1725

ENTERPRISE, TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT

1730 **Registered unemployed
Number of Moroccan workers**

Clerk: Question 1055, the Hon. J J Netto.

1735 **Hon. J J Netto:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister for Employment say how many Moroccan workers aged 60 and over are registered unemployed at the Employment Service, broken down by age and length of time as registered unemployed?

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment.

1740 **Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment (Hon. J J Bossano):** Mr Speaker, as at 30th September 2012 the total number of Moroccan workers aged 60 and over registered unemployed was 42.

1745

The breakdown by age is as follows:

1750	Age 60	4
	Age 61	1
	Age 62	12
	Age 63	10
	Age 64	8
1755	Age 66	1
	Age 67	2
	Age 68	1
	Age 69	1
	Age 72	2

1760 The breakdown by length of time registered as unemployed is as follows:

1765	Under 3 months	10
	3 – 6 months	3
	6 – 12 months	7
	12 – 24 months	9
	Over 24 months	13

1770 **Future Job Strategy trainees**
Permanent jobs; contract terminations; public and private sectors

Mr Speaker: Next question.

1775 **Clerk:** Question 1056, the Hon. D A Feetham.

Hon. D A Feetham: Mr. Speaker, how many Future Job Strategy trainees have found permanent employment in the entity they were placed for training since the scheme began, stating whether they were taken on in the private or the public sector?

1780 **Clerk:** Answer, the Hon. the Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment.

Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment (Hon. J J Bossano): I will answer this Question together with Questions 1057, 1058 and 1063.

1785 **Clerk:** Question 1057.

1790 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Can the Minister for Employment please state as at 30th November 2012, how many Future Job Strategy trainees are placed in the public sector and how many are placed in the private sector?

Clerk: Question 1058.

1795 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Can the Minister for Employment please provide brief particulars of the reasons why each Future Job Strategy trainee has had his contract terminated with ETCL, other than the fact that that person has found permanent employment?

Clerk: Question 1063.

1800 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Can the Minister for Employment please state how many Future Job Strategy trainees have had their contracts terminated with Employment Training Company Limited since the scheme was introduced, other than for reasons that the trainee in question has found permanent employment, giving a breakdown of whether the trainee was placed in the public or the private sector at the time?

1805 **Clerk:** Answer, the Hon. the Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment.

Hon. J J Bossano: Mr Speaker, as at 30th November 2012, 54 trainees were employed within the entity that they had been placed for training, eight in the public sector and 46 in the private sector; 178 trainees were placed within the public service and 329 placed within the private sector.

Other than as a result of having obtained employment, 96 ETCL trainees, of which two were in the public service, had their contracts terminated, 62 were at the individual's own request, 20 found not suitable, 12 due to reports of misconduct and two were not offered employment.

Hon. D A Feetham: So, on the last statistic, in relation to the two that were not offered employment, can the Hon. Minister confirm that the training was actually recuperated by ETCL as, in fact, is stated in the contract, with each service provider or training provider?

Hon. J J Bossano: The two employers have been invoiced with the amount and one has confirmed that he will be paying and I am awaiting an answer from the other one and action will be taken if it is not complied with.

Hon. D A Feetham: Mr Speaker, in relation to the question whether individuals or trainees have found permanent employment with the entity that they had been placed for training, I think the answer that he gave me there was that 54 individuals (**Hon. J J Bossano:** Yes.) had been found permanent employment and eight in the public sector. (**Hon. J J Bossano:** Yes.)

My recollection of the hon. Member answering my questions about this in the past has been that the whole object of the exercise - despite the fact that we disagree, that this is the way that it was put at election time - was that people would be shifted from the public sector to the private sector, because there was never any *guarantee* of employment in the public sector and the promise was a guaranteed job in the private sector. Can the Hon. the Minister for Employment please inform this House as to what qualities, what special circumstances, were involved in relation to these eight very lucky individuals that were found permanent employment in the public sector?

Hon. J J Bossano: Well, Mr Speaker, the very lucky individuals were the lucky individuals who were in the Care Agency being trained as carers, which was the group that I have already identified in answer to previous questions, where they are trained as carers to work in the elderly care home and, clearly, there is not another home that they can find jobs in. These people have been trained specifically for that and, consequently, although there is not an agreement in terms of a partnership agreement with a business, they are recruited in the knowledge that there is a vacancy for them to go to.

Given that the system that was in place before, the hon. Member will remember that, if you were a local, you were asked to have either two GCEs or experience and, if you did not have the two GCEs, you could not get the experience because there was nowhere else to get the experience. As I explained to the hon. Member, the criterion is still two GCEs or experience, but they can get the experience now by going in as a trainee and the reason why there are only eight is because only eight have been there long enough. There will be more than eight, but they will all be in that category.

Hon. D A Feetham: Are we talking about individuals that are specifically training for a qualification relating to care workers, or are we talking about individuals that are effectively placed within Social Services and there is no qualification at the end of the day, that those individuals are taken on within Social Services and then placed within the care worker section within Social Services?

Hon. J J Bossano: They are not in Social Services. These are the individuals - (*Interjection*) - these individuals are in the Care Agency and, in fact, what they have got is evidence of having worked in a home which is what all the frontier workers that were recruited previously had, when they came with a piece of paper from the other side. They had no qualifications in anything because what was required was *either* GCEs or experience and what the people here could not get was the experience, unless they went to work in La Linea first and got the piece of paper from there.

Hon D A Feetham: Yes, with respect to the hon. Gentleman, I think that his references to frontier workers are completely irrelevant to the question that I asked him. I would not want the hon. Gentleman, or the people listening to this debate, to come out of this debate with the impression that the hon. Gentleman has something against Spanish workers. I just would not want that at all.

He has not answered my question. (*Interjections*) He has not answered my question. He has not. No. Perish the thought. Absolutely. He has not answered my question. The question is, is there a qualification at the end of it, that these eight individuals have been trained have a qualification at the end of it for care worker, or is it that these eight individuals are part of a number of people placed within the Care Agency and they are doing on-the-job training and, at the end of the day, the Government decides to take them on as care workers.

1870 Whilst he is at it, could he also answer this? Are these eight individuals just simply doing care worker work, or are they doing something else, as part of their placement with the Care Agency before they were taken on?

1875 **Hon. J J Bossano:** Mr Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. Member thinks I am for or against frontier workers, but we have got a very clear manifesto policy on what we want to do for all the unemployed that are in Gibraltar, as he knows. The position is quite simple. All the care workers that were there in Mount Alvernia before 9th December have no qualifications. What they had was experience of having previously worked in a care home and all the care workers in this group of eight have got the same level of skill that was previously required, before 9th December, but was not *obtainable* before 9th December, because the previous administration did not give the opportunity to people here to come in with no previous experience and acquire the experience as part of a training programme. The training programme leaves them at the same state of skill that the other carers, that were recruited before, had when they were recruited, which they obtained by working in their home state, in homes, similar to ours, which was not possible here, because there was nowhere else those skills could be obtained within the boundaries of Gibraltar.

1885 It may be that, in future, we will decide to introduce this, since we are talking to City and Guilds about a whole range of different qualifications that the experience they have obtained and the training they have had will enable them to get a piece of paper, but that piece of paper has not been required of *anybody* working in the home before 9th December.

1890 **Hon. D A Feetham:** The hon. Gentleman has mentioned frontier. He is the person that has brought it up, Mr Speaker. He has mentioned in the same answer the question of frontier workers and the question of these trainees, so therefore I would ask him to answer this question. Is it the Government's policy to have a situation where, effectively, non-Gibraltar belongers are gradually removed from the Care Agency and replaced by Gibraltar belongers?

1895 I quite understand, and I accept, that it must be the aim of *any* Government of Gibraltar to get as many of our people in employment as possible. I accept that, but I am asking whether, as a matter of policy, the policy is to remove those that are there now – and I understand some people are there on 11 month contracts that are revolving – and effectively replace them by Gibraltar belongers? Has he received any representations from the Union in relation to this policy by the Government and what is the Government's attitude to that?

1900 **Hon. J J Bossano:** Mr Speaker, first of all, I am not responsible for dealing with the unions and I am not responsible for industrial relations, as he knows.

1905 Secondly, the question is about *my* responsibility as Minister for Employment in relation to training and my responsibility is to get as many of the resident population into these jobs, which was what used to happen before 1996 and then, for some peculiar reason between 1996 and 2011, the previous administration argued, that people either were not interested in that kind of work or were not able to do it. We have already produced eight and we are going to produce many more. Since there is a continuing demand for this work, if we had not put in place this mechanism, all that would have happened would be that that avenue of employment would have been closed to people in Gibraltar, because there was no way, without working in the home, that they could learn how to work in the home, since there is no other one. Therefore, the situation is that we are committed to continuing this level of training and to increasing the number of resident workers. There are many young people interested in learning to do this job and I am very happy that they are, because it proves that the argument that was being used before was not true. They simply did not explore the avenue of the local supply workers.

1915 I need to remind the hon. Member that when I have asked in the past about the reason for having imported workers in this area, I was regularly told that it was only because they were there, as it were, on temporary, renewable contracts, while people were being trained. All the people that are on 11-month contracts and are concerned about the renewal of those contracts are not people who have started work in the last 11 months, but people who were already on 11-month contracts before.

1920 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Mr Speaker, what I have asked the hon. Gentleman is whether there is a deliberate policy on the part of the Government to effectively remove the workers who are there at present, because they are Spanish or non-Gibraltar belongers, replacing them with Gibraltar belongers. Is that the policy or is it not the policy?

1925 Again, for example, another question he can consider as well, because it is related....

1930 **Mr Speaker:** Why can we not deal with one question at a time?

Hon. D A Feetham: Because it is related, I think that it would be helpful, but I will sit down if –

Mr Speaker: No, no, fine.

1935 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Do these eight arise from, for example, *new* vacancies that have been created by the Government, or is it replacing Spanish workers who have not had their contracts renewed?

1940 **Hon. J J Bossano:** Mr Speaker, these people are filling jobs that are there on the complement that the House has voted and the jobs they are filling are the jobs that were empty, otherwise we would not be able to fill them, irrespective of whether the jobs are filled, because there were people before who have left, or there has been an increase in the complement. The reality is that more than eight new jobs have been created in this financial year, if the hon. Member cares to look at the number of carers employed last year and this year. In fact, we need more than eight in order to meet the requirements of the increases as a result, for example, simply of the wards that have been opened in the St Bernard's Hospital, which are part of the Care Agency.

1945 **Hon. D A Feetham:** My final question in relation to this series of questions: you may recall that we have had a number of exchanges across the floor of this House in relation to the length of contracts of people in the Care Agency. We have questioned the Government about this, the issue of 11-month contracts. Is it the policy of the Government that, where a Spanish national or non-Gibraltar believer serves out his or her 11 months, the Government is not going to renew that contract and will effectively have a situation where that vacancy is then filled in by a Gibraltar believer? Is that the policy?

1950 **Hon. J J Bossano:** Mr Speaker, I do not think this is a question that arises from any of the originals. The hon. Member is asking me what has happened to the people who have completed their training in ETCL and now he is asking me is it the policy of the Care Agency to replace their employees with trainees?

1955 I have just told him that there are, at the moment, more than sufficient extra jobs requiring people to be recruited than there are people in the pipeline. So it is a non-issue as far as I am concerned, but, in any event, I am answering as Minister for Employment questions relating to my responsibilities, which are for the trainees that come out of training. All the trainees that are currently – there are many more than eight – completing their training in the next month or two and that figure will be growing substantially and since there is always, in all these outfits, a turnover, what the hon. Member will see is an increasingly resident, predominantly Gibraltar staffed Care Agency, which is what used to be in the past, and what has changed in the last 15 years. We will be moving back to the direction, where these job opportunities will be there for our people that need the jobs.

1960 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Mr Speaker, I wanted it to be my last supplementary, but the Hon. the Minister for Employment is – and I do not want to be derogatory of the hon. Gentleman – but he is the master of not answering the question and effectively weaving in and out of the dangerous territory that obviously he is treading. He is treading the dangerous territory, not because I asked him the original Question, but because it arises out of an answer he has given me in supplementaries. Therefore, I am entitled to pursue it.

1965 The question is, is it Government policy, is it *deliberate* Government policy not renewing those 11-month contracts in relation to Spaniards and non-Gibraltar believers, in order that those vacancies can be filled in by Gibraltar believers?

1970 Because we all know, Mr Speaker, that...

Mr Speaker: You have asked the question.

1980 **Hon. J J Bossano:** Mr Speaker, the hon. Member clearly has not followed what has been going on in this Parliament in the last 15 years, otherwise he would know that whenever Members of the Opposition ask a question and do not like the answer, what the Government Members used to say from this side, 'Well, look, that is the answer that you are getting. It may not be the answer you want to hear and it may not be the answer you like, but it is the answer you are getting.' And the answer he is getting is that, as Minister for Employment, responsible for the ETCL, which is what the original Question is, I am telling him that the ETCL trainees will be increasingly filling the jobs in Mount Alvernia. As a consequence of that, all the jobs that come out in future will be taken by local people – *all* of them. There will be no new people coming in, because we do not need them. We have got our own supply of people, willing and able to do that work, and all the jobs that become vacant, either as a result of people leaving, or as a result of the expansion of this service will be taken on by local people.

1985 The only reference that I make to frontier workers is that he seems to be concerned that the locals should be qualified, notwithstanding the fact that the record that he defends is 15 years of taking people from outside, who are not qualified, who were taken simply on the basis that they had experience: and

1995 they produced a letter, showing they had worked previously in the field. That is the only reference I have made, that we are giving people in Gibraltar, for the first time, the same opportunity to get these jobs that people from outside Gibraltar have, because they were being *discriminated against* previously, since more was being required of them. If he thinks that that gives him the right to question what may or may not happen to people who are now in employment, he can ask it till the cows come home, but I am not going to give him any answers, other than the one I want to give him.

2000

Clerk: Question one thousand and –

Mr Speaker: [*Inaudible*] you have...

2005

Hon. D A Feetham: Does he not recognise – and he and I share some common values –

Hon. J J Bossano: I hope not! (*Laughter*)

2010

Hon. D A Feetham: Whether he agrees with that or not, just simply because I do not like the way that he does things, we share some common values. One of those values, as somebody who comes from an ideology that is a centre-left ideology, is not to just simply sack an individual and make that individual unemployed or prevent them from pursuing employment opportunities just simply because they are Spanish nationals or non-Gibraltar belongs. Does he not accept that is entirely wrong to, effectively, have a policy that is dependent on a philosophy that says, simply because you are *not* a Gibraltar national, despite the fact that you may be the best person for the job, despite the fact that you may be doing your job to the best of your ability and everybody is happy with you, we are not going to be renewing your contract of employment because I want to fill this vacancy with trainees? Does he not accept that, as a matter of principle, that is wrong?

2015

2020

Hon. J J Bossano: Mr Speaker, I do not accept that he is left of anything, let alone centre-left or left of centre. Therefore, I do not accept that, ideologically, we have anything in common and I do not accept that there is a shred of anything left in him that was common to us when we used to belong to the same party.

2025

Starting from that premise, it is quite obvious to me that he wants to make an issue of something that has not happened and which he claims *may* happen. When and if it happens, if he wants to bring a censure motion to this House, in that we are being too concerned about protecting jobs for Gibraltarians, he can do it and we can debate it, but I am answering questions to him about what is happening with the trainees who are in the system *now*.

2030

He chooses to do that to try and pursue a line, which happens to coincide with incorrect views that have been expressed in the Spanish media, which we have made absolutely clear have not got a shadow of truth in them. Therefore, he knows exactly what he is doing and I know what he is doing and the answer is that his question is: do I accept, or do I not accept that something that has not happened would be wrong, if and when it happened? The answer is that he is not entitled to ask that question, because nobody in the Care Agency or anything else has been sacked on grounds of nationality. So his argument is simply in his imagination and in the fiction that is being put out in the public domain. (*Applause*)

2035

Hon. D A Feetham: Just one more, Mr Speaker, on this series of questions. He says that it is untrue and he questions my motives as to why I ask the question. Well, actually, I ask the question because perhaps I am also aligned to all those workers from the Care Agency, and Mount Alvernia in particular, who last week nearly went on strike, because the Government, it appeared, led by the initiative, by you – sorry, Mr Speaker, by the Minister for Employment – had taken the view that somebody who was there and everybody was happy with them, simply because they were Spanish national, not resident here in Gibraltar, that that person could not have his contract renewed and could not reapply. Indeed, the Chief Minister had to intervene in the situation to prevent industrial action. Is that not correct?

2045

Hon. J J Bossano: It is not correct that I have anything to do with industrial relations or industrial action. Therefore, Mr Speaker, the hon. Member is *inventing* things and then asking me whether they are correct. His inventions are not correct. I have had nothing to do with this, any more than I have to do with a supposed party that excludes Spaniards, on my instructions. That is a complete lie and what the hon. Member is now saying is new to me, is also a complete lie. I have nothing to do with the people who are in employment. I am concerned with the people who are *unemployed* and the concern that I feel for them clearly is not shared by that side of the House.

2050

Fine, that is evident because, if they did share it, we would not be in a situation, where the level of local participation in the staffing of the Care Agency has been declining year after year after year in the last 15 years.

2055

**Level of unemployment and benefit paid
Details from January 2012**

Clerk: Question 1059, the Hon. D A Feetham.

2060

Hon. D A Feetham: Can the Minister for Employment please state how many people were registered unemployed as at 30th November 2012 and on a month-by-month basis since January this year, the number of people in receipt of unemployment benefit?

2065

Clerk: Answer, the hon. the Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment.

Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment (Hon. J J Bossano): Mr Speaker, the number of persons receiving unemployment benefit as at the end of each month, in each of the first three quarters of 2012, was as follows:

2070

January	105
February	127
March	152
April	127
May	127
June	118
July	218
August	223
September	204

2075

2080

Hon. D A Feetham: Mr Speaker, with respect to the hon. Gentleman, he is more candid with the information he provides the *Gibraltar Chronicle*, than with the information he is providing this House today.

2085

I asked him for unemployment *figures*, where people are registered unemployed. The Question is in two parts: 'Can the Minister for Employment please state how many people were registered unemployed' and then the question about receipt of unemployment benefit, because I want to compare one with the other, but he said to the *Gibraltar Chronicle* that there were 1,000 people unemployed and that was reported in Monday's edition of the *Gibraltar Chronicle*. Perhaps he did not read it because he was not in Gibraltar.

2090

Can he please provide the figures for registered unemployed in Gibraltar?

Hon. J J Bossano: I think, Mr Speaker, the Question has been interpreted, the hon. Member was asking for the unemployed at 30th November and not for the unemployed on a month-to-month basis since January, which I believe is already public.

2095

Hon. D A Feetham: No, it is not... the unemployed on a monthly basis is not public. What I have asked is, how many people were registered unemployed *as at* 30th November 2012. As at that date, how many people were registered unemployed *and* on a month-by-month basis in January this year, the number of people in receipt of unemployment benefit is two separate, effectively –

2100

Hon. J J Bossano: I know.

2105

Hon. D A Feetham: Yes. He has given me the second and the hon. Gentleman knows that I have concentrated my public comments on questions of unemployment in relation to receipt of – in fact, not even receipt of unemployment benefits – applications made and accepted, on a month-by-month basis, of unemployment benefit. That does not actually deal with receipt of unemployment benefit, which he has provided. But I have not, actually, I have never asked the question – and I am asking now about registered unemployed as at 30th November. He told Mr Dominique Searle at the *Chronicle* that there were 1,000 people registered unemployed. That was reported in the *Chronicle*. Is that a correct figure or is it not?

2110

Hon. J J Bossano: Mr Speaker, first of all, I have told him that the figure for the fourth quarter will be given in January 2013.

2115

Mr Speaker: No. I am afraid, the hon. Member, you actually omitted that last sentence. I noticed that you had –

Hon. J J Bossano: The fourth quarter will be given in January 2013.

Mr Speaker: He omitted to say, I have it here in the draft answer – the fourth quarter will be given in January 2013. He had the answer, but he omitted to –

2120

Hon. D A Feetham: Yes, but what is the previous quarter? It is not in the – if the answer is that registered unemployed – and he knows what question I am asking – if the answer is registered unemployed, the figures are made up on a quarterly basis. I am telling him that it is not on the internet, so I do not know what the previous quarter of registered unemployed had been, because it is not on the internet.

2125

What is on the internet, and what I have been using, is applications made and received for unemployment benefit and, on that basis, I have calculated that there must be between 8% and 10% more unemployed, effectively, recently, the last time I made my statement, than there was on 9th December. I suspect there is much more than that. If you do not have the figure for registered unemployed for this last quarter, what is the figure for the last quarter, but you have not given me an answer in relation to that at all.

2130

Hon. J J Bossano: Mr Speaker, the hon. Member has got a Question, which is what is the unemployed on 30th November. The figure for 30th November – which is the one he is asking for – will be given in January, in accordance with the policy adopted by the previous Government and spelt out in answer to Question 443/2007, where the previous administration said that they would only produce the unemployment figures on a quarterly basis. Therefore, since the Question is only asking about November and November is in the fourth quarter, he will get the fourth quarter in January. The second half of the Question has been interpreted by the Department to be limited to the people who are receiving unemployment benefit. (*Interjection by Hon. D A Feetham*)

2135

2140

As far as the numbers unemployed, I can tell him that the figure for the unemployment, from my recollection, is around the same as it has been in the past – in that there is a fluctuation, it tends to go up in the summer months and it oscillates around the figure of 500, who are the people that are registered unemployed. As the hon. Member knows, we have got people who are on social assistance, people who are in training without a job guarantee and we consider all those to be without a job and, consequently, unemployed. So we do not make the distinction between whether they are registered as unemployed, or they are available for work without bothering to register.

2145

The figure of 1,000 is the figure that *he* was using before the Election and the figure that I have been using since and what I have made clear on a number of occasions in public is that, notwithstanding the fact that the numbers in employment have gone up this year, and the figures are on the internet and I am sure, if the Member looks at the number of residents taken into employment, he will see that, already in 11 months, we have exceeded the numbers employed in 12 months in the preceding year. So, notwithstanding that, the numbers that are still available for work and without a job has not come down, because more people have come and registered. Sometimes, people who have been out of work for a very long time are now registering. Therefore, people on Social Assistance are not registering so, in fact, the registered figure is not coming down, even though the figure in employment is going up. The registered figure still oscillates around the 500 mark. It changes up and down from month to month.

2150

2155

Hon. D A Feetham: I will ask him for all the previous four quarters, which are not on the internet, at the next session of the House.

2160

The Hon. the Chief Minister, when he was the Leader of the Opposition, during his maiden budget speech, said this:

‘The nation has had enough. The nation is let down by a Government that has not known how to resolve the plight –

2165

Mr Speaker: What is the relevance of that?

Hon. D A Feetham: I am going to ask a question. I am asking a question. This is my –

2170

Mr Speaker: It is relevant?

Hon. D A Feetham: Of course, it is relevant. (**Mr Speaker:** Right.)

2175

‘The nation has had enough. The nation is let down by a Government that has not known how to resolve the plight of almost 400 unemployed. The nation is ready for a change of Government.’

Well, in the light of the fact that unemployment has increased from 400 to 500, is the nation ready for a change of Government or just simply a change of Minister for Employment?

2180 **Hon. J J Bossano:** Given that I am devoting 84 hours a week to the job, anybody is welcome to take it away from me, Mr Speaker, but I can tell the hon. Member that if he had the smallest shred of being left of centre, as he claims, he would have stood up to welcome the fact that I have told him that we have got more of our Gibraltarians and other residents in employment now, than ever before. He does not seem to welcome that and I have already given him the explanation.

2185 Mr Speaker, the reality is that it is not worth attempting to provide him with information. I have just told him the reason why the unemployment is not going down as one would expect, when employment is going up, is because there are people coming forward that have not worked for years. People that he has been urging me, in the past, to try and help back into employment. I tell him that that is the case and therefore he says, notwithstanding there are more people than ever before, we should change our Minister for Employment. Well, I am afraid he does not have a say on whether I am Minister for Employment or not, but I can tell the hon. Member that all the people who have got jobs since 9th December, I am sure, are grateful for the effort and the hours and the time that I put in and I am committed to ensuring that we keep on bringing down the numbers of people without work, whether they are registered or not and we keep on putting more and more of the residents of Gibraltar into employment and I would have hoped that

2190

2195 he would share that objective, given that when we have this debate, they all say, I am not going to succeed, but they wish it was possible to bring unemployment down to the levels that I want. I believe it is possible and I am going to devote everything that I know and I have learnt in my life to achieving it.

2200

**Frontier workers
Nationality of those registered with Employment Service**

2205 **Clerk:** Question 1060, the Hon. D A Feetham.

Hon. D A Feetham: Mr Speaker, can the Government provide a breakdown – and you see I am asking a Question so that the hon. Gentleman can provide the answer with the information he *really* wants to provide me - by nationality of the frontier workers registered with the Employment Service for each month since December 2011?

2210

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment.

Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment (Hon. J J Bossano): The total number of frontier workers registered with the Employment Service since December is as follows:

2215

December 2011	7,910
January 2012	7,690
February 2012	7,566
March 2012	7,460
2220 April 2012	7,413
May 2012	7,268

And that is the lowest figure that it reached, in May.

2225 **Hon. D A Feetham:** Seven thousand, sorry, can you repeat that -

Hon. J J Bossano: 7,268.

Since May the figure for frontier workers has actually gone up, notwithstanding the fact that they keep on claiming that it is going down.

2230

June, 2012	7,335
July, 2012	7,418
August, 2012	7,481
2235 September, 2012	7,501

and then it went down in October:

October, 2012	7,443
---------------	-------

2240 Then, in November, it has gone up again:

November, 2012 7,461

2245 which shows, in fact, that the market is what decides the demand and not that there is a deliberate policy of removing frontier workers and replacing them. It goes up and down, depending on the demand for work.

Mr Speaker: Would the Hon. Minister notice that there is another sentence at the end of the draft?

2250 **Hon. J J Bossano:** The nationality, Mr Speaker – which covers almost half of the United Nations – I now hand over to the hon. Member for each month. It would take several hours to read it out!

Table EMP.2
Frontier workers by nationality, 2011

Nationality	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
American	8	8	8	8	8	7	9	9	9	10	11	11
Argentinian	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3
Australian	2	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Austrian	14	13	13	12	11	12	9	10	10	10	9	8
Belgian	9	10	11	11	11	10	10	11	12	11	12	12
Brazilian	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Bulgarian	14	13	15	15	15	16	17	18	17	5	15	15
Canadian	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Colombian	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-
Czechoslovakian	31	35	35	35	35	35	38	38	39	43	42	43
Danish	37	37	36	37	38	38	38	36	34	34	33	34
Dutch	35	35	34	34	36	35	33	34	34	33	38	35
Equatorian	2	2	2	3	3	4	3	3	2	2	1	1
Estorian	8	7	7	8	9	8	9	9	10	8	9	9
Finnish	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
French	73	70	72	67	70	73	67	77	76	78	79	79
German	114	115	114	115	114	112	97	115	115	109	110	110
Gibraltarian	132	140	138	141	144	143	145	144	142	145	144	144
Greek	26	28	29	28	31	34	28	34	33	34	33	32
Greek Cypriot	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	5
Hungarian	48	48	53	55	58	69	71	67	74	71	73	72
Indian	2	2	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Irish	61	61	63	62	61	60	63	66	66	63	65	64
Israeli	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	3	3
Italian	62	67	65	64	67	75	68	74	83	86	84	84
Japanese	2	2	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Korean	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Latvian	7	7	11	11	14	17	16	13	14	13	15	16
Lithuanian	43	45	49	44	48	47	48	46	48	47	47	47
Luxembourg	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2
Macedonian	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maltese	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Moroccan	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
New Zealander	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2
Norwegian	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Other British	2,024	2,073	2,086	2,074	2,061	2,004	2,022	2,026	2,017	2,031	2,070	2,075
Philipino	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Polish	204	194	204	188	199	199	200	198	203	184	173	147
Portuguese	245	239	241	253	245	256	249	243	271	268	290	294
Romanian	73	87	86	87	88	95	94	94	98	94	101	99
Russian	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	2
Slovakian	20	20	24	24	25	27	24	28	26	27	26	27
South African	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Spanish	4,072	4,106	4,195	4,261	4,190	4,360	4,610	4,548	4,538	4,524	4,392	4,357
Swedish	17	18	18	22	25	29	29	29	30	33	34	34
Swiss	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	11	9	9	9
Tunisian	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ukrainian	6	6	6	6	6	6	5	5	4	4	4	4
Uruguayan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	7,445	7,543	7,675	7,731	7,677	7,830	8,062	8,033	8,068	8,027	7,969	7,910

Updated 12 January 2012

Source: Employment Service

Table EMP.2(b)

Frontier workers by nationality, 2012

Nationality	July	August	September	October	November
American	11	11	11	11	11
Argentinian	3	3	4	4	4
Australian	3	3	3	3	3
Austrian	7	7	7	7	7
Belgian	9	11	12	11	11
Brazilian	3	3	3	4	4
Bulgarian	21	21	21	21	24
Canadian	2	2	2	2	2
Colombian	-	-	-	-	-
Czechoslovakian	33	35	36	36	36
Danish	36	39	40	41	38
Dutch	38	38	39	38	40
Equatorian	1	1	1	1	1
Estonian	11	11	12	11	11
Finnish	8	8	9	9	9
French	71	71	72	73	75
German	116	112	114	117	115
Gibraltarian	153	150	153	148	149
Greek	42	46	51	55	54
Greek Cypriot	6	6	5	5	5
Hungarian	84	83	86	79	78
Icelandic	1	1	1	1	1
Indian	4	4	4	4	5
Irish	73	74	76	79	79
Israeli	3	3	3	3	3
Italian	95	96	96	90	93
Japanese	-	-	-	-	-
Jersey	1	1	1	-	-
Korean	-	-	-	-	-
Latvian	18	19	19	19	19
Lithuanian	19	19	13	12	12
Luxembourg	1	2	2	2	2
Macedonian	1	1	1	1	1
Maltese	5	5	5	6	6
Mexican	1	1	1	1	1
Moroccan	3	4	3	2	2
New Zealander	2	2	2	2	2
Norwegian	2	2	2	2	2
Other British	2,096	2,109	2,092	2,083	2,099
Panamanian	1	1	-	1	1
Philipino	2	1	1	1	1
Polish	94	90	89	93	95
Portuguese	233	237	243	247	246
Romanian	100	106	110	109	122
Russian	2	2	2	2	2
Slovakian	38	35	33	32	34
Slovenian	1	1	1	2	2
South African	2	2	2	2	2
Spanish	3,915	3,955	3,966	3,918	3,900
Swedish	34	35	38	40	38
Swiss	9	9	9	8	9
Tunisian	-	-	-	-	-
Ukrainian	3	3	4	4	4
Uruguayan	-	-	-	-	-
Venezuelan	1	1	1	1	1
Total	7,418	7,482	7,501	7,443	7,461

Updated 12 December 2012

Source: Employment Service

Frontier workers by nationality, 2012

Nationality	January	February	March	April	May	June
American	11	11	11	11	11	11
Argentinian	3	4	3	3	3	3
Australian	3	3	3	3	3	3
Austrian	7	7	7	7	7	7
Belgian	12	13	12	11	9	10
Brazilian	2	2	2	2	3	4
Bulgarian	15	16	16	18	19	19
Canadian	3	3	3	3	2	2
Colombian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Czechslovakian	42	39	38	39	38	37
Danish	34	35	35	35	37	37
Dutch	34	35	36	38	36	37
Equatorian	1	1	1	1	1	1
Estonian	9	11	11	12	12	11
Finnish	8	9	9	8	8	8
French	76	77	77	70	70	71
German	110	110	113	110	109	111
Gibraltarian	145	146	154	154	155	156
Greek	32	34	36	37	39	42
Greek Cypriot	5	5	5	5	5	5
Hungarian	68	75	73	77	77	79
Icelandic	1	1	1	1	1	1
Indian	4	4	4	4	4	4
Irish	67	69	70	69	68	70
Israeli	3	3	3	3	3	3
Italian	85	85	88	90	93	91
Japanese	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jersey	-	-	-	-	-	1
Korean	-	-	-	-	-	-
Latvian	16	17	17	17	19	18
Lithuanian	45	39	39	36	28	20
Luxembourg	2	1	1	1	1	1
Macedonian	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maltese	2	2	2	2	4	5
Mexican	1	1	1	1	1	1
Moroccan	4	4	4	4	3	2
New Zealander	2	2	2	2	2	2
Norwegian	2	2	2	2	2	2
Other British	2,062	2,074	2,070	2,057	2,064	2,072
Panamanian	-	-	-	-	-	1
Philipino	1	1	1	1	1	1
Polish	143	122	116	114	105	92
Portuguese	297	296	239	219	216	223
Romanian	97	91	83	90	89	89
Russian	3	3	3	3	2	2
Slovakian	26	25	25	25	25	28
Slovenian	1	1	1	1	1	1
South African	2	2	2	2	2	2
Spanish	4,152	4,033	3,987	3,971	3,839	3,899
Swedish	36	37	39	39	37	36
Swiss	10	9	9	9	9	9
Tunisian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ukranian	4	4	4	4	4	4
Uruguayan	1	1	1	1	-	-
Venezuelan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	7,690	7,566	7,460	7,413	7,268	7,335

Updated 4 October 2012

Source: Employment Service

2260

Hon. D A Feetham: This is all the same question that he asked always. It is in the same format.

MOD employees
Number registered with Employment Service

2265

Clerk: Question... sorry. Question 1061, the Hon. D A Feetham.

2270

Hon. D A Feetham: I think this is answered in a previous question that the Chief Minister has already answered, he has already provided me with, but if you have got the answer separate, I will take it.

Can the Government state what was the number of employees registered with the Employment Service and employed by the MOD at the end of November 2011 and 2012?

2275

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment.

Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment (Hon. J J Bossano): Mr. Speaker, the total number of employees registered with the Employment Service employed by the MOD in November 2011 was 698 and November 2012 was 598 – a hundred less.

2280

Hon. D A Feetham: Can the hon. Gentleman provide any information as to account for the decrease in exactly 100 employees in the MOD from November 2011 to 2012? Is that to do with casuals, or is it transfers to Government? Is there a reason for that, does he know?

2285

Hon. J J Bossano: Mr Speaker, there has been a constant decline of numbers, throughout 2011 and throughout this year. We have just taken two specific months and it so happens – by coincidence, I think – that there is exactly 100 less between November and November in that 12-month period, but there have been people taken on into the Government companies that were set up by the previous administration, so some of these people are not actually unemployed. They have not gone from being in the MOD to being registered with the Employment Service, but from being in the MOD to being in the companies that were set up in the case of the generating station and in the other company that was set up and, in some cases, there are people who have taken advantage of the exit packages which have got a cut-off point. In fact, I think, at the moment there are more people wanting to go than the MOD is willing to leave, because the fact that the package is at its most valuable to the individual below a certain age, means that people are keen to go because, in practical terms, in some instances, if they stayed, they are really working for nothing.

2295

Clerk: Question –

2300

Hon. P R Caruana: Would the hon. Member say whether he is familiar – I assume he is – with that element of the global agreements that prevent the MOD from lowering their manpower below a certain level before 2017 and is that being adhered to by both? Is the Government holding the MOD to that agreement?

2305

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, yes, this is an issue that is relevant to ongoing discussions between me and the MOD and what I should tell him is that, when I was elected and I saw the figure at the end of the schedule 3 of the agreement, at the bottom of the column, which I think from memory was 590 something, I observed that the number had been reduced.

2310

The reduction, on some occasions, was as a result of agreement with the Government of Gibraltar. For example, the totals, I think, there included people who were employed with GMES [Gibraltar Mechanical & Electrical Services Ltd] and, of course, before the Election, GMES people had moved into the wholly owned company also, which is GMES, it is ISGS into GMES etc. I noticed there was a discrepancy, even then, between the number that was left over in the MOD, or should be left over in the MOD, and this was when this question of what is known as the VERS was referred to me –

2315

Hon. P R Caruana: The what?

Hon. Chief Minister: The VERS – the Voluntary Early Redundancy Scheme – which the MOD has been running.

2320

On that issue I have been in contact with the MOD, because they have been letting people go on Voluntary Early Redundancy Schemes who are relevant to the numbers in the columns that add up to the total and then taking people on short-term contracts to 2017. So can I just leave it with him, that this is an issue that has been picked up by us and is live with us, because all those short-term contracts end on the same day in 2017.

2325

**Gaming industry
Number and nationality of employees**

Clerk: Question 1062, the Hon. D A Feetham.

2330

Hon. D A Feetham: Mr Speaker, can the Government say what is the total number of persons employed in the gaming industry in Gibraltar, giving a breakdown by company and by nationality, showing how many are residents and the dates when the figures apply?

2335

Clerk: Answer, the Hon. the Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment.

Minister for Enterprise, Training and Employment (Hon. J J Bossano): Mr Speaker, the total number of persons employed in the gaming industry in Gibraltar, according to the records of the Employment Service – which may not be 100% up to date, because sometimes contracts take time to reach us - as at 30th November was 2,699. Of these, 1,354 are Gibraltar residents.

2340

The breakdown by gaming company is as follows:

	Total Employees
Tombola (Int) Ltd	13
Mansion Gib Ltd	132
32 Red PLC	58
888 Holdings PLC	4
Bwin Party Digital Ent PLC	5
Profitable Play Ltd	17
Partouche Interactive (Gib) Ltd	8
Leisure Spin Ltd	5
Gala Interactive Gib Ltd	79
Coral Interactive Gib Ltd	70
BetClic Everest (Gib) Ltd	56
Cassava Enterprises Gib Ltd	156
Bwin Party Management (Gib) Ltd	438

	Total Employees
TSE (Gib) LP T/A BetFred	23
St. Endellion Ltd	19
Probability (Gib) Ltd	10
Petfre (Gib) Ltd	125
Entertaining Play Ltd	15
Ladbrokes International Ltd	173
Digibet Ltd	15
Stan James PLC	225
Spielo International (Gib) Ltd	111
WHG International Ltd	331
Etruvian Gibraltar Ltd	94
Hillside (Gib) Ltd	124
Newcote Services Ltd	393
Total	2699

2345

The break down by nationality is as follows:

Nationality	
American	12
Antiguan	6
Argentinian	2
Australian	5
Austrian	20
Belgian	7
Bolivian	1
Bulgarian	20
Brazilian	1
Canadian	5
Chinese	6
Czech /Slovak	8
Danish	22
Dominican	3
Dutch	19
Estonian	5
Ecuadorian	1
Finish	8
French	46
German	108
Gibraltarian	346
Greek	59
Greek-Cypriot	3
Hong Kong	1
Hungarian	23
Indian	31
Indonesian	1
Irish	48
Israeli	21

Nationality	
Italian	83
Japanese	1
Kazakhstan	1
Latvian	12
Lithuanian	7
Luxembourg	2
New Zealand	1
Malaysian	5
Maltese	1
Mexican	1
Moroccan	3
Norwegian	1
Other British	1368
Polish	56
Portuguese	43
Romanian	25
Russian	6
Slovakian	14
Slovenian	1
South African	3
Spanish	171
Swedish	48
Swiss	1
Taiwanese	1
Thai	2
Turkish	1
Ukrainian	3
Total	2699

Hon. D A Feetham: Mr Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman has actually caught up (*Laughter*) with the Government's iPad culture. He certainly has not caught up with the culture of providing schedules across the floor of this House in answer to Questions. May I ask that the hon. Gentleman provides me with a copy of that answer that I may take it away with me for further reading over the weekend. (*Laughter*) Thank you very much.

Could I, whilst I am at it, wish the hon. Members opposite and, indeed, the entire House and those listening to our proceedings, a very Merry Christmas indeed and a Happy New Year.

WRITTEN ANSWERS

2360 **Clerk:** With that we come to the end of Answers to Oral Questions.
Answers to Written Questions, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, I have the honour to table the Answers to Written Questions, numbered W239/2012 to W263/2012 inclusive.

2365 **Mr Speaker,** I have the honour to move that this House do now adjourn *sine die*. (*Interjections*)
Sorry? We are not doing any Bills. Ah! You are doing a Bill. Ah! Sorry? I thought we were not doing Bills; I was not doing *my* Bills. So, Mr Speaker, I *thought* I had the honour of adjourning the House *sine die*, but in fact the Minister for Justice -

2370 **Mr Speaker:** You still have the honour to move!

Hon. Chief Minister: - asks that I adjourn the adjournment for a few minutes.

2375

BILLS

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012

2380 **First Reading approved**

Clerk: Bills, First and Second Reading.

2385 A Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, the Trustees Act and the Partnership Act to make provision for the keeping of proper books of account, the maintenance of records, identifying settlors, trustees and beneficiaries of trusts and the abolition of share warrants to bearer.

The Hon. the Minister for Education, Financial Services, Gaming, Telecommunications and Justice.

2390 **Minister for Education, Financial Services, Gaming, Telecommunications and Justice (Hon. G H Licudi):** Mr Speaker, I have the honour to move that a Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, the Trustees Act and the Partnership Act to make provision for the keeping of proper books of account, the maintenance of records, identifying settlors, trustees and beneficiaries of trusts and the abolition of share warrants to bearer be read a first time.

Mr Speaker: I really think we should take each Bill separately.

Hon. G H Licudi: It is one Bill.

2395 **Mr Speaker:** Ah, it is one Bill.

I now put the question, which is that a Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, the Trustees Act and the Partnership Act, to make provision for the keeping of proper books of account, the maintenance of records, identifying settlors, trustees and beneficiaries of trusts and the abolition of share warrants to bearer be read a first time.

2400 Those in favour? (**Members:** Aye.) Those against? Carried.

Clerk: The Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2012.

2405

Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012

Second Reading approved

2410 **Hon. G H Licudi:** Mr Speaker, I have the honour to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The amendments contained in the Bill will make provision for the keeping of proper books of account, the maintenance of records identifying settlors, trustees and beneficiaries of trusts and the abolition of share warrants to bearer.

2415 These amendments represent Gibraltar's response to the recommendations for change in the Peer Review Report on Gibraltar by the Global Forum of Transparency and Exchange of Information, phase 1, legal and regulatory framework, published in October 2011.

The industry was consulted earlier this year on the recommendations, which were small in number and, in many respects, uncontroversial. These were already best practice and, in any event, a professional responsibility or mandatory under FSC licensing or other obligations. The amendments are designed to ensure that all individuals or entities are caught, not just those licensed by the FSC.

2420 Three responses were received and there was general agreement with the proposed amendments. The amendments (a) create an obligation on all companies, partnerships and trusts to maintain complete records on their accounts and ownership (b) restrict the issues of share warrants to bearer and requires that existing share warrants are registered (c) require that all trusts maintain information on relevant settlors, trustees and beneficiaries.

2425 Mr Speaker, in relation to the amendments to the Companies Act, clause 2(2) defines the proper books of account – the term ‘proper books of account’. The definition currently filed at section 314(2) of the Companies Act has been expanded to incorporate underlying documentation significant to the trade or business of the company, such as contracts or invoices. This definition has been applied to the Companies Act as a whole, creating a single, universal standard of documentation that must be retained in respect of
2430 company accounts. As a result of this amendment, the definition in section 314(2) is no longer necessary. It has therefore been repealed, or is proposed to be repealed, by sub-clause (6).

Clause 2(3) imposes a requirement that holders of share warrants to bearer are registered on the Companies Register of Members within a period of nine months from the commencement of the clause. Where a bearer has not been registered in the time limit, rights attached to the relevant warrant will not be
2435 exercisable and the company will have committed an offence. The amendment also prevents companies from issuing any new share warrants to bearer.

Sub-clauses (4) and (5) standardise the period for which proper books of account must be retained by companies to five years.

In relation to amendments to the Trustees Act, Mr Speaker, clause 3 of the Bill inserts two new provisions. The new section 61 requires trustees to record the identity of settlors, trustees and beneficiaries of trusts and maintain this information for a period of five years. I would say, for the sake of clarity, that a settlor, although not expressly set out in the Bill, is considered any person who settles *any* assets into a trust, whether or not that person is actually described as a settlor in the trust documentation.

2445 The new section 62 imposes a duty of trust to maintain proper books of account equivalent to those obligations on companies found under section 170 of the Companies Act. The definition of ‘proper books of account’ corresponds with the proposed amendments to the Companies Act.

Finally, Mr Speaker, in relation to the Partnership Act, clause 4 of the Bill inserts a section into the Partnership Act again imposing an obligation to maintain proper books of account in keeping with the requirements under section 170 of the Companies Act.

2450 Mr Speaker, I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr Speaker: Before I put the question, does any hon. Member wish to speak on the general principles and merits of the Bill?

2455 **Hon. P R Caruana:** Mr Speaker, on this occasion Her Majesty’s Loyal Opposition will be loyal to the Government as well as to Her Majesty. (*Laughter*) I recognise, from the report, that I think had arrived [*inaudible*] in Government, that these were the things that we were asked to do. It is worth noting that our regime about bearer shares was already a very controlled regime, where they had to be deposited *and* information – the authorities had to be aware of who the owner was etc, but the Opposition agrees with the Government that this is a very payable price for getting on the... for passing the test in full, so
2460 that next time they come round, they will give us credit for having complied with their [*inaudible*].

We will be supporting the Bill.

2465 **Mr Speaker:** I now put the question, which is that a Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, the Trustees Act and the Partnership Act, to make provision for the keeping of proper books of account, the maintenance of records identifying settlors, trustees and beneficiaries of trusts, the abolition of share warrants to bearer, be read a second time.

Those in favour? (**Members:** Aye.) Those against? Carried.

2470 **Clerk:** The Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act 2012.

2475

Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012
Committee Stage and Third Reading to be taken at this sitting

2480

Hon. G H Licudi: Mr Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Committee Stage and Third Reading of the Bill be taken today, if all hon. Members agree.

2485

Mr Speaker: Do all hon. Members agree that the Committee Stage and Third Reading of the Bill be taken today? (**Members:** Aye.)

2490

International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012
First Reading approved

Clerk: A Bill for an Act to amend the International Co-operation (Tax Information) Act 2009, the hon. the Minister for Education, Financial Services, Gaming, Telecommunications and Justice.

2495

Minister for Education, Financial Services, Gaming, Telecommunications and Justice (Hon. G H Licudi): Mr Speaker, I have the honour to move that a Bill for an Act to amend the International Co-operation (Tax Information) Act 2009 be read a first time.

2500

Mr Speaker: I now put the question, which is that a Bill for an Act to amend the International Co-operation (Tax Information) Act 2009 be read a first time.

Those in favour? (**Members:** Aye.) Those against? Carried.

Clerk: The International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Act 2012.

2505

International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012
Second Reading approved

2510

Hon. G H Licudi: Mr Speaker, I have the honour to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends the International Co-operation (Tax Information) Act 2009, so as to clarify the time periods covered in relation to the provision of information and assistance on taxation matters. In criminal tax matters, information can be requested under the Act in respect of any calendar year beginning on or after 1st January 2004.

2515

In all other specified tax matters, information can be requested under the Act in relation to periods commencing on 1st January following the date of entry into force of the relevant scheduled agreement, or TIEA, or where the scheduled agreement expressly provides otherwise in relation to the periods specified therein. The Bill is in line with the express corresponding provisions contained in the 2002 model agreement on exchange of information on tax matters, that is the OECD model agreement, and the OECD model agreement commentary.

2520

I would add, Mr Speaker, that I am advised that what this Bill does, in fact, reflects the existing practice and this is simply being put into place for the sake of clarity for all those persons who deal with these matters, either professionally or are recipients of requests.

I commend the Bill to the House.

2525

Mr Speaker: Before I put the question, does any hon. Member wish to speak on the general principles and merits of the Bill?

I now put the question, which is that a Bill for an Act to amend the International Co-operation (Tax Information) Act 2009 be read a second time.

2530

Those in favour? (**Members:** Aye.) Those against? Carried.

Clerk: The International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Act 2012.

2535

2540 **International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012**
Committee Stage and Third Reading to be taken at this sitting

Hon. G H Licudi: Mr Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Committee Stage and Third Reading of the Bill be taken today, if all hon. Members agree.

2545 **Mr Speaker:** Do all hon. Members agree that the Committee Stage and Third Reading of the Bill be taken today? (**Members:** Aye.)

2550 **COMMITTEE STAGE**

Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012
International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012

2555 **Clerk:** Committee Stage and Third Reading, the Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Mr Speaker, I have the honour to move that the House should resolve itself into committee to consider the following Bills clause by clause: the Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012 and the International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012.

In Committee of the whole Parliament

2565 **Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012**
Clauses considered and approved

2570 **Clerk:** A Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, the Trustees Act and the Partnership Act to make provision for the keeping of proper books of accounts, the maintenance of records identifying settlors, trustees and beneficiaries of trusts and the abolition of share warrants to bearer.
Clause 1.

2575 **Mr Chairman:** Clause 1 stands part of the Bill.

Clerk: Clause 2.

Mr Chairman: Clause 2 stands part of the Bill.

2580 **Clerk:** Clause 3.

Mr Chairman: Clause 3 stands part of the Bill.

Clerk: Clause 4.

2585 **Mr Chairman:** Clause 4 stands part of the Bill.

Clerk: The Long Title.

2590 **Mr Chairman:** The Long Title stands part of the Bill.

2595 **International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012**
Clauses considered and approved

Clerk: A Bill for an Act to amend the International Co-operation (Tax Information) Act 2009.
Clause 1.

2600 **Mr Chairman:** Clause 1 stands part of the Bill.
Clerk: Clause 2.

Mr Chairman: Clause 2 stands part of the Bill.

2605 **Clerk:** The Long Title.

Mr Chairman: The Long Title stands part of the Bill.

2610

BILLS FOR THIRD READING

Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012 International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012

2615 **Third Reading approved; Bills passed**

Clerk: The Hon. the Chief Minister.

2620 **Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo):** Mr Speaker, I have the honour to report that the Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012 and the International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012 have been considered in Committee and agreed to without amendments and I now move that they be read a third time and passed.

2625 **Mr Speaker:** I now put the question, which is that (1) the Development Aid (Amendment) Bill 2012...sorry, I have got that one on my Order Paper; it should not be there.

I now put the question, which is that the Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012 and the International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012 be read a third time and passed.

2630 Those in favour? (**Members:** Aye.) Those against? Carried.

The Companies, Partnerships and Trusts (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012. (**Members:** Aye.)
The International Co-operation (Tax Information) (Amendment) Bill 2012. (**Members:** Aye.)
Carried.

2635

Adjournment

2640 **Clerk:** The Hon. the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister (Hon. F R Picardo): Yes, Mr Speaker. I do *now* have the honour to move that this House do now adjourn *sine die*.

2645 May I take this opportunity to thank all Members of the House for the work that they have done throughout the year. This is the first time that the House has met for 10 meetings for Questions in any one calendar year and offer them all the very best for a Christmas and New Year that I hope will be happy and prosperous for all, though, of course, not politically for Members opposite... I know that they wish the same to us!

2650 **Mr Speaker:** May I associate myself with the remarks of the Chief Minister and wish all hon. Members and their families a prosperous, happy and peaceful Christmas and all the best for 2013.

I now propose a question, which is that the House do now adjourn *sine die*.

I now put the question, which is that the House do now adjourn *sine die*.

Those in favour? (**Members:** Aye.) Those against? Passed.

2655

The House adjourned at 6.30 p.m.