

The Senate

Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Legislation Committee

Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation
of Age to a Minor) Bill 2013

June 2013

© Commonwealth of Australia

ISBN: 978-1-74229-885-6

This document was produced by the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee secretariat and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Department of the Senate, Parliament House, Canberra.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Members

Senator Patricia Crossin, **Chair**, ALP, NT

Senator Gary Humphries, **Deputy Chair**, LP, ACT

Senator Sue Boyce, LP, QLD

Senator Mark Furner, ALP, QLD

Senator Louise Pratt, ALP, WA

Senator Penny Wright, AG, SA

Participating Members

Senator Nick Xenophon, IND, SA

Secretariat

Ms Julie Dennett	Committee Secretary
Ms Monika Sheppard	Senior Research Officer
Ms Elise Williamson	Administrative Officer

Suite S1.61	Telephone: (02) 6277 3560
Parliament House	Fax: (02) 6277 5794
CANBERRA ACT 2600	Email: legcon.sen@aph.gov.au

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE	iii
RECOMMENDATION	vii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Bill	1
Background to the Bill.....	1
Conduct of the inquiry	2
CHAPTER 2	3
KEY ISSUES	3
Duplication of existing offences in the Criminal Code.....	3
Bill's formulation of offences in proposed new section 474.40	4
Committee view.....	8
DISSENTING REPORT BY SENATOR XENOPHON	11
History of the Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2013	12
APPENDIX 1	15
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	15

RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation 1

2.28 The committee recommends that the Senate not pass the Bill.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 On 26 February 2013, the Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2013 (Bill) was introduced into the Senate as a private senator's bill by Senator Nick Xenophon.¹ On 28 February 2013, the Senate referred the Bill to the Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee (committee) for inquiry and report by 27 June 2013.²

Purpose of the Bill

1.2 The Bill seeks to amend the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) (Criminal Code), to make it an offence for a person who is over 18 years of age to misrepresent their age in online communications to a person they reasonably believe to be under 18 years of age, for the purpose of encouraging a physical meeting or with the intent of committing an offence.³

1.3 The key provision of the Bill is proposed new section 474.40 (item 1 of Schedule 1), which would be inserted at the end of Division 474 (Telecommunications offences) of the Schedule to the Criminal Code.

1.4 Proposed new section 474.40 would create two offences for a person over 18 years of age (the 'sender') to intentionally misrepresent their age using a carriage service to a person who is, or who the sender believes to be, under 18 years of age (the 'recipient'):

- for the purpose of encouraging the recipient to physically meet with the sender (or any other person) (subsection 474.40(1)); or
- with the intention of committing an offence, other than an offence under proposed new section 474.40 (subsection 474.40(2)).

1.5 Both offences will be punishable by a term of imprisonment: five years where the intent was to encourage a physical meeting; and eight years where the intent was to commit an offence.

Background to the Bill

1.6 In February 2010, Senator Xenophon introduced the Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2010 (2010 Bill) into the Senate.⁴ The stated purpose of the 2010 Bill was similar to that of the current Bill,

1 Senate, *Journals of the Senate*, No. 134-26 February 2013, p. 3661.

2 Senate, *Journals of the Senate*, No. 136-28 February 2013, pp 3690-3691.

3 Explanatory Memorandum (EM), p. 2.

4 Senate, *Journals of the Senate*, No. 107-3 February 2010, p. 3117.

the notable difference being that the 2010 Bill did not include an intention to encourage a physical meeting or commit an offence, as formulated in the current Bill.⁵

1.7 The 2010 Bill was referred to the committee for inquiry and report⁶ and, in June 2010, the committee recommended that the Senate should not pass the bill.⁷ The inquiry had highlighted a number of concerns with the 2010 Bill, such as the failure to incorporate an element of intent and the potential duplication of existing Criminal Code offences.⁸

1.8 Upon introduction of the current Bill, Senator Xenophon stated that the proposed legislation would close an important legal 'loophole', as there is no reason for an adult to knowingly misrepresent their age to someone they believe to be under 18 years of age. Further:

I previously attempted to address this serious issue in 2010 with the earlier version of this bill. I acknowledge the concerns raised in relation to that bill, and I have modified this version to ensure there are no unintended consequences of enforcing this law. Instead, this bill creates offences specifically aimed at the circumstances – an adult lying to a minor about their age to facilitate a meeting or to make themselves seem 'more approachable' – that need to be addressed.⁹

Conduct of the inquiry

1.9 The committee advertised the current inquiry in *The Australian* on 6 March 2013 and 27 March 2013. Details of the inquiry, including links to the Bill and associated documents, were placed on the committee's website at www.aph.gov.au/senate_legalcon. The committee also wrote to 64 organisations and individuals, inviting submissions by 26 April 2013. Submissions continued to be accepted after that date.

1.10 The committee received nine submissions, which are listed at Appendix 1. All submissions were published on the committee's website. The committee thanks those organisations and individuals who made submissions. No public hearings were held for this inquiry.

5 Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2010, EM, p. 2.

6 Senate, *Journals of the Senate*, No. 108-4 February 2010, pp 3143-3144.

7 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Inquiry into the Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2010*, June 2010, p. 11 (Recommendation 1).

8 Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, *Inquiry into the Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2010*, June 2010, p. 10.

9 *Senate Hansard*, 26 February 2013, p. 926.

CHAPTER 2

KEY ISSUES

2.1 The majority of submissions received by the committee identified specific concerns with the Bill. The key concerns identified by submitters were:

- duplication of existing offences in the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) (Criminal Code); and
- the Bill's formulation of offences in proposed new section 474.40.¹

Duplication of existing offences in the Criminal Code

2.2 The Criminal Code contains a number of offences, which criminalise online communications with children where there is evidence of intention to cause harm to a child: for example, section 474.26 (the offence of procurement), section 474.27 (the offence of grooming), and section 474.14 (the offence of using a telecommunications network with intention to commit a serious offence).

2.3 Subsection 474.26(1) provides:

(1) A person (the **sender**) commits an offence if:

(a) the sender uses a carriage service to transmit a communication to another person (the **recipient**); and

(b) the sender does this with the intention of procuring the recipient to engage in sexual activity with the sender; and

(c) the recipient is someone who is, or who the sender believes to be, under 16 years of age; and

(d) the sender is at least 18 years of age.

Penalty: Imprisonment for 15 years.

2.4 Subsection 474.27(1) provides:

(1) A person (the **sender**) commits an offence if:

(a) the sender uses a carriage service to transmit a communication to another person (the **recipient**); and

(b) the sender does this with the intention of making it easier to procure the recipient to engage in sexual activity with the sender; and

1 See: Attorney-General's Department (AGD), *Submission 1*, pp 3-5; National Children's and Youth Law Centre, *Submission 4*, pp 2-3; Law Society of South Australia, *Submission 5*, p. 2; ACT Government, *Submission 6*, pp 1-2; Law Council of Australia, *Submission 8*, p. 1; Law Society of Western Australia, *Submission 9*, p. 1.

(c) the recipient is someone who is, or who the sender believes to be, under 16 years of age; and

(d) the sender is at least 18 years of age.

Penalty: Imprisonment for 12 years.

2.5 A number of submitters referred to these existing offences in the Criminal Code, and stated that these provisions already capture the behaviour sought to be covered by the new offences proposed in the Bill.² As the Attorney-General's Department (Department) explained:

[T]he existing online grooming and procurement offences in the Criminal Code apply where an adult has communicated with a child online with the intention of procuring or making it easier to procure the child to engage in sexual activity. This would cover circumstances in which an adult misrepresented their age in an online communication with a child for the purpose of encouraging a physical meeting with that child with the intention of engaging, or making it easier to engage, in sexual activity during the physical meeting.³

2.6 The Law Society of South Australia agreed:

[T]he Society is of the view that s 474.40(1) is unnecessary. The Criminal Code already contains grooming offences which more appropriately criminalise conduct of a criminal nature (eg. ss 474.26 and 474.27).⁴

Bill's formulation of offences in proposed new section 474.40

2.7 The formulation of the offences in proposed new section 474.40 were of most concern to submitters, who argued that the scope of the proposed provision is too wide and the proposed offences are flawed.

Scope of the proposed provision

2.8 Submitters commented on two separate aspects of each proposed offence: paragraphs 474.40(1)(b) and 474.40(2)(b), which contain a fault element (that is, the requirement of an intention to misrepresent one's age); and paragraphs 474.40(1)(d) and 474.40(2)(d), which require that the recipient of a communication is, or is believed by the sender to be, under 18 years of age.

2 See, for example: ACT Government, *Submission 6*, p. 2; Law Society of Western Australia, *Submission 9*, p. 1.

3 *Submission 1*, p. 4. Also see p. 5 (in relation to section 474.14 of the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth) (Criminal Code) and proposed new subsection 474.40(2)).

4 *Submission 5*, p. 4.

Intention to misrepresent one's age

2.9 The Department explained that, because only an intention to misrepresent and not an actual misrepresentation of age is required, the proposed offence is too broad. Accordingly, an actual misrepresentation of age would be preferable to limit the application of the proposed provision.⁵

Recipient is, or is believed to be, under 18 years of age

2.10 In relation to paragraph (d) of the proposed offences, the Law Society of South Australia argued that the offences must only be made out where the sender believes the recipient is under 18 years of age because otherwise non-criminal conduct would also be captured:

By this we refer to criminal liability being created by establishing only that the recipient is under 18. Clearly in this case the gravamen of the criminality would be missing where the sender believed that the recipient was 18 or over. An example may be where a female recipient represents her age to be 21. The sender, to encourage a meeting or the continuation of a relationship, may consider that the recipient would lose interest if she was aware he was younger than her. His age could be 19, but he misrepresents it as 23. The fact the recipient is 17 can never be to the point because the sender at all times believed, on reasonable grounds, that she was [21].⁶

2.11 Further:

Offence provisions are only meant to capture conduct which is criminal in nature. It is no answer to this to suggest that the [proposed offences make] criminal any misrepresentation as to age because that ignores the purpose for which the [offences are proposed to be] created (to protect children from online predators who take advantage of a misrepresentation as to age to set up a meeting with a view to commit an offence).⁷

2.12 The Department informed the committee that the element of belief on the part of the sender is not consistent with existing offences in the Criminal Code which are directed toward online communications with children. In particular, the Department explained that the procurement and grooming offences capture communications with persons under 16 years of age, taking into account the legal age of consent throughout Australia (between 16 and 17 years):

It is a long-held Commonwealth policy that an age limit of 16 years strikes the appropriate balance between the need to protect vulnerable persons from sexual exploitation and the need to allow for the sexual autonomy of young people.⁸

5 *Submission 1*, p. 3. Also see: Law Society of South Australia, *Submission 5*, p. 3.

6 *Submission 5*, p. 4.

7 *Submission 5*, p. 4.

8 *Submission 1*, p. 4. Also see: Law Society of Western Australia, *Submission 9*, p. 1.

2.13 The Department indicated that the proposed new offences would criminalise a misrepresentation of age to a person under 18 years of age, even if consensual sexual activity between the sender of the communication and its recipient would not otherwise be a crime:

For example, a 19 year old saying he or she is 18 years old in order to enter into a relationship with a 17 year old would be an offence under the Bill, even though a 19 year old may legally engage in consensual sexual activities with a 17 year old in all Australian jurisdictions.⁹

Proposed new subsection 474.40(1) – intention to encourage a physical meeting

2.14 Submitters also raised concerns in relation to a particular aspect of the proposed offence in new subsection 474.40(1): the intention to encourage the recipient to physically meet with the sender or any other person. In essence, these concerns were: the offence is not consistent with current Commonwealth criminal law policy; and there is no clear nexus between the non-criminal conduct captured by the proposed offence and the criminal conduct which is the subject of the offence.

Inconsistency with current Commonwealth criminal law policy

2.15 The Department advised:

Under Commonwealth law, it is highly unusual for lying to be made a criminal offence without an additional element that results in the behaviour being considered sufficiently abhorrent to justify criminal sanctions.¹⁰

2.16 The Department explained that lying for the sole purpose of encouraging a physical meeting with a child does not attract such an additional element and, if criminalised, would represent a departure from Commonwealth criminal law policy.¹¹

No clear nexus between non-criminal and criminal conduct

2.17 The ACT Government and the Law Society of South Australia commented on the lack of nexus between the non-criminal conduct captured by the proposed offence (encouraging a physical meeting with a child) and the criminal conduct which might result from that meeting. The Law Society of South Australia submitted that its principal difficulty with proposed new subsection 474.40(1) is that it criminalises conduct of a non-criminal nature:

Part of the problem with the offence provision is that it seeks to criminalise behaviour which is not inherently criminal. The intent is to criminalise a

9 *Submission 1*, p. 4. Also see: ACT Government, *Submission 6*, p. 2; NSW Council for Civil Liberties, *Submission 2*, p. 2.

10 *Submission 1*, pp 4-5.

11 *Submission 1*, p. 5.

preparatory step in the process of committing a crime. However, in attempting to do so, it will capture many situations it does not intend to.¹²

2.18 The Department's submission likewise explained that the broad application of proposed new subsection 474.40(1) 'would capture conduct that is innocent and not warranting of criminal sanctions'.¹³

2.19 The ACT Government expressed similar concerns:

While it is appropriate in some circumstances to criminalise activity which is not illegal but is a step toward the commission of a particular offence, there must be a sufficient connection between the legal and illegal activity to warrant a legislative response.¹⁴

2.20 In its submission, the ACT Government noted specific examples of legislative provisions which criminalise lawful conduct, subject to an intention to carry out, or for the purpose of carrying out, unlawful conduct (for example, section 272.20 of the Criminal Code). It was noted however that 'the non-illegal activity in the proposed new offence at section 474.40(1) is not connected in any way to any illegal activity'.¹⁵

Support for proposed new subsection 474.40(1)

2.21 On the other hand, two submitters – the Carly Ryan Foundation and Ms Susan McLean, a cyber-safety expert – argued that it is important to provide law enforcement agencies with the ability to investigate and prosecute alleged offenders prior to the commission of any procurement or grooming offence (that is, in the preparatory stages of the offence). The Carly Ryan Foundation submitted:

[N]o adult could have a legitimate reason for establishing false profiles with fake names, age and photos to contact and meet a child that is not known to them for legitimate purposes.

...

This online behaviour is a specific method used by those individuals with criminal intent. We wish to empower our law enforcement officers to act in order to prevent children suffering. Currently, the police have no ability to intervene before a crime is committed...This proposed law is the gap between our law enforcement agencies and the ability to make a difference before it's too late.¹⁶

12 *Submission 5*, p. 3.

13 *Submission 1*, p. 4. Also see: Law Society of Western Australia, *Submission 9*, p. 1.

14 *Submission 6*, p. 1.

15 *Submission 6*, p. 2. Section 272.20 of the Criminal Code criminalises acts committed with the intention of preparing for, or planning of, certain offences within Division 272—Child sex offences outside Australia.

16 *Submission 7*, p. 4. Also see: Ms Susan McLean, *Submission 3*, p. 9.

2.22 The Department acknowledged that the offence proposed in new subsection 474.40(1) might allow law enforcement agencies to intervene during the preparatory stages of an offence; however, the scope of the proposed offence may prevent the capture of actual criminal activity.¹⁷

Proposed new subsection 474.40(2) – intention of committing an offence

2.23 In relation to the new offence proposed in subsection 474.40(2), the Law Society of South Australia,¹⁸ the ACT Government¹⁹ and the Department expressed concerns regarding the construction of the provision. The Department particularly questioned the meaning of the term 'offence' in paragraph 474.40(2)(c) and the fact that it is not clear whether the term 'offence' means a Commonwealth, state or territory offence or a serious or other offence. Without clarification, it is possible that this provision could apply to an intention to commit any offence, with the result that a person charged with an offence under new subsection 474.40(2) could face a greater penalty than the offence he or she had intended to commit. Further, it is not clear what fault element would apply to this element of the proposed offence.²⁰

Committee view

2.24 The committee endorses the Bill's broad objective of enhancing the safety of children online; however, it is clear that existing offences in the Criminal Code already criminalise online communications with children where there is evidence of intention to cause harm to children. Accordingly, the committee considers that the new offences proposed in the Bill are not necessary.

2.25 Further, the committee notes that the majority of submitters highlighted issues in relation to the formulation of the new offences in proposed new section 474.40. The committee agrees that, as a general principle, criminal offences must be precisely defined, and should avoid capturing non-criminal conduct unless there is a clear nexus between that conduct and the criminal conduct which is the subject of the offence. The committee agrees that the proposed offences, while potentially criminalising a broader range of conduct than that already covered in the Criminal Code, capture conduct that goes beyond reasonable and accepted limits of criminal responsibility.

2.26 The committee notes the proposed amendments to the Bill (9185), which have been circulated by Senator Xenophon. One effect of these amendments is to reduce the age stipulated in the Bill from 18 years of age to 16 years of age, consistent with Commonwealth criminal law policy. While the committee considers that this may address one of the concerns identified in submissions, it does not resolve the

17 *Submission 1*, p. 4.

18 *Submission 5*, p. 4.

19 *Submission 6*, p. 2.

20 *Submission 1*, p. 5.

committee's primary concerns that the Bill is not necessary and is too broad in its capture.

2.27 Therefore, the committee concludes that the Senate should not pass the Bill.

Recommendation 1

2.28 The committee recommends that the Senate not pass the Bill.

Senator Trish Crossin

Chair

DISSENTING REPORT BY SENATOR XENOPHON

1.1 Carly Ryan was only 15 when she was brutally murdered by Gary Francis Newman, an online predator. This is her story, in the words of her mother, Sonya Ryan:

In 2006 Carly Ryan thought she had met her dream boyfriend online. His name was Brandon Kane, a 20 year old musician from Melbourne. Brandon was in fact fictitious. An internet construct, the cyberspace alter ego of Gary Francis Newman, a 50 year old predator and paedophile. Carly fell in love with the Brandon construct during months of online contact and phone calls.

Gary Newman took on another identity when he attended Carly's 15th birthday: that of Brandon's adopted father "Shane". In that guise, he attempted to gain the trust of Carly's mum, Sonya, and continued to deceive Carly, buying her gifts and promising to bring Brandon to Adelaide to meet her.

Gary Newman spent months masquerading as Brandon Kane to win Carly's love. When he tried to seduce her in person, while pretending to be Brandon's father Shane, saying that Brandon wouldn't mind if his dad had sex with her, she rejected him. Angry, Gary Newman returned to Melbourne vowing to "fix Carly up". He used his alter ego to lure Carly to a final, fatal meeting.

In February 2007, Gary Newman convinced Carly to meet him. He took Carly to a secluded beach at Port Elliott, South Australia. There, he bashed her, pushed her face into the sand, suffocating her. He then threw her into the water to drown. She was only 15 years old.

A local lady found Carly's body the next morning, covered in sand, her clothing in disarray.

Within 11 days detectives located Gary Newman in Victoria. They found him at his computer, logged in as Brandon Kane, talking with a 14 year old girl in Western Australia. They arrested him, charging him with Carly's murder.

In a Supreme Court trial which continued for over three months, a jury found Gary Francis Newman guilty of murder. He was sentenced on 31 March 2010. South Australian Justice Trish Kelly ordered him to serve a life behind bars with a 29 year non-parole period.¹

1 The Carly Ryan Foundation, *Carly's Story*, available at: http://www.carlyryanfoundation.com/carlys_story (accessed 25 June 2013).

History of the Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2013

1.2 In 2010 I introduced the Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2010, the purpose of which was to make it illegal for an adult to lie about their age when communicating with a child online. This bill failed to pass, however Sonya and I were not going to give up on the challenge of protecting children from online predators.

1.3 The Criminal Code Amendment (Misrepresentation of Age to a Minor) Bill 2013 ('the bill') amends the *Criminal Code Act 1995* to make it an offence for a person over 18 to intentionally misrepresent their age in online communications to a person they reasonably believe to be under 16 years of age for the purposes of encouraging a physical meeting, or with the intention of committing an offence.

1.4 I am dismayed that the committee recommended this bill not be passed. I understand the committee shares the view of the Attorney-General's Department and the South Australian Law Society that the Criminal Code already captures the behaviour this bill seeks to criminalise. However, I strongly disagree with this position for the reasons below.

The need for preventative measures

1.5 Internet use among persons under 16 years of age has reached unprecedented levels. In her submission, Ms Susan McLean, a cyber-safety expert and educator, summarised some research which reveals disturbing trends:

A 2005 survey of 742 teens (aged 13-18) and 726 tweens (aged 8-12) conducted by the Polly Klass Foundation (USA) reported...54 per cent of teens admitted communicating with someone they've never met using an Instant Messaging program, 50 per cent via email and 45 per cent in a chat room. Sixteen per cent of all respondents...discovered that someone that they were communicating with online was an adult pretending to be much younger.²

1.6 Ms Sonya Ryan explained in her submission why children are particularly vulnerable in an online environment:

Young teens often have a desire to be free of their parents' authority to gain acceptance as grown-ups. Teens are naïve and inexperienced, especially in dealing with adults who have ulterior motive. Sexual predators take advantage of this naivety. They manipulate kids in an effort to gain trust, which they use and gradually turn seemingly innocent online relationships into real-life sexual interactions. A predator usually approaches a child initially through harmless chat room or instant message dialogue. Over time – perhaps weeks or even months – the stranger, having obtained as much personal information as possible, grooms the child, gaining his or her trust

through compliments, positive statements and other forms of flattery to build an emotional bond.³

1.7 As Sonya knows all too well, the consequences of an adult misrepresenting their age to a child through online communication can be fatal. In her submission, she explains why our current legislation does not go far enough:

We are seeking to add this vital law to address the common denominator in the way online predators behave, they all set up false online profiles, most reduce their online age to present as a peer to the child with the intention to meet that child. I put it to you that no adult could have a legitimate reason for establishing false profiles with fake names, age and photos to contact and meet a child that is not known to them for legitimate purposes. The proposed law is specifically tailored to that fact.⁴

1.8 The bill aims to provide law enforcement agencies with the ability to investigate and prosecute alleged offenders in the preparatory stages of their grooming activities, and to prevent children being placed in a position of danger:

As a nation we need to support our law enforcement units that are dealing with this new form of stranger danger, to ensure that once they have identified a predator, they have the support of Parliament to apprehend these criminals...This proposed law is the gap between our law enforcement agencies and the ability to make a difference before it's too late. We have comprehensive laws that protect us from those who seek to commit an act of terror, apprehending the persons (involved) prior to the event. I believe we also need to have laws that protect our children on the same basis, to prevent an act of terror, terror that may or may not end in death, but may cause a lifetime of trauma.⁵

Amendments to the bill

1.9 The amendments circulated for this bill address the concerns which have been raised through the committee process by reducing the age of the victim from 18 to 16 (in line with Commonwealth criminal laws) and by removing the reference to provisions which would have made offences committed under this bill absolute liability offences.

1.10 I find it extraordinary that while the committee has considered these amendments, it still maintains this bill to protect children is unnecessary. The committee is in effect saying an adult can lie about their age online to a child and attempt to meet that child without any legal consequences. As Sonya Ryan knows too well, this deception can have devastating consequences.

3 *Submission 7*, p. 3.

4 *Submission 7*, p. 4.

5 *Submission 7*, p. 4.

Recommendation 1

1.11 That the bill (as amended) be passed.

Senator Nick Xenophon

APPENDIX 1

SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

Submission Number	Submitter
1	Attorney-General's Department
2	New South Wales Council for Civil Liberties
3	Ms Susan McLean
4	National Children's and Youth Law Centre
5	The Law Society of South Australia
6	ACT Government
7	The Carly Ryan Foundation
8	Law Council of Australia
9	The Law Society of Western Australia