

WEDNESDAY 9TH APRIL 2014

The Speaker, Sir Allan Kemakeza took the chair at 9.47 am.

Prayers.

ATTENDANCE

All were present with the exception of the Ministers for Fisheries; Infrastructure Development; Education and Human Resources; Culture and Tourism; Provincial Government. And Members for: Fataleka; North-West Guadalcanal; East Honiara; Temotu Pele; South New Georgia, Rendova/Tetepare; North Guadalcanal.

SPEAKER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr Speaker: Honourable Members, I welcome in the Speaker's gallery, Mr. Noven Purnell-Webb and Ms Jayne McPherson, both volunteers from Australia. Mr. Purnell-Webb who is an IT specialist has helped our ICT team at Parliament with various developments including the live streaming of Parliament meetings through desktop computers in the office and connecting the two buildings here at Parliament accessing the shared network to our server among many achievements. He joined Parliament on 13th February 2014 and will be leaving us this Friday. I take this opportunity to thank him for helping us out with our IT needs and wish him a pleasant journey back home."

Ms McPherson will be helping us out as a Parliamentary Research Officer assisting the Parliament library. She will be helping us in providing technical back up to parliamentary committees, providing expert interpretation, explanation and analysis and assessing strengths and weaknesses of policy options. She will be with

us for six months. We look forward to her assistance and working with her in the coming months. Thank you, we will move to our next item of business.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Licensed Firearms in Solomon Islands

34. Mr. JOHNLEY HATIMOANA (Central Guadalcanal) to the Minister of Police, National Security and Correctional Services: Can the Minister inform Parliament of the following:

- (a) How many licenses firearms in total belonging to civilians and citizens of this country were collected and destroyed by RAMSI in 2003 and 2004?
- (b) What is the Ministry's short, medium and long term plan to replace the number of licensed firearms confiscated and destroyed in different locations throughout the country in 2003 and 2004?

Hon CHRIS LAORE (*Minister for Police, National Security and Correctional Services*): The total number of guns collected and destroyed by RAMSI in 2003 and 2004 is about 4000, and there were no records when RAMSI collected the guns. However, there was a buy-back project of about 2,171 recorded licensed. The remaining ones maybe were home-made ones or unlicensed guns and not arms from the armoury.

Part (b) of the question asks for the ministry's short, medium and long term plans to replace the guns that belong to civilians. To ask a question on when the ministry is going to give back guns to civilians surprises me when we cannot even arm our RSIPF. There are no plans of replacing those firearms.

Mr. Johnley Hatimoana: This is just a supplementary question but before I ask the question, I just want to make a point here. This is looking at medium and long term

plans, and there are laws safeguarding those licensed firearms given to some of our people in the past. My question is whether there are any plans, may be medium or long term but let us say long term of giving back arms to people. Are there any plans or are we going to be like this for the next 100 years?

Hon. Chris Laore: The answer is no, not at this stage. There are no plans at this point in time and for the next 10, 20, 30 years as it is much safer for us.

Mr. MANASSEH SOGAVARE (*East Choiseul*): On the issue of guns, there are only two things here. Only the license belongs to the Government –permission for someone to own a gun. However, a gun is owned by the person himself and he pays it with his/her own money. And therefore if the government orders the removal of guns from people, it then basically becomes a constitutional question in that if you remove something that belongs to people, then you have to compensate them. If the government does not have any long term plan to allow people to purchase guns again, then that is a decision we can understand. But the fact that guns are removed from people which are the private properties of people, the Government has the duty to compensate them.

My question is there is a standing cabinet decision that those people whose guns were removed from them should be compensated. When the minister responsible for that portfolio was the current Minister for Tourism, the decision was to compensate those people on market value. That Cabinet decision still stands unless another Cabinet comes along and removes that decision. Is that decision still stands and are we going to compensate those people whose guns were removed from them?

Hon. Chris Laore: I thank the Member for East Choiseul and Chairman of the Bills and Legislation Committee for asking this supplementary question. I think it was in 2008 that the CNURA Government was paying people who surrendered their guns

under the Buy Back Project. These were not confiscated guns but surrendered for the security of this country because at that time everybody was living in fear and so they willingly handed in their licensed firearms. There was a Cabinet Paper in 2008 that approves paying those people for their surrendered guns. Payments were done at that time in Rove but it stopped in 2010 because of misconduct by people dealing with the licensed firearms. I think they may have misused funds and the case is now with the Public Service to deal with the situation. The project was suspended in 2010. Currently the ministry is trying to look at ways of settling the issue with guns. The ministry still has \$400,000 in its account for that but it is not enough to cater for about more than 700 plus guns that are still to be paid. The ministry is looking at ways this year and maybe this will come back to Cabinet for a decision by the government. Thank you.

Mr MATTHEW WALE (*Aoke/Langalanga*): I want some clarifications from the Minister. Is it 2,171 on the list for the Buy Back Scheme with regards to licensed firearms that people surrendered, in which 700 are yet to be paid?

I would like to know the first phase of 4,000 guns that were surrendered to RAMSI, which you said there was no record of those, can you clarify how many of those were licensed firearms? I know that a lot of licensed firearms were surrendered during the first phase when police arms were taken out from the armoury were surrendered. Some people with licensed firearms also surrendered theirs at that time. I need clarification just in case they are not included in the 2,171 names on the list. Thank you.

Hon. Chris Laore: As I have said, the 4,000 was the total firearms collected but some licensed arms were not recorded during the time of collection. There were about 2,171 licensed guns in the record of the ministry during the Buy Back Project. Out of that, 1,428 licensed owners were compensated for their loss while 743 licensed owners are still to be compensated. The Ministry still has \$400,000 in its account as it

was held up due to the misuse of funds earlier on during the payback period. That is the reason for the hold up and the ministry is looking into this.

Hon. DEREK SIKUA (*Leader of Opposition*): A supplementary question, which you might rule out, Mr Speaker, but I am going to ask it and see how we go. Since the guns were confiscated and guns are no longer in the communities or owned by people, it seems the population of crocodiles within my constituency has increased dramatically and is a threat to the lives of my people, especially in the big rivers. The recent floods have scattered the crocodiles in the constituency and they are now in places that were not there before. That is the story by my people last night. Hence, I want to ask the Minister his views on how we can cull the increase of crocodiles in our constituency. Can we borrow some guns to shoot the crocodiles and then return them to you or how do we address this?

Hon Chris Laore: Thank you Leader of Opposition for that question. Currently, RAMSI has the capability to do that job and so when there is sighting of crocodiles we should inform RAMSI to go and shoot them. Requests can be made through RAMSI to do that. In the Shortlands, we have traditional ways of trapping crocodiles. I believe we have other means of catching and fishing crocodile which can be used rather than relying on guns which can back fire on us. I think traditional ways can be useful as well in trapping crocodiles which can be eaten as well. Those of us from the Shortlands can eat crocodile meat.

Mr Matthew Wale: I want to know more about the total firearms of 4,000 mentioned by the Minister. The question of firearms still out in the community, does the Minister have some indications of the number? There must be some estimates as to the total number of weapons that were stolen from the police armouries out there around the country, including licensed firearms and the number of firearms collected. How many do you think are still out there in the communities?

Hon Chris Laore: Currently, the RSIPF and the Ministry does not have any information about arms that are still out there in the communities. But if you have information, you can come forward and inform the Ministry and the Commissioner of Police so that we are aware of the number of guns still out there. Currently, the Ministry does not have any information as to the number of firearms still out there not yet collected. Or whether any were brought in through the border, we do not have any information at all.

Mr JOHN MOFFAT FUGUI (*Central Honiara*): I want to ask the Minister a supplementary question regarding licensing. Is it possible for the Minister to be transparent about who the license holders are because those guns belong to our people? In terms of a transparent government, the names of licensed holders must be put out so that we can follow up. I heard the Minister said they do not have any plans in terms of Question 2, and I am even surprised that even RAMSI does not have any records of who the licensed holders are. For somebody whose motto is 'Helpem Fren' and not knowing who his friends are, that is the least we can expect from an important institution in our country. The question is, is it possible for us to know the licensed holders.

Hon Chris Laore: I am not really sure but during the CNURA Government, a notice was put up and there was a list of those licensed holders to come forward. Information I gathered is that it was also published in the newspaper at that time. A list of name was also put up at Rove. Those licensed owners know who they are.

In terms of transparency, information was published during the buyback project period. Information I also received is some people have already been paid but instead went back using a different surname to make another claim but still the same person. This is a situation where people are trying to use as an opportunity to make money out of the government. It is like we are committing the government to

spend more when there is disaster at this time. Currently the ministry is looking into this, and when to pay people will be looked into by the ministry and assess it properly before we look for funds to top up the \$400,000 that is there to help pay back the remaining 743 licensed holders.

Mr Matthew Wale: The Minister's response to my question on guns out in the community is worrying when he said the ministry does not have any records of guns. We do know that guns are out in the community. There have been firearms offenses, crimes committed since the two phases of surrendering weapons and the buy- back scheme. There are guns out in the community, and I am concerned that the ministry does not seem to have any records of that. I just want to register that the Police ought to be doing something to know the number of weapons that are out in the community.

Hon. Chris Laore: As I have said earlier, we do not have any information but since you have information of firearms out there, it would be best if you come forward and inform the Ministry so that our officers can go and check those that are still holding, hiding or burying the firearms. But as I have said the ministry does not have any information about who is still holding on to guns in the country.

Mr. Johnley Hatimoana: I would like to thank the Minister of Police, National and Correctional Services for answering the questions that we often have doubts about. It is good that he has clarified some of the questions and I would like to thank him for the answers.

STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Bills – First Reading

The 2013 Supplementary Appropriation Bill 2014

The 2014 Supplementary Appropriation Bill 2014

Bills –Second Reading

The Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014

Hon COMMINS MEWA (*Minister for Justice and Legal Affairs*): I rise to move that the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014 be now read the second time. This Bill is one of the two bills I am presenting to this House during this parliamentary sitting to allow for the sound recording of evidence in the Magistrates Courts. The other Bill is the 'Magistrates Court (Amendment) Bill 2014.

This Bill seeks to make one amendment to the Criminal Procedure Code. It adds a new clause 315(a) to allow for the recording of proceedings before the magistrate courts to be made by a clerk of the court or other officers where suitable recording equipment is available.

Under the current provisions, all evidences maybe taken down in writing by short-hand notes and transcribed. Allowing this evidence to be sound recorded will improve the accuracy and speed of the recording process. Sound recording of evidence is currently used in the high court and this amendment will modernize the recording evidence in the magistrates courts, to bring them in line with the more accurate and efficient processes used in the high court. It will enable witnesses deliver their evidence more quickly and without interruption.

Currently when proceedings are recorded in writing, witnesses may be asked to slow down, to pause to enable the person writing notes to catch up. This can lead witnesses losing their train of thought and interrupts the flow of proceedings. With the introduction of sound recording, evidence can be given more quickly, cases can

proceed at a faster pace and accurate transcription can be made for the court recording. These minor amendments will make a significant difference to the functioning of the courts. It is important for the Solomon Islands courts and justice sector to keep up to date with new technology where it can deliver efficiencies and improve levels of service delivery.

This Bill builds on the achievement of the NCRA Government and provides a further demonstration of its commitment of implementing policy to improve the timely discharge of justice and efficiency and effectiveness of the courts. It is for these reasons that I urge honourable Members to support these reforms to the magistrate's courts and the justice system.

With these few remarks, I beg to move that the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014, be now read the second time.

Mr Speaker: Honourable Members, it has been proposed that the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014, be read the second time. We will commence debate of this Bill.

Hon DEREK SIKUA (*Leader of Opposition*): First of all, I would like to thank the Minister for Justice and Legal Affairs for the Bill, members of his staff and the legal team that have worked on this Bill. I also would like to thank the chair and members of the Bills and Legislation Committee for scrutiny of the bill enabling it to come before the House.

I think the Bill is basically the same as the one we debated yesterday, the Magistrates Court Amendment Bill 2014. The Criminal Procedures Code (Amendment) Bill 2014 are both considered together by the Bills and Legislation Committee because the proposed amendments sought to amend a procedural matter that is associated in the application of both principal acts where the objective is to enable proceedings conducted in the magistrates courts to be recorded using sound recording equipment.

The arguments we put forward in our debate yesterday on the Magistrates Courts (Amendment) Bill 2014, on my part I do not want to repeat myself. But to put forward the same sentiments I have expressed yesterday. I am sure other colleagues would want to say the same things and so I will allow them to speak their minds. But on my part I would like to put forward the same arguments that I have mentioned yesterday in support of this Bill.

Structurally, as we have seen in yesterday's Magistrates Courts (Amendment) Bill 2014, which seeks to repeal a section of the principal act and substitute it with two new sections, this Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014 seeks to insert a new section after section 315 of the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) 2014. I think that is the only difference we will see. But otherwise as I have mentioned, for our records in Hansard, I do not want to repeat myself on the arguments that I put forward yesterday in support of the Magistrates Court (Amendment) Bill 2014. I want to say that I fully support this Bill.

Mr PETER SHANEL AGOVAKA (*Central Guadalcanal*): I also share the same sentiments alluded to by the Leader of Opposition. In our debate yesterday, we were debating both Bills - the Magistrates Courts (Amendment) Bill 2014 and the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014.

I say this because if one looks at the Executive Summary of the Bills and Legislation Committee's report, both amendments seek to enable proceedings conducted in the Magistrates Courts to be recorded using sound recording equipments or devices. The amendments sought will enable the Magistrates Courts to record oral evidence and have more accurate records of trials. These records can assist in appeals to the High Court to be quicker as transcripts of recorded evidence are made available on time.

There are three points I would like to raise. Firstly, oral evidences are recorded. Secondly and the most important point is that the records of the trial are accurate. Thirdly, the records can be used in cases of appeal to the High Court and

the transcripts can be quickly obtained for the purposes of appeal to the High Court. Those are the three important points that I see in these two important amendment Bills.

Without further ado, I think the House should just go into Committee Stage and support this Bill so that we can disperse with it quickly. I do not see any opposition from both sides of the House but I can only see support for these Bills. With these few remarks, I support the Bill.

Hon WALTER FOLOTAU (*Minister for Civil Aviation*): I would also like to briefly contribute to this Bill. Yesterday I have already said what I wanted to say because it is just the same thing but blessed by two legislations; for which one is the criminal procedure code and the Magistrates code Act. Therefore, although they are very small but it is a very powerful system because it is blessed by two legislations.

We have covered the legal aspects of it. This morning I would like to touch on the theological perspective of it on how laws are given to us. Standards of justice were set down by God in the Mosaic Law and further detailed in the teachings of Jesus, most notably the Sermon on the Mount have been foundational to the western system styled justice. These standards indicate the seriousness of judgement and the importance of fair and impartial applications of the law in society. One notable and relevant principle was given through Moses, which says 'that by the testimony of two or two witnesses, a matter is established.' Therefore, this system is for the guidance and protection of those principles. It will guide the testimonies and witnesses. The law tries to establish the setting of devices and procedures in the Magistrates Court for the purpose of accuracy and speed.

I believe that the setting of the recording devices will surely escalate to higher heights with the recording of evidences in the Magistrates Court. This is something that our judiciary or the courts should be proud of because in history at least we have set something in the systems. With these few remarks, I support the Bill.

Mr JOHN MOFFAT FUGUI (*Central Honiara*): I would like to contribute to the Bill this morning for the sake of the records. Firstly, I disagree with the Minister for saying that he is modernising the system. No, this system is out of date. He is not modernising but he is only updating the system. I come back to the point I mentioned yesterday.

The other important point to put on record, as I have said yesterday, is that sometimes magistrates may lapse when writing down evidences made by witnesses. It is normal for human beings to do that. And so records are important because we speak in different languages. In Parliament we can switch from English to Pidgin English and in courts that need is greater because someone who does not understand Pidgin English may speak in Gari or Poleo, Kwara'ae or Lau and so the transcription of the language must be exact because it determines the nature of evidence produced in courts.

My second point is that if that is done to the criminal procedure code, why not do it as well for the civil procedure code because that would be the next natural step the Minister has to bring here. I know the demands in terms of proofs are different but that does not make it less important in terms of the exactness. If it is done to the criminal procedure code today, it should also be done for the civil procedure code too.

Finally, we are out of date in terms of technology and I still see stated there 'suitable recording device'. If I were the Minister I would have opted for something like, 'a suitable recording technology.' This is because the very nature of the device is technological. I would like the Minister to take note of that point. I know he is strong on this but time and technology will prove him wrong given the opportunity that devices will change.

On that note, I want to thank him for bringing this Bill to the House and the government as well for supporting it. But let us not do it in piecemeal but we do it in a concerted, wholesome reform process so that it comes as part of updating and reforming of the judicial system.

Hon COMMINS MEWA (*Minister for Justice and Legal Affairs*): I wish to thank all my good colleagues for their contributions towards the Bill yesterday. I was anticipating that only a few members will contribute to the debate today because this is more or less the same as the Bill of yesterday.

I would like to thank all my colleagues for your understanding and thank you very much for your contributions. Like I said yesterday even though the Bill is very short, it is a bill that is very important and a way forward for this country, especially with the installation of this new equipment at the magistrate court.

In regards to the comment by the Member for Central Honiara, the term 'modernise' is used in the Bill because according to Civil Court Rules made in 2008, the term 'modern' is used; terms like 'modern practices', 'modern technologies' were used and that is the reason why the Bill uses that term. However, the important thing is to support the Bill and that is much appreciated. With those few remarks, I beg to move that the Criminal Procedure Code Amendment Bill 2014, be now read the second time.

The Bill agreed to at its second reading

Bills – Committee Stage

The Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2

Mr John Moffat Fugui: I would like to ask the Minister the same thing I asked yesterday so that it is down on records because I think time is moving on and time will tell. On the terms 'suitable recording device', how would you ensure in terms of the technologies we have now that if we transcribe or we record (I just want him to think loudly on this), and there is another device there to make sure that the evidence given in terms of court does not go outside of court because there are technologies now that can make that vulnerable and porous. I want him to explain that or to talk little bit on that.

Hon Commins Mewa: I do not think that will happen because tight security will be provided.

Mr John Moffat Fugui: What kind of security measures is he talking about? I just want to know as I am very ignorant about that.

Hon Commins Mewa: What I meant by security is human security that will ensure nothing of such nature happens in the magistrate court.

Mr Selwyn Riumana: I just want to follow up on the question by Central Honiara. What does suitable device really mean? Are mobile phones also suitable devices?

Mr Chairman: You have covered it yesterday but can you repeat the same comments.

Hon Commins Mewa: I think the MP for Kia/Havulei who asked this question was not here yesterday and so I will repeat the answer to that question. The equipment as I explained yesterday is described in a broad and flexible term so that if

technology changes, equipments can be updated without having to amend the Act. This word suitable is used so that we do not have to come to Parliament to keep amending the Act if we specifically describe a particular device to be used in the high court. This word suitable as explained yesterday implies or describes any suitable device or equipment that can used to ensure records of proceedings are taken care of smoothly. I believe that is what I said yesterday.

Mr. Manasseh Sogavare: Just a follow up on the question by the Member for Central Honiara. Maybe we should itemise the areas of security threats so that the Minister could explain what security measures are there to account as unauthorised access, unauthorised alterations, unauthorised disclosure and unauthorised destruction of any evidence tendered during court.

Hon Commins Mewa: I think the procedure that will be employed in this new system is exactly like what is in the High Court and as such we cannot guarantee what sort of security systems will be enforced in this new system. But I would like to bring to the attention of colleague members in this House to look at what the High Court is doing now. That is exactly the same system advocated in this Bill. Like I said, it is very successful to date. I do not think there is going to be anything of disruptive in terms of security.

Hon Derek Sikua: Yesterday the Member for Aoke/Langalanga mentioned what is happening at the High Court in which the judge has a judge associate to assist the judge in the use of recording devices. I think the Minister did not answer the question yesterday when it was asked – this is just on the admin side of the Bill. The magistrate is going to have an associate that will help him to efficiently and effectively operate and use the devices to avoid hiccups when hearings go on in the court room.

Hon Commins Mewa: In the case of magistrate, I do not think we are going to have an assistant magistrate. But a magistrate will always have a clerk beside him or in the court room to assist him or her in any difficulties. Similarly to what is going on in Parliament where we have the clerk assisting the Speaker in everything. That is exactly what is going to happen in the high court.

Mr. John Moffat Fugui: I would like to make a comment and then ask a question. Yesterday, when the Minister made an analogy I thought it does not have a face or a nose when he said, "It is just like writing with a pen, whether it is a black, red or blue pen, it does not make any difference." I would like to remind you, Mr Speaker, that words carry meanings and so words used are very important in terms of law and in other systems.

I would like to ask him a very simple question. If the suitable recording device in terms of technology security is realised to malfunction after a court hearing, what will the Minister do to ensure the technology has a security device so that this does not happen. Just comment on that.

Hon Commins Mewa: Once again I wish to thank my colleague Member of Parliament for Central Honiara for his questions. If the Bill is properly analysed, you would see it does not do away with the fact that notes are not hand-written. When there is a court proceeding written notes will always be made so that in the event the recording device malfunctions, evidences given will be picked up in the written notes.

In addition, the recording devices will always be closely checked for accuracy even if the recording devices are functioning. Thus, one benefit of this Bill is accuracy and speedy hearing of court cases. I believe what the Member for Central Honiara stated can be taken care of by written notes by the magistrate and the court clerk.

Mr. Matthew Wale: I would like to know the actual process now that it is successfully used at the high court, and it is a system already used maybe since the days of Moses. After the recording is done, what happens after that? Are cameras set up and videos are taken and who is responsible for the one taking the video, who takes custody of the videos from thereon? That process is what I want to see from recording to when records are archived.

When we asked about archiving at the Bills and Legislation Committee, the advisor who answered stated that the archiving still follows the old archiving law for court records. That is proper but the process from recording to archiving is what I would like know.

I am asking because my concern is that in case the magistrate is not taking down notes because he thinks the system still functions when it already malfunctions and a sizable chunk of, say hearing a criminal proceeding is not being recorded. In such a case, what is going to happen? Is it likely going to end up in a situation where the case could not be re-tried because it is already being heard?

Hon Commins Mewa: I believe this process will always succeed. I do not think there was ever a proceeding where the magistrate was not taking handwritten notes of proceedings. If there is any fault with the device, hand-written notes will always be available through the clerk or the magistrate. I really believe that things like will not occur. Not only that, but I also believe that before any court case or any magistrates court proceedings is held, the equipments will be tried out to ensure equipments work properly before any proceedings can take place.

I also believe that if the equipments are installed there, there is always a standby equipment of a similar kind so that when one does not work, another one will be switched on. I do not believe what the colleague Member for Aoke/Langalanga has said will occur.

To answer the second part of his question, the proceedings will be transcribed and filed awaiting any appeal. When the appeal period is over, they will then be archived.

Mr Selwyn Riimana: In our courts, we have civil and criminal cases. Just out of interest, I just want to ask the Minister whether the Criminal Procedure Code can be also used in civil cases?

Hon Commins Mewa: Yes, the system will be used for both.

Mr Andrew Manepora'a: I am going to refer again to the question by the Member of Parliament for East Choiseul because maybe out of my ignorance I might not have clearly heard the Minister when he answered the question. I want to hear the Minister again on this because this is talking about the security of using the system. Security-wise in terms of protecting the system from alteration, disclosing and dissemination of information is not yet clear from the Minister's answer, and that is what we want further explanation on. Can that be explained further to the floor?

Hon Commins Mewa: In terms of security, maybe he wants a definite answer on how we would really ensure security actually happens in regards to this system. Like I have said earlier, what is recorded will always be checked with handwritten records. As I said, the system does not do away with handwritten records, it will still continue. The Clerk and the Magistrate will always keep some very important handwritten notes as well on the proceedings because faults can occur. Some alterations can be made like bribing and so we anticipate problems like that. But like I said, those will always be cross checked and if it is discovered there is a huge alteration to the proceedings, then that is where an appeal can be made because the person giving evidence in court can challenge that he/she did not say those statements and could be alterations to their statements. As I said, handwritten notes

will always be there for purposes of crosschecking with what is recorded and what is written. Thank you.

Hon. Derek Sikua: Just to alert the Committee of a typing error at the end of sub-clause 2. We need to correct this in the final form of the Bill; the inverted comma and the extra full stop at the end of sub-clause 2. Thank you.

Mr Manasseh Sogavare: This question is for the Attorney General to clarify for me and the Leader of Opposition. The two inverted commas at the back there implies that there must be an open inverted comma. Do we take it that this starts from the narrations? There is an open inverted comma in the beginning, the whole thing there, including the narration is the new insertion into the new section 315(a) inclusive of this narrations. The open inverted comma starts from the narrations and ends with a closed inverted comma. Is that the reason why we have the closed inverted comma there?

Attorney General: You would see that from the left margin of the proposed amendment, clause 315(a), that is the subject of the amendment, which is brought up so that Parliament knows that is the actual amendment being made and that is why the commas are there.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Parliament is resumed

Hon. Commis Mewa: I wish to report that the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014 has gone through the Committee of the Whole House without amendments.

BILLS

Bills – Third Reading

The Criminal Procedure Court (Amendment) Bill 2014

Hon. Commins Mewa: I move that The Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill 2014 be now read a third time and do pass.

Question agreed to.

(The Bill is passed)

The House adjourned at 11.03am