

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Tuesday 7 January 2003
(Morning)

Session 1

£5.00

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body 2003.

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

Tuesday 7 January 2003

Col.

DELEGATED POWERS SCRUTINY	1141
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill: Stage 1	1141
Local Government in Scotland Bill: as amended at Stage 2	1148
INSTRUMENTS SUBJECT TO ANNULMENT	1152
Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Exemptions for Disabled Persons) (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/547)	1152
Public Service Vehicles (Registration of Local Services) (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/548)	1152
School Crossing Patrol Sign (Scotland) Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/549)	1152
Air Quality Limit Values (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/556)	1152
Seeds (Miscellaneous Amendments) (No 2) (Scotland) Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/564)	1152
Products of Animal Origin (Third Country Imports) (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/565)	1152
Act of Sederunt (Fees of Sheriff Officers) (No 2) 2002 (SSI 2002/567)	1153
Act of Sederunt (Fees of Solicitors in the Sheriff Court) (Amendment No 4) 2002 (SSI 2002/568)	1153
INSTRUMENTS NOT SUBJECT TO PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL	1154
Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions) (Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning) (West Coast) (No 4) (Scotland) Order 2002 Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/550)	1154
Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions) (Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning) (West Coast) (No 6) (Scotland) Partial Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/551)	1154
Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions) (Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning) (West Coast) (No 12) (Scotland) Partial Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/552)	1154
Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions) (Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning) (West Coast) (No 14) (Scotland) Partial Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/553)	1154
Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions) (Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning) (Orkney) (No 3) (Scotland) Partial Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/558)	1154
INSTRUMENTS NOT LAID BEFORE THE PARLIAMENT	1155
Act of Sederunt (Debt Arrangement and Attachment (Scotland) Act 2002) 2002 (SSI 2002/560)	1155
Adoption (Intercountry Aspects) Act 1999 (Commencement No 7) (Scotland) Order 2002 (SSI 2002/562)	1155
Act of Sederunt (Fees of Messengers-at-Arms) (No 2) 2002 (SSI 2002/566)	1155
Act of Sederunt (Summary Applications, Statutory Applications and Appeals etc Rules) Amendment (No 5) (Proceeds of Crime Act 2002) 2002 (SSI 2002/563)	1156

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

1st Meeting 2003, Session 1

CONVENER

*Ms Margo MacDonald (Lothians) (SNP)

DEPUTY CONVENER

*Ian Jenkins (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Butler (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)

*Colin Campbell (West of Scotland) (SNP)

*Brian Fitzpatrick (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)

*Murdo Fraser (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)

*Gordon Jackson (Glasgow Govan) (Lab)

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTES

Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab)

Mr Kenny MacAskill (Lothians) (SNP)

Mr Brian Monteith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)

Mr Mike Rumbles (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)

*attended

CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE

Alasdair Rankin

SENIOR ASSISTANT CLERK

Steve Farrell

ASSISTANT CLERKS

Joanne Clinton

Alistair Fleming

LOCATION

Committee Room 3

Scottish Parliament

Subordinate Legislation Committee

Tuesday 7 January 2003

(Morning)

[THE CONVENER *opened the meeting at 11:33*]

The Convener (Ms Margo MacDonald): I welcome everyone to the first meeting in 2003 of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I trust that members will have a happy and prosperous new year and loads of votes in the bag. Fortunately, the election will come and go and will not be noticed by the committee because our minds are on much higher things—the issues of good governance.

Delegated Powers Scrutiny

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill: Stage 1

The Convener: That brings us to the first item on the agenda. The bill is a consolidation measure and three members of this committee are on the committee that will consider how the bill consolidates various acts relating to fishing. As usual, the Subordinate Legislation Committee's duty is to consider whether the subordinate legislation provisions in the bill are in accordance with the Parliament's standing orders and with the principles of good governance, which I mentioned earlier.

Section 4(3) confers a power on the Scottish ministers to define the meaning of fishing for or taking salmon by rod and line. There is a suggestion that the ministers will be able to redefine the meaning, which is potentially a wide power. I presume that the committee will want to ask the Executive for clarification on that. Is that acceptable?

Members *indicated agreement.*

The Convener: The bill contains many cross-references and it is not certain whether they knit happily together. I presume that the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill Committee will consider that matter.

Murdo Fraser (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con): Yes, it will, but the Subordinate Legislation Committee could also usefully raise the point.

The Convener: Do you mean the fact that section 4 contains a cross-reference to section 33,

which also contains provision for specifying baits and lures? I did not want to get into the nasty bits of fishing, but it appears that, in consolidating different pieces of legislation that stretch back over a considerable time, a straightforward knitting exercise has not taken place.

Brian Fitzpatrick (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab): Hence the term "consolidation".

The Convener: The Scottish ministers should have a power to adjust the definition of rod and line. [*Interruption.*] Let the record show that Mr Fitzpatrick helpfully demonstrated how a rod and line is used in fishing for or taking salmon.

Brian Fitzpatrick: Has Gordon Jackson declared his interest in salmon fishing?

Gordon Jackson (Glasgow Govan) (Lab): What interest?

The Convener: He likes it with lemon and a wee touch of black pepper.

Brian Fitzpatrick: He is murdering sashimi.

The Convener: We will refer the matter of the interaction between section 4 and sections 33 and 38(5)(b) to the Executive because we are not happy with it. We will ask the Executive for comment and reconsideration of those sections.

Sections 31(1)(a) to (f), 31(2) and 31(3) of the bill confer a power to make general regulations, which derives from section 3(2) of the Salmon Act 1986. The power permits the Scottish ministers to make general regulations relating to the observance of weekly close time, the construction and use of cruives, the means of passage of salmon, the construction of nets, obstruction to the passage of salmon and screens and the passage of salmon. That seems fine.

Sections 31(4)(a) and (b), which derive from section 2(2A) of the Freshwater Fisheries (Protection) (Scotland) Act 1951, allow the Scottish ministers to make regulations that define fishing for or taking salmon by net and coble, bag net, fly net or other stake net. Are there any appropriate gestures that might explain to the committee those means of taking salmon, Brian? [*Interruption.*] The committee is greatly enlightened.

Brian Fitzpatrick: I take it that you were playing Pictionary at new year, convener. My demonstration was for those listening on the radio.

I heard you on Radio 4 from Broadcasting House.

The Convener: Imagine being up so early in the morning.

Brian Fitzpatrick: Who said that I was up?

The Convener: Oh well, right enough.

Like section 31(1) to (3), the regulations will define the scope of section 1. The committee would usually subject the power to particular scrutiny, and although we are not allowed to make any points about the power, I presume that Murdo Fraser's committee could.

Murdo Fraser: Not necessarily. If we are talking about a straightforward consolidation of existing law, the consolidation committee should not consider that matter.

Ian Jenkins (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD): That cannot be altered, but it would be possible to say during discussion that in other circumstances we would want stricter procedures to be applied. That might put down a marker for future consideration.

Gordon Jackson: It is important to remember what a consolidation does. It is, by definition, a restatement, not a consideration of legislation from scratch. That which is restated might include subordinate legislation provisions for which, if they were in a brand new bill, we would decide whether the procedure should be positive or negative. I do not see how this committee can consider that for this bill, because not even the consolidation committee can consider that—we cannot change policy. We have a different remit for this bill and I am worried that we are straying from it.

The Convener: I do not want us to do that, but I want to say to the Executive that our procedures should not perpetuate the ambiguous drafting of subordinate legislation, which might happen.

Gordon Jackson: The consolidation is not meant to perpetuate ambiguity, but to some extent all that this kind of bill can do is to perpetuate. It can clear up obvious ambiguities and nonsense, but it can only perpetuate. You would probably agree with that, convener.

The Convener: I have been thinking about that.

Gordon Jackson: Normally, anything that does not only perpetuate would have to go before Parliament. The consolidation committee is a procedure for doing things without parliamentary scrutiny.

The Convener: Yes, but if we notice during the passage of the consolidation measure that aspects of it are less than well drafted, or have become anomalous because of practices and procedures that we are building up, should we not state that?

Gordon Jackson: Without wanting to be over-technical, it depends on what we mean by anomalous. Deciding whether something should be subject to the negative or the affirmative procedure is not any of our business in this context. If parts of the bill were anomalous because they were mutually contradictory or did

not make sense, that would be the kind of thing that consolidated legislation is meant to change and there would be nothing wrong in our noting that. It is a fine line to draw.

We are not carrying out a normal exercise. Consolidation is a fast-tracking exercise that misses out parliamentary scrutiny, so we cannot make substantive changes.

The Convener: I appreciate that. I am trying to find an easy, one-step way of ensuring that, as well as being consolidated the legislation is improved without changing policy intention. Perhaps it is impossible to square that circle.

Gordon Jackson: It is. The legislation is not meant to "improve" in the way that you use the word.

The Convener: I just want to make the legislation more workable and understandable to those affected by it.

Gordon Jackson: It would be easy to cross the line.

The Convener: I shall not go to the wall on that, but if you feel the same suspicion or unease as you go through bill, perhaps there will be a role for us to comment.

Section 31(4)(c) deals with haaf nets. I am assured that people on the Solway have been fishing with haaf nets since Adam was a boy or Peter was casting his nets. It is not, therefore, controversial, even though fishing with haaf nets is allowed only on the Solway.

Murdo Fraser: It is quite controversial. In fact, there have been disputes about what haaf-netting is over centuries. Haaf nets are permitted only on the Solway and nowhere else. The fishermen of the Solway jealously guard their right to fish with haaf nets. However, because it is exclusive to the Solway, there has been much litigation over the years as to what haaf-netting is. Therefore, the right to define haaf-netting is a very sensitive issue.

The Convener: Recommendation 9 at paragraph 67 of the Scottish Law Commission report is that this method of fishing should be recognised as lawful, but that the Scottish Ministers should have a power to regulate the construction and use of haaf nets.

So, it is a big deal, then?

Murdo Fraser: Well, it is if you use haaf nets.

Colin Campbell (West of Scotland) (SNP): I have a point of information. How can haaf nets be altered? Are they made bigger? Is the mesh a different size? Is that what we are talking about?

11:45

The Convener: I presume that it is the size of the net.

Murdo Fraser: As I understand it, haaf nets are built on a wooden construction, the style and size of which could obviously be altered.

The Convener: As this has a material effect, we must question whether the matter should be left to subordinate legislation.

Murdo Fraser: I can see why there might be a need to amend regulations about the size and scale of haaf nets in the future. However, the point could be made that it should be subject to the affirmative procedure rather than the negative.

The Convener: That would be consistent with what we have done before. Brian Fitzpatrick, do you agree?

Brian Fitzpatrick: Yes.

The Convener: We will mention to the Executive that the committee would prefer to see the matter dealt with under the affirmative procedure.

Section 31(5) is derived from section 3(3) of the Salmon Act 1986.

Ian Jenkins: The Executive's notes do not comment on the subsection. It appears to create a new power and goes wider than the existing legislation.

The Convener: As the Executive, in its memorandum, has not given the committee any notice of its intentions, we must ask the Executive its intentions before we jump to conclusions. As we know, the Executive is a fine body of men and women.

Colin Campbell: Some of them are.

The Convener: Murdo Fraser will also be examining the matter in the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill Committee.

Murdo Fraser: Yes, with the leave of the committee.

The Convener: They tell me that you are outvoted anyway.

Brian Fitzpatrick: That is just because Jackson is there.

The Convener: This is another matter where, from this committee's point of view, we might be more inclined to think that the affirmative procedure would be more appropriate, but we will simply notify the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill Committee of our opinion. Are we agreed?

Members indicated agreement.

The Convener: Section 33 deals with regulations as to baits and lures for salmon fishing. Again, we do not have the Executive's thoughts on this. There might be a difficulty with the interaction of this provision with section 4(3), and there is also a question as to whether the provision is properly consolidated. Again, that issue is one for Murdo Fraser's committee, but there might be a question for this committee as to whether the power should properly be left to subordinate legislation that is subject to no parliamentary procedure. Does anyone have any thoughts?

Murdo Fraser: We should ask the Executive to clarify its intentions.

Ian Jenkins: There is also a bit of a drafting problem about references to designation orders and so on because they do not appear in some of the other associated documents. We could also bring that point to the Executive's attention.

The Convener: Section 34 relates to salmon fishery districts. There is some doubt about what the Executive means by "existing salmon fishery district".

Ian Jenkins: Yes. We should ask the Executive what it means by that phrase.

The Convener: Section 34(4) reproduces section 1(4) of the Salmon Act 1986 and confers powers on the Scottish ministers to make orders ancillary to designation orders. We need clarification on that.

We also require some clarification from the Executive on section 35, which is on designation orders.

Section 36 is on estuary limits. Section 36(3) derives from section 7(2) of the 1986 act, and allows the Scottish ministers to prescribe limits by order for any river, which are to be the estuary limits for that river. A lot of consultation is required for this, as members can imagine. I think that we are okay about this point. I see that those orders are not subject to any parliamentary procedure.

Ian Jenkins: It is just consolidation anyway, so we should not bother with it.

The Convener: As I said, there has to be consultation; we are okay about that.

I think that similar remarks apply to section 36(5) as applied to the matter of estuary limits. The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill Committee will decide whether or not the proposed amendment is appropriate to a consolidation bill.

Section 37(3) covers annual close times. Its provisions derive from section 6(3) of the 1986 act.

Ian Jenkins: Section 37(3) simply reproduces the existing provisions, so we do not need to comment.

The Convener: The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill Committee can pick the matter up.

Section 38 is on salmon conservation orders. It derives from sections 10A, 10C and 10D of the 1986 act and confers on the Scottish ministers power to make a salmon conservation order.

Murdo Fraser: There is some dubiety about the drafting of subsection (4)(b). I suggest that we ask the Executive to clarify its intentions.

The Convener: The original provision provides for the power to be exercised by regulation rather than by order, as is provided for now. Murdo, you will consider that on your committee too.

Murdo Fraser: Yes, I believe that we will.

The Convener: That is fine, but we will also ask the Executive for clarification.

Section 39 covers procedures for making orders and regulations under section 33 and part 2. Murdo Fraser and his committee should consider the section and establish whether it is needed.

Section 40(8) is on qualified proprietors and upper and lower proprietors. It originates from section 11 of the 1986 act.

Ian Jenkins: It is a straight lift from the 1986 act, and I do not think that we should comment on it.

The Convener: We like straight lifts.

Section 43(8) is on district salmon fishery boards.

Ian Jenkins: Again, that is a straight piece of consolidation. This is not territory that we want to go into any further.

Colin Campbell: We should point out that it would have been nice to have this power subject to the affirmative procedure—but we cannae do that.

Gordon Jackson: I do not think that we could make a change in that regard.

The Convener: We know that we cannot do that, but I will comment on the matter in passing. We should simply say that, in line with our general approach, we would have preferred it if the procedure under section 43(8) had been affirmative.

Section 48(1) originated in section 1 of the Freshwater and Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act 1976. It permits Scottish ministers to make a protection order prohibiting persons without legal right, or permission of the owner of the right, from

fishing for or taking freshwater fish in inland waters specified in the order.

Brian Fitzpatrick: That is the John Farquhar Munro clause.

The Convener: The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill Committee will seek expert advice when it considers the consolidation.

Murdo Fraser: We have the expert on the committee.

The Convener: That is fine then. I know that we are straying into policy areas, but the section is a bit restrictive.

Section 65 is on additional powers in respect of the licensing and regulation of salmon fishing.

Colin Campbell: We cannot comment, because the power is a pure consolidation of existing provisions.

The Convener: Section 72(2) is on commencement. I believe that the section might be wrong. Section 72(2) of the bill provides that Scottish ministers may appoint the day on which the act comes into force, other than section 72, which the Executive claims will commence by operation of law two months after royal assent. Seemingly, it is normal for consolidating acts to come into force two months after royal assent, but it is also usual to specify such a commencement date in the act itself. The way in which the section has been drafted suggests that the bill might come into force not two months after royal assent, but on royal assent. We must draw that to the Executive's attention.

Ian Jenkins: There should be a commencement date in the act.

The Convener: Yes, I think so.

We hope that you have a lovely time on the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Bill Committee.

Brian Fitzpatrick: I am sure that we will.

Local Government in Scotland Bill: as amended at Stage 2

The Convener: We raised six concerns with the Executive at stage 2 and the Executive has said that it agrees with us on four of the points that we made. I do not know whether the Executive felt that it had to stand on our dignity, but it has stuck to a couple of its points on section 25G, which is on capital expenditure limits. The section places a duty on local authorities to manage their capital expenditure, requiring them in so doing to comply with regulations made by Scottish ministers. It is an important power and we asked for further justification of the negative procedure proposed.

Brian Fitzpatrick said that he thought that on this occasion he was minded to accept the Executive's response to our concern, because he did not think that the power could be pushed through using the negative procedure. I think that he is probably right, but we have said as a matter of principle that we think that the affirmative procedure would be better. Given the practicalities, I think that Brian Fitzpatrick is right. We might be minded as a committee to accept the Executive's argument. Are we so minded?

Members indicated agreement.

The Convener: Section 25H is on the imposition of capital expenditure limits. We asked why the Executive had not referred to the new power in its memorandum. The Executive said, "Well we are quite glad that you noticed that we hadn't told you why." However, the Executive feels that it really is none of our business, because the power is not in the form of a power to make subordinate legislation. Are we happy with that response? The Executive is saying that the power will rarely, if ever, be used; but we are nitpickers and we say that if it can be used the Executive should get it right.

Gordon Jackson: Why is the power not expressed as a power to make subordinate legislation?

The Convener: Why not? Because the Executive did not make it like that.

Gordon Jackson: All right.

Murdo Fraser: The Executive says that the power would be used only in exceptional and extreme circumstances.

The Convener: That is why the Executive did not embody the power in a statutory instrument.

Murdo Fraser: The power would also be used where the need for intervention was immediate. That is why the Executive cannot hang around producing an SSI; it would have to get on and do something.

The Convener: Yes. However, we are talking about money and about curtailing the power—

Gordon Jackson: Surely the reality is that if the power were used controversially it would be raised in the Parliament.

The Convener: That is what the Executive is saying.

Gordon Jackson: That is bound to happen. It is not possible to envisage a situation in which an Executive would use the power against local government.

The Convener: No, but the Subordinate Legislation Committee is bound to say that such powers should be expressed in the correct way.

12:00

Gordon Jackson: Even if the power was to be used against local government and a complaint was to be made, it would become a public political issue. If we are not careful, SSIs could go through on the nod because they are often administrative in nature. Exercising the power in this case would be such a big political issue that it could not be done in a corner. There is no doubt that a huge row would result in the Parliament if it were to be exercised. In an odd way, the power is such a huge thing to exercise that it hardly needs an SSI to go before the Parliament.

The Convener: I see the argument.

Gordon Jackson: If we did not have the Executive coming before the Parliament with SSIs—

The Convener: We are making political judgments.

Gordon Jackson: If the Executive wanted to do things to regulate shellfish, for example, it could do so without using an SSI and naeboddy would notice. SSIs are needed so that at least somebody looks at what the Executive is doing. I repeat that this power could never be exercised in a corner.

The Convener: Are we just deciding that it could not?

Gordon Jackson: Well, we decide on certain things, such as that night follows day.

The Convener: We are not meant to decide anything on this committee.

Gordon Jackson: It could not possibly be done without a huge political row. The convener could contact the Parliament or the lead committee. When is the bill to be introduced?

Alasdair Rankin (Clerk): Stage 3 is tomorrow.

Murdo Fraser: Yes, it is tomorrow.

The Convener: As part of our general letter to the Parliament and the lead committee, we should say that we have, yet again, had to produce a report on a very important piece of legislation overnight. We are anything but pleased with that. It does not lead to good governance.

Gordon Jackson: Absolutely. I have no problem with that. However, there is nothing to stop the convener from standing up in the stage 3 debate and saying that there is an argument—Why is the convener looking at me like that?

The Convener: Because I love you, Gordon. No, it is because every time I stand up to say something as convener of the Subordinate Legislation Committee everybody else goes out for a piece of shortbread. I exclude the loyal members of the committee from that remark—they stay.

Gordon Jackson: There is nothing to stop the convener saying that the power is such that it should be made as an SSI. I personally do not care if it is made as an SSI, because I do not think that the power could be slipped through on the fly. If the power were to be used, it would be such a big deal that a huge row would ensue.

The Convener: Aye, but governments can ride out big rows, which is why we need to take a belt-and-braces approach. I return to the point that Murdo Fraser made about what would happen if the power had to be used quickly.

Gordon Jackson: On balance, for the reasons that I have just given, I am happy with the power not being made as an SSI, but the Parliament should at least have it drawn to its attention that the power is not being expressed as a power to make subordinate legislation.

The Convener: I will do it just for you, Gordon.

Ian Jenkins: Presumably, if there was a big fuss the Executive could withdraw its imposition of the limit. However, the Executive may be in a hurry to get the thing done. If it cannot impose the limit until it has gone through a whole lot of scrutiny and big debates, it would take longer for it to do its Executive bit.

The Convener: Big debates can be truncated, but they can still be held. The clerk and I will confer on the matter to ensure that I do not let you down, that I say the right things tomorrow and that I give a proper flavour of the consideration of the committee.

Instruments Subject to Annulment

Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Exemptions for Disabled Persons) (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/547)

The Convener: The regulations are okay.

Public Service Vehicles (Registration of Local Services) (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/548)

Murdo Fraser: We can draw a couple of typos to the attention of the Executive by informal letter.

School Crossing Patrol Sign (Scotland) Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/549)

Colin Campbell: It is interesting to note that the signs are not traffic signs; they are school crossing patrol signs.

The Convener: They are no longer traffic signs.

Murdo Fraser: Those are what used to be called lollipop men and ladies.

The Convener: We will have to write an informal letter to the Executive on the regulations.

Air Quality Limit Values (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/556)

Ian Jenkins: We have no comments, but we might draw a couple of points about the explanatory note to the Executive's attention in an informal letter.

The Convener: Yes. The explanatory note on instruments such as this is important.

Seeds (Miscellaneous Amendments) (No 2) (Scotland) Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/564)

Ian Jenkins: There are no problems with the regulations.

The Convener: It was our good work that brought this about.

Products of Animal Origin (Third Country Imports) (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2002 (SSI 2002/565)

Ian Jenkins: The regulations are okay.

**Act of Sederunt (Fees of Sheriff Officers)
(No 2) 2002 (SSI 2002/567)**

The Convener: There are wee typos in the instrument.

**Act of Sederunt (Fees of Solicitors in the
Sheriff Court) (Amendment No 4) 2002
(SSI 2002/568)**

The Convener: There is a more serious point on the instrument. We probably need to get clarification from the draftsmen about whether the instrument is intended to have retrospective effect. I know that there have been communications between the draftsmen and the committee to find out whether the intention was that it was meant to be retrospective. It would be very serious if it was.

That is not the intention. We have been given an assurance that it would not be retrospective.

Ian Jenkins: We should probably get that in writing.

The Convener: Yes. A wee bit of clarification is required, but we do not need to worry about it.

**Instruments not Subject to
Parliamentary Control**

**Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions)
(Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning)
(West Coast) (No 4) (Scotland) Order 2002
Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/550)**

**Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions)
(Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning)
(West Coast) (No 6) (Scotland) Partial
Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/551)**

The Convener: The orders are okay. I see that Gordon Jackson has returned to the room.

Gordon Jackson: Sorry.

The Convener: It is okay. You have missed two of the amnesic shellfish orders.

**Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions)
(Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning)
(West Coast) (No 12) (Scotland) Partial
Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/552)**

**Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions)
(Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning)
(West Coast) (No 14) (Scotland) Partial
Revocation Order 2002 (SSI 2002/553)**

**Food Protection (Emergency Prohibitions)
(Amnesic Shellfish Poisoning) (Orkney)
(No 3) (Scotland) Partial Revocation Order
2002 (SSI 2002/558)**

The Convener: The orders are all hunky-dory.

Instruments not laid before the Parliament

Act of Sederunt (Debt Arrangement and Attachment (Scotland) Act 2002) 2002 (SSI 2002/560)

The Convener: The act of sederunt is okay.

Adoption (Intercountry Aspects) Act 1999 (Commencement No 7) (Scotland) Order 2002 (SSI 2002/562)

The Convener: The order is okay, but perhaps an informal letter should be sent to the people who drafted it. The reason for that being that such orders must be consumer friendly and its preamble is perhaps not as straightforward as it might be.

Act of Sederunt (Fees of Messengers-at-Arms) (No 2) 2002 (SSI 2002/566)

The Convener: There are some typos and missing footnotes and so on. An informal letter is required.

Act of Sederunt (Summary Applications, Statutory Applications and Appeals etc Rules) Amendment (No 5) (Proceeds of Crime Act 2002) 2002 (SSI 2002/563)

The Convener: There are no points on the act of sederunt.

Before we leave this morning, I should mention that members will have had notice of the number of Subordinate Legislation Committee meetings that there will be. We have 12 meetings to go—or 11, now that we have almost finished this one. About 15 bills are expected. It will be heavy going. Will any committee members have problems with other committees or anything like that?

Gordon Jackson: No, not to my knowledge.

Colin Campbell: I have one Robin Rigg Offshore Wind Farm (Navigation and Fishing) (Scotland) Bill Committee meeting that may coincide with a Subordinate Legislation Committee meeting.

The Convener: Let us know if a problem crops up.

I thank members for their attendance.

Meeting closed at 12:10.

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:

Wednesday 15 January 2003

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: £350.00

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