

# **JUSTICE 2 COMMITTEE**

Wednesday 7 February 2001  
(*Morning*)

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body 2001.

Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to the Copyright Unit,  
Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ  
Fax 01603 723000, which is administering the copyright on behalf of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate  
Body.

Produced and published in Scotland on behalf of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body by The  
Stationery Office Ltd.

Her Majesty's Stationery Office is independent of and separate from the company now  
trading as The Stationery Office Ltd, which is responsible for printing and publishing  
Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body publications.

---

# CONTENTS

Wednesday 7 February 2001

	Col.
NUMBER OF INNER HOUSE JUDGES (VARIATION) ORDER 2001 (DRAFT) .....	11
ITEMS IN PRIVATE.....	19
GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT (VISIT).....	20

---

## JUSTICE 2 COMMITTEE 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting 2001, Session 1

### CONVENER

\*Pauline McNeill (Glasgow Kelvin) (Lab)

### DEPUTY CONVENER

\*Mrs Lyndsay McIntosh (Central Scotland) (Con)

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS

\*Scott Barrie (Dunfermline West) (Lab)

\*Christine Grahame (South of Scotland) (SNP)

\*Ms Margo Macdonald (Lothians) (SNP)

\*Euan Robson (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)

Karen Whitefield (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)

\*attended

### THE FOLLOWING MEMBER ALSO ATTENDED:

Iain Gray (Deputy Minister for Justice)

### CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE

Lynn Tullis

### ACTING SENIOR ASSISTANT CLERK

Fiona Groves

### ASSISTANT CLERK

Graeme Elliot

### LOCATION

Committee Room 4



# Scottish Parliament

## Justice 2 Committee

*Wednesday 7 February 2001*

*(Morning)*

[THE CONVENER *opened the meeting at 10:02*]

**The Convener (Pauline McNeill):** I welcome members to the second meeting of the Justice 2 Committee. I also welcome the Deputy Minister for Justice, Iain Gray, and his team.

There are five items on our agenda this morning. Euan Robson will join us in about an hour, as he has some other business connected with the working group for a replacement for poinding and warrant sale. I ask everyone to check that any mobile phones have been switched off.

### Number of Inner House Judges (Variation) Order 2001 (Draft)

**The Convener:** Item 1 is subordinate legislation. The minister will speak to and move motion S1M-1559, then we will take questions.

**The Deputy Minister for Justice (Iain Gray):** If the committee will bear with me, I will take a few minutes to explain the purpose of the draft Number of Inner House Judges (Variation) Order 2001. Forgive me if some of this is familiar territory to some members.

The order's purpose is straightforward: it will increase the number of judges in the inner house of the Court of Session from eight to 10. Of course, the Court of Session and the High Court of Justiciary form the supreme courts of Scotland and they deal with civil cases and the more serious criminal cases respectively.

There are 32 judges, all of whom may deal with civil and criminal work and the court is divided into the inner and the outer house. The inner house is the court of appeal and therefore has the more senior group of judges. Judges of the inner house consider appeals against decisions taken by a judge sitting alone, who may be a judge of the outer house, a sheriff of the sheriff court or, in some cases, a justice of the peace in the district court.

The Court of Criminal Appeal is the final arbiter in criminal cases in Scotland, but in civil business there can be appeals from the Court of Session to the House of Lords.

The number of inner house judges has been

fixed at eight since 1825. Since then, there have been significant increases in the overall complement of judges, which now stands at a record 32. The number of inner house judges, however, has never been increased and in recent years their work load has grown substantially. To cope with that, the Lord President has been obliged to co-opt to the inner house a number of outer house judges, and some retired and temporary judges have been re-engaged on daily contracts to sit as members of the appeal court bench.

In the most recent full court year—1999-2000—only 55 per cent of judge days in the appeal courts were provided by the more senior inner house judges. The Lord President believes that it is no longer defensible to ask the judges of the outer house to take on so much of the work load that properly should fall to the judges of the inner house. The Minister for Justice and I have considered the case that was made by the Lord President and we are satisfied that the business programme of the inner house justifies an increase from eight to 10 judges. There is a need now, and it would be of considerable help to the Lord President if the powers to recommend two new appointments were available soon.

The Executive is well aware—as is the committee—of the problems that court delays have caused. At sheriff court level, we dealt with the problems that were caused by the suspension of the use of temporary sheriffs towards the end of 1999 by appointing additional permanent sheriffs. The appointment of additional inner house judges to preside in the appeal courts would be another small contribution to our overall aim of getting the courts back on track and ensuring that all court users have ready access to justice.

On that basis, I hope that committee members will find the proposal worth their support.

I move,

That the Justice 2 Committee recommends that the draft Number of Inner House Judges (Variation) Order 2001 be approved.

**The Convener:** Thank you. The committee has 90 minutes to debate the order, but I do not expect that we will take that long.

I will begin by asking why there has been no request from Lords President since 1825 to increase the number of inner house judges.

**Iain Gray:** I have asked that question of my officials and have not really received an answer. Since 1825, the Lord President has not seen the need to increase the number of judges, but the inner house has coped with the work load in the ways that I have described—by using outer house judges, for example.

It seems that two things have happened. There is more court work generally; that is demonstrated by the fact that the number of judges has increased to 32, which is a record number. Secondly, it appears that more cases are being appealed. The combination of those two things has led to a work load crisis.

**Christine Grahame (South of Scotland) (SNP):** There is really nothing to challenge—the order seems perfectly sensible—but I have a few questions.

Out of interest, how often do the two divisions sit in term-time? How will the order impact on the outer house if judges are transferred from there and the overall number of judges stays the same, although more will be appeal judges?

This may not be relevant, but is any of the increase in the number of judges in recent years a result of court work coming from other parts of the United Kingdom? Obviously, it is good for the Scottish courts if parties are deciding to take their cases in Scotland and there is a knock-on effect on appeals in Scotland.

Not everybody may know that civil cases can be brought in Scotland rather than in other parts of the UK or in Europe, but it is quite important for the standing of Scots law and our courts. I do not know whether that is part of the reason for the increased work load; I am interested to know if indigenous court work is the only reason.

Do you know, from research, whether any specific type of case is being appealed more or any area of law is generating more appeal work? Or are civil cases in general being taken to appeal?

**The Convener:** I think that that was four questions.

**Christine Grahame:** I do not know how many it was. I just thought that they were interesting, and that we had time to discuss them.

**Iain Gray:** I counted five questions. I will try to answer them.

Both divisions of the court meet pretty well every day to deal with the pressure of business.

**Christine Grahame:** Is that on four days—Tuesdays to Fridays?

**Iain Gray:** Yes.

Another question was about pressure on the outer house. To some extent, the proposal is an attempt to regularise the current position, because some 45 per cent of inner house work is carried out by outer house judges.

The increase in the number of judges is at the request and recommendation of the Lord

President, who is responsible for allocating business. He feels that that the increase is required to make the court function more as it is meant to and to ensure that the vast majority of days in the inner house are provided by the more senior inner house judges.

**Christine Grahame:** If you keep the same number of judges and only regularise those who are co-opted to the inner house—if that is the way it is being put—the pressure on outer house business will remain the same. Has the Lord President discussed with you how that might affect delays in cases, for example, which the public are concerned about?

**Iain Gray:** That is a fair point. If there was pressure on the overall number of judges, the Lord President would raise that with us. As things stand, we have a record number of judges and it appears that the Lord President is satisfied with that for the moment.

**Christine Grahame:** Presumably the fact that the judges who dealt with the Lockerbie trial are back will make a difference.

**Iain Gray:** That will certainly make a difference. However, the problem of there not being enough inner house judges predates the Lockerbie trial. The problem is not solely a manifestation of the trial. If it were, that would obviously not be the right reason to make the change, as that situation was temporary.

You also asked about cases from other parts of the UK, and about what type of cases are being appealed more. Cases from other parts of the UK are not a significant factor at the moment. Both civil and criminal cases are being appealed more. Criminal appeals are increasing by something like 20 per cent over a year, which is a big increase. The other area that has contributed to the change in work load, as Christine Grahame probably expects and guessed, is new work relating to the European convention on human rights.

**Christine Grahame:** So the effect of the ECHR is already working its way through to the appellate system.

**Iain Gray:** Yes.

**Christine Grahame:** Do you have any figures for that?

**Iain Gray:** No, I do not have exact figures.

**Christine Grahame:** That question was unfair in a way, but it would be interesting to know the answer.

**Iain Gray:** The numbers are smallish, but there were none previously.

**Scott Barrie (Dunfermline West) (Lab):** Given the fact that the number of inner house judges has

not increased since 1825 and that the order just regularises what has become common practice, I do not think that it is too controversial.

Christine Grahame has already covered a number of the questions that I wanted to ask. However, given that the pressure on the Court of Session has been recognised, does the Executive have any plans to extend a review to a number of other areas of the judicial system in which pressures are becoming clear, for example, the procurator fiscal service?

I know that we are not discussing those other areas of the system today. However, it strikes me that, as we now have a clear idea that some parts of the justice system are creaking at the seams, now might be a good time to review other parts that are creaking equally.

**Iain Gray:** Most of Scott Barrie's points would be more properly put to the Crown Office, which has responsibility for the procurator fiscal service, for example. I am not aware of a particular review having been undertaken, but I think the Crown Office might respond that it is responsible, on a daily basis, for the procurator fiscal service. Given that, the Crown Office has to consider the smooth running of that service, day in, day out, and take whatever measures are necessary to improve the service.

10:15

**Ms Margo MacDonald (Lothians) (SNP):** I apologise for being late, and to the minister if my question relates to ground that he has already covered. The minister mentioned briefly the effect of the Lockerbie trial on the number of available judges. I understand that there is to be an appeal, and I read somewhere that not three judges, but five, may be required. Is that correct? If that were the case, surely it would strain the system?

**Iain Gray:** The point made by Ms MacDonald is correct and well made. The saving grace is that, if there is an appeal, it will take a shorter time than the trial did. Margo MacDonald is absolutely right that an appeal would involve five, rather than three, judges. If and when the appeal happens, it would be for the Lord President to consider whether he or Scottish ministers need to take action to cope with the appeal or its impact on the service. The appeal would certainly be a factor, as there would be an impact on the Scottish court service.

**Ms MacDonald:** Newspaper reports may be pure speculation, but if they are true, the independence of the Scottish judiciary has been much admired throughout the world—except perhaps in Tripoli. If that is the case, and if there are a number of other international tribunals, might a call be made on the Scottish judiciary to help

flesh out those tribunals?

**Iain Gray:** I think that that is entirely possible. One aspect of the Lockerbie trial is that it has done great credit to our judicial system. I return to a question that was asked by Christine Grahame, about cases in which there is a choice of jurisdiction. We may well see an increase in the number of cases in which Scotland is chosen as the jurisdiction that people want their case to be tried in. I think that that would apply to civil cases in particular. That remains to be seen. Were either of those things to begin to happen and, as a result, the work load changed or pressures increased, the Lord President would have to consider whether that required an increase in the number of judges, or whatever other action he thought appropriate.

**The Convener:** The brief that we have been given describes the Court of Session as Scotland's supreme civil court. Why would the three Lockerbie judges serve in that court? Would not they serve in the High Court of Justiciary?

**Iain Gray:** I am advised that all judges do both.

**The Convener:** But for today's purposes, am I correct in saying that we are talking about the Court of Session?

**Iain Gray:** We are talking about the inner house judges who would hear appeals in both types of case. I understand that the only difference is that, in civil cases, the potential exists for a further appeal to the House of Lords, although that is very rare.

**Mrs Lyndsay McIntosh (Central Scotland) (Con):** The minister mentioned the most recent year's court figures, which show that only 55 per cent of sitting days were provided by judges from the inner house. With the addition of two judges, what will that percentage rise to?

**Iain Gray:** I cannot give you an exact percentage, but I understand that the Lord President is confident that it will be not all of the days, but close to all of them.

**Mrs McIntosh:** Will that make it the exception rather than the rule for outer house judges to be provided?

**Iain Gray:** Yes, that is the case.

**Christine Grahame:** My understanding is that the inner house is the civil appeal court and that, when these judges sit in appeals on criminal matters, it is the High Court of Justiciary that is sitting in appeal. Today we are talking about civil cases.

I am concerned about the impact that the proposed change will have on the outer house. In addition to the matter that Margo MacDonald drew to our attention—the possibility of an appeal in the Lockerbie case, which would pull out five judges

for I know not how long—we have concerns, which were raised previously by the convener of the former Justice and Home Affairs Committee, about the length of time that reparation actions often take to proceed in the Court of Session.

We know that people are backed up in queues at the outer house and we know why—quite often they settle at the door. That is why it is not necessary to have one judge for each case; five cases are allocated to one judge and proofs sit waiting to be allocated. Nevertheless, a significant number of proofs, which have been set down for many months, may require to be discharged if there is a clash of two cases.

What research is the Executive's justice department doing on the delays in outer house cases and on the time that cases take? If, instead of increasing the overall number of judges, we are simply to have more judges sitting in the appellate courts—although I accept that that may simply reflect the reality of the work load—will the department also consider whether more judges are required? I ask that question notwithstanding the fact that it is for the Lord President to decide. I do not want to malign that gentleman; I am thinking merely of the point of view of the public at large.

**Iain Gray:** Christine Grahame makes a fair point. The statistics are known and the figures to which she refers are recorded and made public. In the end, however, it is for the Lord President to make a recommendation on whether the number of judges needs to be changed. I concede that the point is important, but it is a different point from the one that we are considering today, which concerns the balance between the number of inner and outer house judges.

As far as Christine Grahame's first point is concerned, my understanding is that in both civil and criminal business, the same inner house judges hear the appeals.

**Christine Grahame:** Yes, I know that it is the same judges, but they are not called the inner house. The inner house is a civil court of appeal. The same personnel sit on the bench, as I understand it.

**Iain Gray:** I accept the point.

**The Convener:** A senior high court judge is on record as saying recently—within the past two weeks, I think—that the High Court system is a shambles. I do not really know what he means by that—

**Christine Grahame:** I think we know what “shambles” means.

**The Convener:** I think that it was Lord Bony. Has there been any response to that?

**Iain Gray:** My understanding is that that specific comment referred to the Crown Office and its preparation of cases and evidence. I make no comment on that, but that was the substance of it.

It might be worth pointing out that I have a meeting with the Lord President early next week. I would be happy to undertake to raise members' questions with him directly, especially the questions on the impact that the change will have on outer house judges and their business. I could also raise the general point about delays.

**The Convener:** That would be very useful. We have yet to discuss our forward work programme—we will do that later—but I think it is fair to say that there is a fair level of interest in the High Court. It would be useful if you could relay that. Perhaps we may even pursue a visit to the High Court to follow that up.

If members have no further questions on the order, does the minister want to sum up?

**Iain Gray:** No. Some specific points have been raised and I have undertaken to come back on them. It seems to me that support has been expressed for the proposal and I hope that members will agree the order.

**The Convener:** The question is, that motion S1M-1559 be agreed to.

*Motion agreed to.*

That the Justice 2 Committee recommends that the draft Number of Inner House Judges (Variation) Order 2001 be approved.

## Items in Private

**The Convener:** Under agenda item 2, we must decide whether to take items 4 and 5 in private.

**Christine Grahame:** I just need to go and get my glasses.

**The Convener:** Are they in the building?

**Scott Barrie:** Is that what you call emergency glazing?

**Mrs McIntosh:** She probably has a spare set in her office.

**The Convener:** While Christine Grahame is trying to match herself up with her glasses, we shall deal with item 2. Item 4 concerns how to increase the effectiveness of committees, on which we have a paper. Item 5 concerns our work programme for the coming year.

Is it agreed that we take items 4 and 5 in private?

**Members** *indicated agreement.*

## Glasgow Sheriff Court (Visit)

**The Convener:** Item 3 concerns the visits that have been made by members of the committee to Glasgow sheriff court. Members will know that two visits have been made, the first organised by the Glasgow Bar Association and the second at the invitation of the sheriff principal. I was fortunate enough to attend both visits, and Margo MacDonald was able to attend the second. It might be useful for committee members to hear what Margo and I learned at the sheriff court, as there might be ideas for future work or future visits. I invite Margo to make some general comments.

**Ms MacDonald:** I appreciated the opportunity to visit the sheriff court. We were treated extremely well. The facilities that were afforded us were not lavish, but we were treated well.

**Mrs McIntosh:** Were you given lunch?

**The Convener:** Yes, the lunch was excellent.

**Ms MacDonald:** The courts are new but obvious effort has been made to maintain the environment of the place. I have seen some other district courts in times past, and I know that that is important. Although it may seem a minor point, the environment helps to create an atmosphere.

The atmosphere was one of controlled business. It was very busy, but we were there on a Monday morning, when custody cases are dealt with. A large percentage of the people there were not unaccustomed to the ways of the justice system.

**Christine Grahame:** Not just the professionals.

**Ms MacDonald:** No. There were obvious signs of co-operation and the fact that people understand how the system worked. However, there were also obvious signs that the system was under strain. The role of the procurator fiscal in the whole procedure seemed to be under strain and, when we asked, we were told that it was. As a lay person sitting in the court, I noticed that, on many occasions, the sheriff said that they should have received some report or other, which they did not have. I am not an expert, nor do I feel that people were not doing their job, but I felt that the progress of the cases would have been smoother were it not for a glitch in the procurator fiscal service. That seemed to account for some of the problems, anyway.

It was interesting to speak to one of the sheriffs who specialise in family cases. Pauline may want to say more on that.

**The Convener:** Thanks, Margo. That is a fair reflection of what I saw on both occasions when I attended the court, and describes the pressure that the court is under.

There are 21 courts at Glasgow sheriff court, which is about the busiest court in Europe. Each court has its own programme and, as Margo has indicated, two unique initiatives are in operation. The first is a family court, which contains four sheriffs who are dedicated to family cases. It is claimed that the number of appeals has fallen due to the fact that sheriffs specialising in family law are in place and making the right decisions. The other initiative is a specialised commercial court, in which complex cases involve the sheriffs in considering the paperwork informally as it comes in, so that, when a case is ready to be heard, preparation has already been done.

We attended different courts, but what we witnessed was similar. On my first visit to the court, it was apparent that the intermediate diet—a procedure that was set up to bring in parties earlier, to determine the state of preparation in order to speed up the process—is failing in some ways because of the problems that Margo described. Papers, such as police and witness statements, are not available, which means that the defence is unable to decide whether there should be a plea, as they are not prepared. The intermediate diet is not, therefore, serving the purpose for which it was established.

Some of the courts were a bit quieter than they usually are, apparently, but we did get the general impression of utter chaos. When I was first there, I saw solicitors running from court to court and clerks running around looking for a court in which to have a case heard. Fiona Groves and I went to listen to a jury case and the judge was giving direction to the jury, which was something that I had never seen before.

10:30

I take the view that such visits can educate us about the practicalities of the court system. I know that some members have direct experience of that. It is the fourth visit that I have carried out—if one includes the prison visit—and they have all been invaluable. I would like to encourage the committee to carry out more visits in the future.

**Christine Grahame:** I imagine that those comments also pertain to Edinburgh sheriff court. It is not always the procurator fiscal who is to blame for delays—sometimes social inquiry reports from other agencies are simply not available. I would defend those agencies because they are also under pressure. When you saw someone running between courts, convener, it may be that they were looking for a sheriff to fill in an interim interdict as a matter of urgency. The courts are very lively and must be in a position to be reactive, even though there is a set timetable. That is true of civil matters as well, which can be urgent, although they are easier to keep to a

timetable.

Specialist sheriffs are important, particularly in family matters, which was one of my specialist areas. The commercial specialism takes place in the Court of Session, where that approach was pioneered. As solicitors and perhaps even offenders are becoming specialised, so should the sheriffs. Your comments echo my experience, convener.

**Ms MacDonald:** They reminded us that, in many respects, we were seeing the jewel in the crown—consider how many sheriffs there are in Glasgow sheriff court in comparison with Dingwall.

**Christine Grahame:** Edinburgh has a new sheriff court too.

**Ms MacDonald:** It is not the newness, it is the size. Scott Barrie is about to mention Dunfermline, but I do not know about Dunfermline because we did not get round to it.

**Christine Grahame:** Scott will tell us about Dunfermline.

**Scott Barrie:** I am not going to tell you now.

Margo MacDonald has raised an important point. How typical or atypical was your experience in Glasgow, convener? Did you get a feel for the fact that it is by far the busiest court in Scotland? The strange thing about sheriff courts is that they do not necessarily reflect the population centres. There are a large number of sheriff courts, but many of them have only one sheriff and do not meet every day of the week.

I am glad to hear about the developments in Glasgow but, in terms of good practice, how relevant are those to other parts of Scotland? We might end up with a two-tier justice system in which a person who lives within the Glasgow jurisdiction will get one type of justice and a person in a more rural area will get a different one, in terms of sheriff specialisms, for example. I am not sure how we tie that up. I am not saying that we do not want to make innovations in one area, because that should happen wherever possible. Did members get some sense of how typical Glasgow sheriff court was?

**The Convener:** That is a good point. I have nothing to compare it with, and if we are to do a report we should have some context. I got the impression that that was a typical day in the life of Glasgow sheriff court in terms of the chaos and how busy it was. Having visited Glasgow sheriff court a second time, I am able to make comparison and I found it to be fairly consistent, particularly on the administration side. Perhaps we want to come back to that.

**Ms MacDonald:** We went into the sheriff's chambers and asked practical questions. We

asked what happened in smaller courts. What Scott Barrie says about first and second-class justice sounds a bit too stark at present, but if a specialist sheriffs service is developed, one has to ask whether the service will be itinerant. It cannot just be settled in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Dundee, which might be big enough to support a family law specialist, for example. That was a concern. However, the people whom we met in Glasgow felt that they were the prototype and that they were testing things out. It is up to the committee to decide whether we think that it is a good idea and to consider how it could be developed or amended.

**Christine Grahame:** Scott Barrie made an important point about smaller courts. I have appeared at Haddington sheriff court, which is a moderately sized court. I have also appeared at Selkirk, which is a tiny, cosier place. I borrowed someone's gown there—it was the only gown hanging there and one cannot appear without a robe. A raging person came in asking "Where's my gown?" while I was sitting wearing it, red-faced, trying to pretend that it was not me who had taken it.

The point is that at Haddington sheriff court, criminal matters were heard first and were followed on the same day by civil cases. One is like a fish out of water when one goes from a large court to a smaller court. The very small courts sometimes do not sit every day. I do not see how specialisms could work there. We could not parachute in a sheriff for a half-hour hearing on a family law matter in the middle of general business.

There will be differences between large and small courts. There are some advantages to the smaller rural courts. The sheriffs know the agents and the agents know them, so matters can be arranged—that may sound sinister, but cases can be dealt with in a different way. The sheriffs may even know the people who are in front of them. That may be regarded as a bad thing—"You're back again, Jimmy,"—but it can be helpful. I could detect advantages in the small courts, as opposed to the anonymity of the sheriff court in Edinburgh, for people appearing there for the first time. It is quite right to say that specialisms cannot apply in some rural courts.

**Scott Barrie:** I wonder whether figures are available from the Scottish Court Service for the number of cases that have to be adjourned for whatever reason, and whether the number is greater in the very busy courts such as Glasgow and Edinburgh than in smaller courts in rural areas or courts in which there are two permanent sheriffs in one court, such as Dunfermline. Christine Grahame will note that I have now mentioned Dunfermline.

**Christine Grahame:** It is a very nice court.

**The Convener:** Would you like the committee to pursue that point, Scott?

**Scott Barrie:** Members have said that the visit to Glasgow was very useful and that it gave them a real feel for what was happening there. As a way of broadening and developing that experience out, we should consider whether there is mileage in asking about the type of statistics that are collected by the Scottish Court Service. Those figures might put flesh on people's experiences.

**Christine Grahame:** We could also ask about the time scale for civil cases.

**The Convener:** We should find out what statistics are available on court delays and adjournments.

**Christine Grahame:** Could we ask whether the figures are divided according to sheriffdoms?

**The Convener:** We will ask for whatever is available.

**Mrs McIntosh:** I am interested in your observations about intermediate diets, as they were an idea that trickled down to my old stamping ground. They were supposed to be the be-all and end-all of efforts to prevent court time being wasted. You said that they were failing. Do you have any more detail on that? Were any suggestions made for improvement?

**The Convener:** I am reporting back on the basis of two visits. The problem that has been identified to me is that not all the information is available when the intermediate diet is called, in particular to the defence. In particular, police statements are not always available. The point of the intermediate diet is sometimes to get a plea, but that is happening less often because the defence is unable to say whether it would make a plea. That is relevant only to the sheriff court as there are no intermediate diets in the High Court.

**Christine Grahame:** While we are looking for figures on delay—this point falls under that banner—we could ask for statistics, perhaps by sheriffdom, on intermediate diets that are continued without pleas.

**The Convener:** I confess that I was given a set of figures, but I cannot find it. I will write to the sheriff principal to ask for another set.

**Ms MacDonald:** I would be surprised if those figures were not available in Glasgow.

**Christine Grahame:** We should ask for figures over three years. There is no point in having them for just one year. We want to see whether there is a trend. We could ask for figures for as long as there have been intermediate diets—that is a long time.

**Ms MacDonald:** When we gather that information, we will present it to the committee and decide whether it raises any big issues.

**Christine Grahame:** It is all related to delays in the system.

10:40

*Meeting continued in private until 12:03.*

Members who would like a printed copy of the *Official Report* to be forwarded to them should give notice at the Document Supply Centre.

No proofs of the *Official Report* can be supplied. Members who want to suggest corrections for the archive edition should mark them clearly in the daily edition, and send it to the Official Report, 375 High Street, Edinburgh EH99 1SP. Suggested corrections in any other form cannot be accepted.

The deadline for corrections to this edition is:

**Tuesday 20 February 2001**

Members who want reprints of their speeches (within one month of the date of publication) may obtain request forms and further details from the Central Distribution Office, the Document Supply Centre or the Official Report.

#### PRICES AND SUBSCRIPTION RATES

##### DAILY EDITIONS

*Single copies: £5*

*Meetings of the Parliament annual subscriptions: £500*

The archive edition of the *Official Report* of meetings of the Parliament, written answers and public meetings of committees will be published on CD-ROM.

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN THE SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT, compiled by the Scottish Parliament Information Centre, contains details of past and forthcoming business and of the work of committees and gives general information on legislation and other parliamentary activity.

*Single copies: £3.75*

*Special issue price: £5*

*Annual subscriptions: £150.00*

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS weekly compilation

*Single copies: £3.75*

*Annual subscriptions: £150.00*

Standing orders will be accepted at the Document Supply Centre.

Published in Edinburgh by The Stationery Office Limited and available from:

**The Stationery Office Bookshop**  
71 Lothian Road  
Edinburgh EH3 9AZ  
0131 228 4181 Fax 0131 622 7017

**The Stationery Office Bookshops at:**  
123 Kingsway, London WC2B 6PQ  
Tel 020 7242 6393 Fax 020 7242 6394  
68-69 Bull Street, Birmingham B4 6AD  
Tel 0121 236 9696 Fax 0121 236 9699  
33 Wine Street, Bristol BS1 2BQ  
Tel 01179 264306 Fax 01179 294515  
9-21 Princess Street, Manchester M60 8AS  
Tel 0161 834 7201 Fax 0161 833 0634  
16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD  
Tel 028 9023 8451 Fax 028 9023 5401  
The Stationery Office Oriel Bookshop,  
18-19 High Street, Cardiff CF1 2BZ  
Tel 029 2039 5548 Fax 029 2038 4347

**The Stationery Office Scottish Parliament Documentation**  
Helpline may be able to assist with additional information  
on publications of or about the Scottish Parliament,  
their availability and cost:

**Telephone orders and inquiries**  
**0870 606 5566**

**Fax orders**  
**0870 606 5588**

**The Scottish Parliament Shop**  
George IV Bridge  
EH99 1SP  
Telephone orders 0131 348 5412

sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk

www.scottish.parliament.uk

**Accredited Agents**  
(see Yellow Pages)

and through good booksellers