



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA

18th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4)

Tuesday 4 June 2013

The Committee will meet at 10.00 am in Committee Room 3.

1. **Instruments subject to affirmative procedure:** The Committee will consider the following—

[Debt Arrangement Scheme \(Scotland\) Amendment Regulations 2013 \[draft\];](#)

[Public Services Reform \(Functions of the Common Services Agency for the Scottish Health Service\) \(Scotland\) Order 2013 \[draft\].](#)

2. **Instruments subject to negative procedure:** The Committee will consider the following—

[Children's Hearings \(Scotland\) Act 2011 \(Rehabilitation of Offenders\) \(Transitory Provisions\) Order 2013 \(SSI 2013/146\);](#)

[Children's Hearings \(Scotland\) Act 2011 \(Transitional, Savings and Supplementary Provisions\) Order 2013 \(SSI 2013/150\);](#)

[Animal Health \(Miscellaneous Fees and Amendments\) \(Scotland\) Regulations 2013 \(SSI 2013/151\);](#)

[Sheriff Court Districts Amendment Order 2013 \(SSI 2013/152\);](#)

[Justice of the Peace Courts \(Scotland\) Amendment Order 2013 \(SSI 2013/153\);](#)

[Town and Country Planning \(Control of Advertisements\) \(Scotland\) Amendment Regulations 2013 \(SSI 2013/154\);](#)

[Town and Country Planning \(Development Management Procedure\) \(Scotland\) Regulations 2013 \(SSI 2013/155\).](#)

3. **Instruments not subject to any parliamentary procedure:** The Committee will consider the following—

[Certification of Death \(Scotland\) Act 2011 \(Commencement No. 1\) Order 2013 \(SSI 2013/159 \(C.11\)\);](#)

[Act of Sederunt \(Lands Valuation Appeal Court\) 2013 \(SSI 2013/161\);](#)

SL/S4/13/18/A

[Water Resources \(Scotland\) Act 2013 \(Commencement No. 1\) Order 2013 \(SSI 2013/163 \(C.12\)\).](#)

Euan Donald
Clerk to the Subordinate Legislation Committee
Room T1.01
Tel: 0131 348 5212
Email: euan.donald@scottish.parliament.uk

The papers for this meeting are as follows—

Agenda Items 1, 2 and 3

Legal Brief (private)

SL/S4/13/18/1 (P)

Agenda Items 1 and 2

Instrument Responses

SL/S4/13/18/2

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**18th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4)****Tuesday 4 June 2013****Instrument Responses****INSTRUMENTS SUBJECT TO AFFIRMATIVE PROCEDURE****Debt Arrangement Scheme (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2013 [draft]****On 23 May 2013, the Scottish Government was asked:**

The Scottish Government is asked to explain whether new regulation 4A of the Debt Arrangement Scheme (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as inserted by regulation 5 of the draft instrument) permits the DAS Administrator to correct a determination with retrospective effect. If so, the Scottish Government is asked which power in the Debt Arrangement and Attachment (Scotland) Act 2002 which confers authority on the Scottish Ministers to make provision with retrospective effect is being relied upon here.

The Scottish Government is also asked to explain what the effect of new regulation 4A(3)(b) is on persons who have acted in accordance with a determination to revoke a debt payment programme (for example, a creditor who commences diligence against a debtor whose DPP has been revoked) where the programme is subsequently restored. We note that new regulation 44A of the DAS Regulations as inserted by regulation 14(5) of the draft instrument provides that revocation of a programme is to have no effect for 14 days following the date of revocation. However, under new regulation 4A(a) of the DAS Regulations, an error may be corrected by the DAS Administrator up to 28 days from the date on which the error was made.

Finally the Scottish Government is asked whether the intention is that both sub-paragraphs of new regulation 4A(3) of the DAS Regulations apply in relation to a debt payment programme revoked in error. If so, what is the effect of applying both sub-paragraphs to such a programme?

The Scottish Government responded as follows:**Regulation 4A**

New regulation 4A of the Debt Arrangement Scheme (Scotland) Regulations 2011 ("the DAS Regulations") would provide that the DAS Administrator can correct inadvertent errors in determinations made under the DAS Regulations, with effect from the date of the original determination. This is in the context of the operation and administration of debt payment programmes, applied for by debtors, and operated with the agreement of creditors (which can be dispensed with under certain circumstances, as provided for in particular in section 4 of the Debt Arrangement and Attachment (Scotland) Act 2002 ("the 2002 Act") and regulations 23 to 25 of the DAS Regulations.

The scheme affects the rights of debtors and creditors in that context. As part of the framework which balances the competing interests of debtors and creditors affected by the programme, regulation 4A enables a determination to be corrected to vary the

rights of the parties with limited retroactive effect but only in the context of the process in the regulations including review and appeal to determine the rights of the parties. It is intended to cover a range of clerical or incidental errors, but also, where appropriate, it could restore the effect of a programme revoked in error. Crucially, regulations 4A(4)(b) and 47(3)(d) inserted by the draft Regulations make clear to affected parties, including creditors, that a correction can be made and is capable of review (see further below).

The powers conferred on the Scottish Ministers by section 7 of the 2002 Act to make further provision for the debt arrangement scheme are particularly wide. Specifically, they enable the Scottish Ministers to make such further provision as they think fit as to the manner in which debt payment programmes are to operate including conditions with which debtors and creditors must comply (section 7(1)(b)). Section 7(1)(c) of that Act enables provision as to the effect of such programmes and section 7(2)(p) provision as to the manner in which a debt payment programme affects the rights or remedies of a creditor or other third party. Section 7(3) enables different provision in relation to different debts or other matters and (in sub-paragraph (b)) for provision to have effect for such periods as are specified by Scottish Ministers.

The Scottish Government considers the power is apt to include provision about whether determinations can be corrected or not, in the context of the process of review and appeal to decide between the respective legal rights affected, particularly the effect of revocation. It is considered that the powers envisage that provision can be made regarding the effect of on-going decisions taken in relation to the operation of the scheme where the parties can make representations about their legal rights. The provision for corrections is procedural, which is an exception to the general presumption against retrospective effect. For accidental errors, a correction will be “merely declaratory or restorative of what was generally thought by all concerned to have been the position...likely to be both unobjectionable and desirable or even essential for practical purposes” (see Craies on Legislation, ed. Daniel Greenberg, 10th ed, 10.3.15) There would be limits on the power in that the DAS Administrator could not exercise the power—particularly for instance to restore a debt payment programme which had been revoked—in the light of representation received if that undermined legal rights to enforce debts in a manner which placed an undue burden on a party.

It may be worth noting separately that under regulation 20(2) of the draft Regulations, regulation 4A would only apply to determinations made after the draft Regulations come into force. The Regulations will not have retrospective effect in relation to commencement of the Regulations.

Regulation 4A(3)(b)

New regulation 4A(3)(b) (of the DAS Regulations) clarifies that the effect of the correction where a programme was revoked in error is that the programme is restored. This provision in particular is considered necessary to provide legal certainty for those affected by a correction.

As the Committee notes, the original revocation determination can have no effect for 14 days following the date of the revocation (new regulation 44A) which means that a creditor could not take action within those 14 days. Thereafter up to 28 days from the original determination the DAS administrator may correct that decision, to restore the programme as if it had not been revoked.

If no review application is made in relation to the revocation, it may be possible for instance for creditors to take enforcement action in reliance on fact that the revocation had effect. The making of a subsequent correction to refuse the revocation and revive the debt payment programme might then interfere, (for example) with diligence commenced after the end of the 14 day period. The effect of the revocation would be to stop that diligence in line with the general effect of the scheme, as if the revocation had initially been refused—in the event that the DAS Administrator proceeds subsequently to make a correction.

However, in the event that the DAS Administrator intends to correct a revocation decision, notice requires to be given to any person (known of under the general effect of the DAS scheme), by regulation 4A(2). From that date regulation 47(3)(d) gives those affected express rights of a further 14 days to seek a review and appeal of the decision on grounds which would result in an error of law. In that event express provision is made in regulation 4A(4)(b) so that the correction cannot take effect until the review and any appeal have been disposed of. The DAS Administrator and the courts would be bound to take account of the effect on parties in deciding whether to make a correction. In some cases they could make the correction, but in others that would be unfair.

It is not considered in addition that regulation 4A(4)(a) causes any difficulty with correction following review after 28 days from the date of the error, because of the clear provision for review and appeal of a correction, and regulation 47B(1) which enables the DAS Administrator to confirm its determination.

Regulation 4A(3)

On the Committee's final question, it is the intention that both sub-paragraphs of new regulation 4A(3) of the DAS Regulations apply to a debt payment programme revoked in error. The effect of both sub-paragraphs is the same—where a debt payment programme was revoked, and a correction is made to reverse that (following any review) under regulation 4A(1), the effect is as if the programme was not revoked, as explained above. Under sub-paragraph (a) the corrected form of the relevant determination would be a determination to refuse revocation (rather than a determination to revoke). The effect of sub-paragraph (b) is to make clear in these circumstances for the avoidance of doubt that the programme is restored.

INSTRUMENTS SUBJECT TO NEGATIVE PROCEDURE

Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Rehabilitation of Offenders) (Transitory Provisions) Order 2013 (SSI 2013/146)

On 16 May 2013, the Scottish Government was asked:

1. The Order makes transitory provisions under section 205 of the 2011 Act in connection with the coming into force of provisions of the Act.

As in our view it is not explained in the policy note or the explanatory note to the instrument, please explain to assist the Committee how the provisions are in connection with provisions of the Act coming into force; which provisions those are; and when they are planned to come into force.

2. Article 2(2) of this Order modifies the effect of section 1(4) of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 ("the 1974 Act"). The reference to "criminal proceedings" is to be read, for a temporary period, as if it includes proceedings in which a ground of referral in a children's hearing under the 2011 Act in relation to the commission of an offence is under consideration.

This means that the text of section 1(4) is to be read in relation to those proceedings under the 2011 Act as: "In this Act, references to a conviction, however expressed, include references—....(b) to any finding....in any proceedings in which a ground of referral under section 67(2)(j) of the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 , is under consideration".

Please explain how the provision gives effect to the policy intentions? Why does it specify that a "conviction" includes any finding in any proceedings under the 2011 Act in which an offence ground under consideration, rather than specifying that it is a finding that the section 67(2)(j) ground has been determined to apply in relation to a child; or that the reference to "conviction" includes a finding as to the section 67(2)(j) ground, rather than "any finding" (as a hearing or the sheriff, as the case may be, could be considering more than one ground in the proceedings)?

3. Article 2(4)(a)(ii) modifies the effect of section 5(3) of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974, to extend the provision in that subsection to where there is the discharge by a children's hearings or, as the case may be, the sheriff of the referral of a child's case to a hearing under section 91(3)(b), 93(2)(b), 94(2)(b), 108(3)(b), 114(3)(b) or 119(3)(b) of the 2011 Act.

Section 5(3) provides that in any of those circumstances, "the rehabilitation period applicable.....shall be 6 months from the date of conviction." Article 2(2) of this Order modifies the effect of section 1(4) of the 1974 Act as outlined at the start of question (2) above. Paragraph 2 of the Explanatory Note plainly states that the Order relates to disposals under the 2011 Act where a child has committed an offence, or where an "offence-based ground of referral is established".

Please explain therefore—

(a) Why article 2(4)(a)(ii) implements the policy intentions, given that the provision extends to any discharge of the referral of a child's case, rather than a discharge

where the offence ground of referral under section 67(2)(j) applies or is established in relation to a child?

(b) Why it implements the policy intentions to refer in article 2(4)(a)(ii) to—

(i) section 93(2)(b), so far as that provision includes where a hearing discharges the referral where none of the grounds in the statement of grounds is accepted, and there will be an application to the sheriff in terms of section 93(2)(a)?

(ii) section 94(2)(b), so far as that provision applies where the hearing is discharged because the child or a relevant person would not be capable of understanding, or has not understood, an explanation given in relation to a ground, and the hearing must in terms of section 94(2)(a) direct an application to sheriff to determine whether the ground is established?

(iii) section 114(3)(b), so far as that provision applies where the sheriff determines the ground is not established, and the sheriff discharges the referral?

(iv) section 119(3)(b), so far as that provision applies where the hearing discharges the referral because it is not satisfied that it is necessary for the protection etc. of the child to make a compulsory supervision order (which does not refer to where a section 67(2)(j) ground applies to the child)?

The Scottish Government responded as follows:

1. This Order makes transitory provisions to deal with disposals by children's hearings under the Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011, which is largely scheduled to come into force on 24 June 2013. In terms of this Order, certain disposals by a children's hearing in respect of an 'offence-based ground' – the ground under section 67(2)(j) of the 2011 Act – will be treated as convictions for the purposes of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974, just as the equivalent disposals under the Children (Scotland) Act 1995 are presently treated in terms of section 3 of the 1974 Act.

In due course sections 187 and 188 of the 2011 Act will re-classify these disposals from 'convictions' to 'alternatives to prosecution' ('ATPs'). Section 187 and 188 cannot yet be brought into force, as the Scottish Ministers have powers to deal with these disposals, in so far as they have an effect on reserved matters, only in relation to **convictions** – in terms of functions transferred to them by the Scotland Act (Transfer of Functions to the Scottish Ministers etc.) Order 2003 (SI 2003/415).

Paragraph 8 of the Policy Note summarises the effect of sections 187 and 188 which are explained in detail in the Annex to the Policy Note. Paragraph 12 of the Policy Note explains that sections 187 and 188 cannot be brought into force until the Scotland Act Order has been made and Article 1(2) of the present Order indicates that the Order ceases to have effect on the day section 187 comes into force.

Section 187, in effect, extends the definition of "alternative to prosecution" in section 8B of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 to include children's hearings

disposals. An alternative to prosecution will have been given where the offence was accepted or established or treated as established and either:-

- (a) a compulsory supervision order has been made, or as the case may be, varied or continued, or
- (b) a supervision requirement has been made, or as the case may be, varied or continued, or
- (c) the referral to the children's hearing has been discharged.

Section 187 also amends the period after which an alternative to prosecution becomes spent.

Section 188 amends the definition of "relevant matter" in section 113A(6) of the Police Act 1997 to include alternatives to prosecution (as defined in section 187) which relate to any offence which is specified in an order made by the Scottish Ministers. That order effectively specifies the offences which Disclosure Scotland can automatically access for the purposes of issuing standard or enhanced disclosure certificates under the 1997 Act or for checks under the Protection of Vulnerable Groups Scheme. Shortly stated, an ATP will only be a "relevant matter" under the Police Act 1997 if the offence is one which is specified in the order to be made under section 113A(6)(ba) of the 1997 Act.

The provisions will cover supervision requirements or discharges under the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968.

The general premise of the 1974 Act is that a person is not required to disclose any convictions or alternatives to prosecution which have become 'spent'. Therefore, to enable the policy behind the order under the Police Act to be fully achieved, that order needs to be supplemented by an order under paragraph 6 of Schedule 3 to the 1974 Act for the reason set out in paragraph 9 of the Policy Note. The order is intended to ensure that a person will only require to 'self-disclose' spent alternatives to prosecution if they relate to offences set out in the Police Act order. In other words, a person will only be required to disclose those alternatives to prosecution which are disclosed by way of standard or enhanced disclosure certificates under the 1997 or for checks under the Protection of Vulnerable Groups Scheme.

However, the order under paragraph 6 of Schedule 3 to the 1974 Act will cover some types of employment and proceedings which fall within reserved matters and it is considered that at present Scottish Ministers do not have the legislative competence to legislate on alternatives to prosecution in reserved areas. This is why the Scottish Ministers need an order under the Scotland Act. The provisions in the Transitory Order amend the effect of the 1974 Act such that certain children's hearings disposals on offence grounds under the 2011 Act will be regarded as convictions meanwhile.

2. In broad terms, the amendment effected by article 2(2) is necessary if the scheme in respect of rehabilitation of offences under the 1974 Act is to apply to disposals, in offence-based cases, by children's hearings and the sheriff – because the reference to 'criminal proceedings' in section 1(4)(b) would otherwise exclude any disposals in non-criminal proceedings such as these.

The reference to “*any finding... in any...proceedings in which a ground of referral under...section 67(2)(j) of the Children’s Hearing (Scotland) Act 2011 is under consideration...that a person has committed an offence or done the act or made the omission charged*” is intended to ensure that the situation in which a finding to the effect that a ground of referral under 67(2)(j) has been established, but the children’s hearing has decided to discharge the case, is caught by the provision. That reference is intended to align with the remaining wording of section 1(4): “*a conviction in respect of which an order is made discharging the person concerned absolutely or conditionally shall be treated as a conviction for the purposes of this Act...*”. This links to section 5(3), which provides that in such cases a rehabilitation period of six months applies. The key point to note is that for this provision to have effect there has to have been a finding. It is assumed that the question is prompted by the reference to “*proceedings....under consideration*” which might infer that there has not yet been any finding that the grounds of referral are established. This interpretation overlooks the fact that section 1(4) only applies where there has been a finding that the person committed the offence or has committed the act or omission. While it may be that a form of words other than “*proceedings....under consideration*” might have been useful the Scottish Government’s view is that these provisions accurately embody the policy intentions.

3(a). Section 5(3) must be read together with section 3, the effect of which has been modified by article 2(3) of the Order. Section 3, thus modified, refers to section 67(2)(j) (the offence-based ground) and specifies that that ground must either have been accepted by the child and, where necessary, by any person who is a relevant person, or been established to the satisfaction of the sheriff.

Section 3 provides that only in cases in which there is an offence-based ground (either under section 52(2)(i) of the 1995 Act or section 67(2)(j) of the 2011 Act) are accepted/established grounds treated as convictions, and disposals of such cases treated as sentences. Only such cases are brought within the provisions of the 1974 Act. Thus to the extent that article 2(4)(a)(ii) can be read as extending article 5(3) to discharges other than a discharge in a case on section 67(2)(j) grounds, it is then constrained by section 3. The Scottish Government’s view is that the meaning of the provision, read in context, is clear and that these provisions accurately embody the policy intentions.

3(b)(i). The reference to section 93(2)(b).

One of the outcomes of a case under section 93(2)(b) is that a ground of referral – which could be a section 67(2)(j) ground – is accepted, and the hearing discharges the referral. That case would fall within the scope of sections 3 and 5(3) of the 1974 Act, as modified by the Order. The acceptance would constitute a conviction, and the discharge a sentence, in terms of section 3. An acceptance and a discharge under a different section 67 ground would not constitute a conviction and sentence, standing the terms of section 3. Non-acceptance of a ground – whether under section 67(2)(j) or any other ground – and a discharge would not constitute a conviction and sentence, standing the terms of section 3. Where none of the grounds has been accepted, and there is an application to the sheriff, that will not – at that stage – constitute a conviction and sentence, because there has been no acceptance/establishment of a ground. Thus section 93(2)(b) is relevantly referred to, because one of the outcomes engages section 3, and the rehabilitation scheme of the 1974 Act, while other outcomes do not. The wording of section 3 ensures that

only relevant outcomes are engaged. The Scottish Government's view is that these provisions accurately embody the policy intentions.

3(b)(ii). The reference to section 94(2)(b).

The Scottish Government accept that the reference to section 94(2)(b) is erroneous. However, none of the outcomes possible under section 94(2)(b) engage section 3 of the 1974 Act, and the rehabilitation scheme set out in that Act, since there can be no valid acceptance of a ground of referral and therefore no 'conviction' within the meaning of section 3. Accordingly, the reference to section 94(2)(b) is without effect. The Scottish Government undertake to amend the Order by removing the reference to this provision at the next available opportunity.

3(b)(iii) The reference to section 114(3)(b).

The Scottish Government accept that the reference to section 114(3)(b) is erroneous. However, none of the outcomes possible under section 114(3)(b) engage section 3 of the 1974 Act, and the rehabilitation scheme set out in that Act, since there can be no establishment of a ground of referral and therefore no 'conviction' within the meaning of section 3. Accordingly, the reference to section 114(3)(b) is without effect. The Scottish Government undertake to amend the Order by removing the reference to this provision at the next available opportunity.

3(b)(iv) The reference to section 119(3)(b).

Section 119 deals, shortly stated, with the situation in which a children's hearing has been arranged under various sub-sections of the 2011 Act. That children's hearing has discretion to defer the decision to make a compulsory supervision order until a subsequent children's hearing. One of the outcomes of a case under section 119 is that a ground of referral – which could be a section 67(2)(j) ground – has been accepted under section 91(1)(a) or established under section 108(4)(a), and the children's hearing decides, rather than deferring the decision, to discharge the referral. Thus the acceptance/establishment of the ground would constitute a conviction, and the discharge a sentence, in terms of section 3 of the 1974 Act, as modified. An acceptance and a discharge under another section 67 ground would not constitute a conviction and sentence, standing the terms of section 3. Accordingly section 113(3)(b) is relevantly referred to, as one or more of the outcomes engages section 3, and the rehabilitation scheme of the 1974 Act, while other outcomes do not. The wording of section 3 ensures that only relevant outcomes are engaged. The Scottish Government's view is that these provisions accurately embody the policy intentions.

Children's Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Transitional, Savings and Supplementary Provisions) Order 2013 (SSI 2013/150)

On 22 May 2013, the Scottish Government was asked:

1. Article 2(4) excludes the application of any rules of court made under section 91 of the 1995 Act and the general powers to regulate procedure in the sheriff courts and the Court of Session, in relation to "relevant proceedings" in progress under the 1995 Act at the date of commencement of the Order.

Please clarify which rules of court will apply to such proceedings from the commencement date of the Order, if those rules do not apply?

2 (a) Please clarify the intentions underlying article 2(5).

(b) Please explain how this provision can validly have effect to prevent any later repeal or modification of any enactment which contains provisions applicable to "relevant proceedings" having effect until those proceedings have concluded; as any such later enactment would have effect in relation to "relevant proceedings" as that enactment determined, and this Order cannot "entrench" the position to prevent change by later enactment?

3. Article 14 provides that where a court has referred a matter to the principal reporter under section 54 of the 1995 Act (as to children requiring compulsory measures of supervision), the 1995 Act applies to that matter regardless of whether "relevant proceedings in relation to the child to whom the matter relates have commenced before the relevant date".

Section 54(2) of the 1995 Act defines "relevant proceedings" for the purposes of a reference by the court where it appears that any of the conditions specified in section 52(2)(a) to (h), (j), (k) or (l) of the 1995 Act is satisfied with respect to a child. That definition is different from the definition of "relevant proceedings" in article 1(2) of this Order.

Please clarify which "relevant proceedings" are intended to be referred to, and whether you would consider there is any need to make this clearer?

4. Article 27 revokes the Legal Aid (Scotland) (Children) Regulations 1997 with effect from the date of commencement of the Order. Articles 2(1) and (2) continue to apply those Regulations for all purposes in relation to "relevant proceedings" in progress under the 1995 Act as at the commencement date, and express provision is made in article 2(1) that that is "subject to...the following provisions of this Order".

Is that provision inconsistent, in specifying that the 1997 Regulations remain in effect for particular purposes, but that is subject to the following provisions, which include the entire revocation of those Regulations? Would it be clearer if article 27 was instead made subject to that provision in article 2(2)?

The Scottish Government responded as follows:

1. It is intended that the existing rules of court made under section 91 of the 1995 Act together with the general powers to regulate procedure in the sheriff courts and the Court of Session are to apply to “relevant proceedings” under the 1995 Act at the date of commencement of the Order. The existing rules made under section 91 of the 1995 Act are to be found in the Act of Sederunt (Child Care and Maintenance Rules) 1997. However, following discussions with the Lord President’s Private Office, the view was taken that the most appropriate place to make such a transitional and saving provision in respect of that instrument was in the Act of Sederunt to be made amending the rules of court in consequence of the 2011 Act coming into force. It is anticipated that this Act of Sederunt will be made on 28 May 2013, and that it will contain transitional and saving provision in respect of the existing rules of court. The intention behind the carve-out provision at article 2(4) is to prevent the existing court rules being effectively saved in two separate pieces of legislation and to avoid any overlap in provision between the current Order and the forthcoming Act of Sederunt, where the saving will more appropriately be made.

2.(a) The intention underlying article 2(5) is to make a general saving of other enactments, beyond the specific “core” enactments saved in article 2(2), which are also applicable in some way to relevant proceedings and which will be either repealed or modified on the date of commencement of the Order (for example, by schedule 5 to the 2011 Act or by the draft Children’s Hearings (Scotland) Act 2011 (Modification of Primary Legislation) Order 2013 which come into force on the same date as the Order). The effect of article 2(5) is that such repeals or modifications do not have effect for the purposes of relevant proceedings until those proceedings have concluded.

(b) It is not intended that this provision has effect to prevent any later repeal or modification of any enactment which contains provisions applicable to “relevant proceedings” having effect until those proceedings have concluded. We agree that this provision in the Order could not validly “entrench” the position to prevent change by later enactment. As discussed in the response to 2(a) above, it is only intended to prevent repeals or modifications of enactments applicable to relevant proceedings, which would otherwise take effect on the same date as the commencement date of this Order, from taking effect until those relevant proceedings are concluded. The Scottish Government considers that when the provisions of article 2(5) are read in context the desired effect is achieved.

3. The “relevant proceedings” referred to in article 14 of the Order are “relevant proceedings” within the meaning of article 1(2) of the Order. As article 1(2) defines the term “relevant proceedings” for the purposes of the Order the Scottish Government considers that the provision is clear and that the provision does not need to be amended. Whilst section 54(2) of the 1995 Act contains a definition of “relevant proceedings”, that definition only applies for the purposes of that section.

4. The intention is that notwithstanding the revocation of the 1997 Regulations they shall continue to apply as regards relevant proceedings. The Scottish Government accepts that the drafting might have been clearer in this respect, but considers that the intention of article 2, as it affects article 27, can still be understood.

Animal Health (Miscellaneous Fees and Amendments) (Scotland) Regulations 2013 (SSI 2013/151)**On 23 May 2013, the Scottish Government was asked:**

1. The Scottish Government is asked whether the references to EU collection centre, EU quarantine centre and EU storage centre in Schedule 3 are correct given that regulation 7(4) provides that expressions used in that Schedule have the same meaning as they have in the 2007 Regulations. The 2007 Regulations contain definitions of EC collection centre, EC quarantine centre and EC storage centre. The Treaty of Lisbon (Changes in Terminology) Order 2011 would not appear to have glossed those definitions by virtue of article 4(2) of that order.

2. The Scottish Government is asked to clarify what functions regulations 11(1) permits the Scottish Ministers to arrange should be exercised by the Secretary of State on the Ministers' behalf. The regulation refers to "their functions of requiring payment". Is it the functions of inspection, approval, examination etc in respect of which these regulations require payment which are to be exercised by the Secretary of State under such arrangements or the collection of fees chargeable in respect of the exercise of such functions or both?

The Scottish Government responded as follows:

1. In light of article 4(2)(a) of the Treaty of Lisbon (Changes in Terminology) Order 2011 (SI 2011/1043), we agree that the references to "EU collection centre", "EU quarantine centre" and "EU storage centre" in Schedule 3 of the instrument ought indeed to be references to "EC collection centre", "EC quarantine centre" and "EC storage centre". We are grateful to the SLC for drawing this to our attention and we will amend the regulations for clarity at the next available opportunity.

However, in the meantime, the Government's view is that, in context, the references to "EU collection centre", "EU quarantine centre" and "EU storage centre" could only be interpreted as referring to "EC collection centre", "EC quarantine centre" and "EC storage centre" as defined in the Bovine Semen (Scotland) Regulations 2007, so far as those relate to the implementation of EU requirements under Directive 88/407/EEC (as amended) on the Community trade in and imports of semen of domestic animals of the bovine species as mentioned in the 2007 Regulations.

2. Regulation 11(1) of the instrument concerns the Scottish Ministers' functions of collecting fees only. It is not intended to cover functions of inspection, approval and examination, which are covered by existing agency arrangements, for example, under the Scotland Act 1998 (Agency Arrangements) (Specification) Order 2008 (SI 2008/1035). However, the Committee may wish to note that this 2008 Order is currently being reviewed in anticipation of a further order under section 93 of the Scotland Act 1998 being made later this year.

Sheriff Court Districts Amendment Order 2013 (SSI 2013/152)

On 20 May 2013, the Scottish Government was asked:

The Scottish Government is asked whether the reference to “the sheriff court district of the receiving court” in article 14 of the order is intended to refer to the present sheriff court district of the receiving court or that district as it will be amended after the relevant appointed date.

The Scottish Government responded as follows:

The words “the sheriff court district of the receiving court” are used in article 14(2) of the Order for reference purposes only, for example, as regards article 4, prior to the appointed date, instead of proceedings referring to “Arbroath Sheriff Court” and/or “the sheriff court district of Arbroath” in relation to a date after the appointed date, they would refer to “Forfar Sheriff Court” and/or “the sheriff court district of Forfar.”

This is consistent with the terms of schedule 1 of the Sheriff Court Districts (Alteration of Boundaries) Order 1996. Column 2 of that Order is headed “Sheriff Court District” and the entries are for example “Arbroath” and “Forfar”. Column 3 is headed “Area comprised in Sheriff Court District”.

There will continue to be a sheriff court district of Forfar. What will change on the appointed date is the area comprised in that sheriff court district, but this is not relevant for the transitional arrangements in article 14.

Accordingly, nothing turns on whether the phrase “the sheriff court district of the receiving court” refers to the district before or after amendment.