



OFFICIAL REPORT
AITHISG OIFIGEIL

Meeting of the Parliament

Wednesday 25 September 2019

Session 5



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body

Information on the Scottish Parliament's copyright policy can be found on the website - www.parliament.scot or by contacting Public Information on 0131 348 5000

Wednesday 25 September 2019

CONTENTS

	Col.
PORTFOLIO QUESTION TIME	1
SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLDER PEOPLE	1
Social Security Spending (Impact of Welfare Reform)	1
Universal Credit Housing Element	2
Scottish Child Payment	3
Pension Credit (Mixed-age Couples)	4
Social Isolation and Loneliness (Highlands and Islands)	5
Two-child Limit (Effect on Families in Scotland)	6
Devolution of Social Security Powers	8
Social Security Scotland (Information Technology)	9
FINANCE, ECONOMY AND FAIR WORK	9
Productivity	9
Barnett Consequential Funding (Education)	11
Financial Support for Companies (Fair Work First Principles)	12
Diversity in the Workplace	13
Scottish Enterprise (Exclusivity Agreements)	14
Living Wage Employers	15
Small Town Economies (Support)	15
BUSINESS MOTION	17
<i>Motion moved—[Maurice Golden]—and agreed to.</i>	
CLIMATE CHANGE (EMISSIONS REDUCTION TARGETS) (SCOTLAND) BILL: STAGE 3	18
CLIMATE CHANGE (EMISSIONS REDUCTION TARGETS) (SCOTLAND) BILL	84
<i>Motion moved—[Roseanna Cunningham].</i>	
The Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform (Roseanna Cunningham) ...	84
Maurice Golden (West Scotland) (Con)	87
Claudia Beamish (South Scotland) (Lab)	89
Mark Ruskell (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)	91
Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD)	92
Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)	94
Alexander Burnett (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)	96
Daniel Johnson (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)	97
Gillian Martin (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)	99
Sarah Boyack (Lothian) (Lab)	100
Finlay Carson (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)	102
Roseanna Cunningham	104
BUSINESS MOTIONS	107
<i>Motions moved—[Graeme Dey]—and agreed to.</i>	
PARLIAMENTARY BUREAU MOTIONS	109
<i>Motions moved—[Graeme Dey].</i>	
DECISION TIME	111
PRODUCT RECALL DATABASE	116
<i>Motion debated—[John Mason].</i>	
John Mason (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)	116
Tom Mason (North East Scotland) (Con)	119
Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab)	121
Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)	122
Bill Bowman (North East Scotland) (Con)	124
The Minister for Business, Fair Work and Skills (Jamie Hepburn)	125

Scottish Parliament

Wednesday 25 September 2019

[The Presiding Officer opened the meeting at 14:00]

Portfolio Question Time

Social Security and Older People

Social Security Spending (Impact of Welfare Reform)

1. **Colin Beattie (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what impact United Kingdom Government welfare reforms have had on Scottish social security spending. (S5O-03567)

The Cabinet Secretary for Social Security and Older People (Shirley-Anne Somerville): The Scottish Government's 2019 welfare reform report found that when universal credit is fully rolled out, welfare reforms since 2015 could have reduced social security spending in Scotland by around £500 million per year. That will be the impact of the benefit freeze, reductions in universal credit work allowance and the two-child limit.

The cuts only build on a yet larger set of United Kingdom Government welfare reforms that have been introduced since 2010. Previously, our 2018 welfare reform report estimated that by 2020-21, total cuts since 2010 could have reduced annual social security spending in Scotland by a massive £3.7 billion per year.

Colin Beattie: Will the cabinet secretary confirm how much the Scottish Government spends on mitigating harmful UK Government policies? Does the cabinet secretary agree with the United Nations special rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, Professor Philip Alston, who wrote that

"mitigation comes at a price and is not sustainable"?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: I very much agree with Professor Alston and his recent reports. Unfortunately, the scale of the UK Government social security cuts is so vast that it is not possible for the Scottish Government to mitigate them in full, especially given that our resource block grant has been reduced by £2 billion in real terms since 2010-11.

Nonetheless, the Scottish Government is continuing to invest more than £100 million this year to mitigate the worst impacts of the UK Government welfare reforms. That is part of the

estimated £1.4 billion that we are investing in 2018-19 to support low-income households.

Universal Credit Housing Element

2. **James Kelly (Glasgow) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government what its response is to the Social Security Committee's recommendation that universal credit housing element should be paid directly to a landlord by default, with the option for a tenant to opt out. (S5O-03568)

The Cabinet Secretary for Social Security and Older People (Shirley-Anne Somerville): As stated in my answer to Jackie Baillie on 26 June, the Scottish Government

"worked directly with people in receipt of universal credit in Scotland"

when developing the universal credit Scottish choices. The feedback received was that

"people wished to have a choice about whether or not to have the housing costs in their universal credit award paid directly to their landlord ... almost 50 per cent of the people who have been offered the choices have taken up one or both."

In other words, people have had the flexibility to decide for themselves

"whether it works better for them to have their housing costs paid directly to their landlord."—[*Official Report*, 26 June 2019; c 12.]

James Kelly: Research by Citizens Advice Scotland has shown that rent arrears have shot up by 40 per cent since 2012. That is why the Social Security Committee heard evidence that paying rent directly to landlords with an opt-out for tenants was a "no-brainer". Will the cabinet secretary confirm whether officials have assessed the social return on investment of the £2.50 that is paid each time that flexibility is used, and whether the experience panels have carried out any research in response to the committee's recommendation?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: I recognise the Social Security Committee's recommendation on that and, more widely, I recognise its report. I point out to James Kelly that that was not the universal view of those who gave written and oral evidence to the committee. As I said in my original answer, we built Scottish choices by directly asking people who are in receipt of universal credit what they wanted.

The experience panels have not looked at the issue since the publication of the Social Security Committee's report. However, as a Government, we are committed to a review of Scottish choices, so I look forward to hearing what those with lived experience of universal credit say about the choices that we have on offer—we can act on that accordingly.

Clare Adamson (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP): A recent Trussell Trust report found that food banks experienced a 30 per cent increase in demand in areas where universal credit had been in place for a year. Does the cabinet secretary think that it is time that the UK Government listens to the overwhelming evidence about the hardship that universal credit is causing and fixes the flaws in the system, starting with the five-week delay for new claimants?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: The UK Government needs to look very urgently at universal credit, although it has spectacularly failed to do so to date. There are a number of significant problems with universal credit. Clare Adamson is quite right to point out the five-week wait, which, from recent reports, is having an impact on rent arrears. The minimum five-week wait before receiving the first payment, together with the direct deductions as a result of loans from the DWP, is the single biggest problem that people are having with universal credit.

As I did with her predecessors, I urge the new Secretary of State for Work and Pensions to listen to that evidence and act upon it.

Scottish Child Payment

3. **Fulton MacGregor (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government how many children will be taken out of poverty by the Scottish child payment. (S5O-03569)

The Cabinet Secretary for Social Security and Older People (Shirley-Anne Somerville): By the end of 2022, once it has been fully rolled out, the Scottish child payment is expected to lift 30,000 children out of poverty, reducing relative child poverty by 3 percentage points. It will also help to stop families falling into poverty and mitigate some of the worst effects of UK Government welfare cuts. The first payments for under-sixes will be made before Christmas 2020.

Along with the wider actions set out in our “Every child, every chance: The Tackling Child Poverty Delivery Plan 2018-2022”, the Scottish child payment sets Scotland apart as the only country in the UK that is taking concerted action to ultimately eradicate child poverty.

Fulton MacGregor: I welcome the cabinet secretary’s response and the announcement in the programme for government that the new benefit will be introduced early for the most vulnerable children, many of whom are in my constituency of Coatbridge and Chryston. Can the cabinet secretary confirm that the Scottish child payment will have no cap on the number of eligible children in a family, unlike the UK Government’s callous two-child benefit cap and rape clause?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: I confirm that there will never be any cap on the number of eligible children in a family for the Scottish child payment, or any other social security payment. Numerous independent projections that have been published over the past year have shown that child poverty is set to rise in Scotland as a result of the UK Government’s continued welfare cuts, and particularly as a result of policies such as the two-child cap and the benefits freeze. Such policies should always be opposed for the hardship that they cause and the impact that they have on families in child poverty. They run counter to the principles of dignity, fairness and respect, on which the social security system in Scotland is based.

Pauline McNeill (Glasgow) (Lab): Given that the Scottish Fiscal Commission believes that the take-up of the best start grant will be 69 per cent at best, but could be as low as 45 per cent, does the cabinet secretary agree that moving towards an automated payment—if that could be achieved—would substantially reduce the barriers and make deeper inroads into child poverty?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: I recognise Pauline McNeill’s continued commitment to ensuring that we do all that we can in Scotland on automated payment. We looked very seriously at the issue when working on how to deliver the Scottish child payment. We settled on our approach of an application-based process, because it offers a more timely and efficient model for delivery. It simply would not have been possible for us to introduce the Scottish child payment within the timescales that we announced if we had not done that. I did not want a delay, and nor did Aileen Campbell, with whom we have been jointly working on the Scottish child payment. Those are the reasons behind that decision.

However, as I have said to Pauline McNeill in the past, I am more than happy to look at whether we can do anything more in the longer term on automation of social security in general.

Pension Credit (Mixed-age Couples)

4. **Ruth Maguire (Cunninghame South) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what the impact will be on mixed-age couples in Scotland of the United Kingdom Government’s decision to exempt them from claiming pension credit. (S5O-03570)

The Cabinet Secretary for Social Security and Older People (Shirley-Anne Somerville): I am deeply concerned about that regressive policy, which punishes older people for having a younger partner. The Scottish Government estimates that the change could lead to an annual loss of as much as £7,000 per household, and by 2023-24

could affect as many as 5,600 households in Scotland.

The issue is not just about the money. As Age Scotland has rightly pointed out, the policy could also have a devastating effect on the health and wellbeing of some older people, as they struggle to pay bills and heat their homes.

Ruth Maguire: Nearly 6,000 households in my Ayrshire constituency are not getting the pension credit that they are entitled to. The United Kingdom Government admits that, across the UK, a staggering £3.5 billion that is earmarked for the poorest pensioners does not reach them. Does the cabinet secretary support the charity Independent Age in its the call for the UK Government to reform pension credit to ensure that everyone who is entitled to it receives their money?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: I absolutely concur with those remarks. It is imperative that we do all that we can to increase benefit take-up. The Scottish Government will do that in relation to the benefits that are devolved, but there is an absolute responsibility on the UK Government also to actively encourage take-up, which is something that it has failed to do in the past.

Ruth Maguire is right to point out that £3.5 billion is being lost. That affects 1.3 million households that are entitled to pension credit but are not receiving it. That is not a new problem, and the UK Government must be urged to act to ensure that those who are entitled to benefits receive that money.

Social Isolation and Loneliness (Highlands and Islands)

5. Edward Mountain (Highlands and Islands) (Con): To ask the Scottish Government what action it is taking to support people in the Highlands and Islands who are experiencing social isolation and loneliness. (S5O-03571)

The Minister for Older People and Equalities (Christina McKelvie): It is important that our work to address social isolation and loneliness includes rural communities. Over the summer, I spent time on Skye and in the western Highlands, where I had the pleasure of visiting a number of important projects that are working to tackle social isolation and loneliness, including RagTag and Textile Ltd in Broadford, and the Fort William Men's Shed. Those projects are working tirelessly to build communities and support individuals, and it was a joy and a privilege to be able to spend time with them.

We know that rural communities can face particular challenges around social isolation and loneliness, so we have engaged with key stakeholders such as Scottish Rural Action and Scotland's national rural mental health forum as

part of our wider work to build a more connected Scotland.

I want to reassure Edward Mountain that particular challenges that are faced by the Highlands and Islands—and, indeed, other rural communities in Scotland—will form an important part of our work, going forward.

Edward Mountain: Befrienders Highland plays a vital role in tackling loneliness and social exclusion. The problem is that the money that it has been awarded by the Scottish Government will run out in March next year. Can the minister assure me that she will assess the feasibility of longer-term funding so that organisations such as Befrienders Highland can continue to establish communities and provide the invaluable support that they offer at the moment?

Christina McKelvie: I am delighted to give Edward Mountain that assurance. The social isolation and loneliness strategy fund is worth about £1 million. We are already working with the implementation group to consider how we can roll that out and meet the ambitions of the strategy. The member will probably like to know that we have already spent some of that money. Within the past month, we have given about £80,000 to befriender networks to do exactly the work that he has just mentioned.

We are absolutely committed to looking across all investment into communities with an eye to maximising alignment with the strategy. We have some money to use for that—which is unusual. We have started to spend it, starting with befriending networks, because we know exactly the value of their work.

Two-child Limit (Effect on Families in Scotland)

6. David Torrance (Kirkcaldy) (SNP): To ask the Scottish Government what information it has regarding how many families in Scotland have been denied entitlement to benefits due to the two-child limit. (S5O-03572)

The Cabinet Secretary for Social Security and Older People (Shirley-Anne Somerville): The Scottish Government's 2019 welfare reform report shows that, according to the latest statistics, more than 8,500 families across Scotland had been denied entitlement for at least one of their children by April 2019. The report also estimates that around 3,400 of those households were headed by a lone parent.

Over time, more and more families will be affected by the limit, and by the appalling rape clause. The 2019 welfare reform report estimates that the two-child limit could reduce social security spending by up to £120 million a year in the long

run, which would affect around 40,000 households.

David Torrance: Kirkcaldy Foodbank, in my constituency, has seen unprecedented levels of demand over the past 12 months. Does the cabinet secretary agree that the uncaring and out-of-touch United Kingdom Tory Government continues to attack the most vulnerable people in our society through universal credit? Can she explain what steps the Scottish Government has taken to mitigate those actions?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: The Scottish Government considers it unacceptable that families have been forced to resort to food banks. Last week, the Trussell Trust published research that noted that, in some areas where universal credit has been in operation for more than two years, food bank demand has increased by as much as 48 per cent.

I will continue to call on the UK Government to listen to that evidence, to halt the on-going migration of people to universal credit and to fix the problems that we all know about, as well as taking action on the wider punitive measures, such as the two-child cap.

We are investing more than £100 million this year to help to mitigate the worst of the impacts of the UK Government's benefit cuts. That is part of overall spending of £1.4 billion, which I mentioned earlier, and which we are investing to support low-income households.

Mark Griffin (Central Scotland) (Lab): Is Social Security Scotland collecting data on the best start baby payment for third and subsequent children in families? That data would be extremely valuable if the current or any other Administration were to decide to support families with three or four children who were missing out because of the UK Government's callous cap.

Shirley-Anne Somerville: In the best start application forms, applicants can include details of other children, so that we can ensure that, if they are eligible for other elements of the best start grant payments they will be given that money, too. Social Security Scotland is looking seriously at ensuring that we maximise take-up of the best start grant, which potentially involves its knowing about other children in a household if the applicant wishes to pursue that.

As I said in my original answer, any Government wishing to mitigate the effects of the two-child limit would, of course, have to meet the £120 million cost of that. We are not simply mitigating the two-child limit; we have gone further, with the introduction by Christmas 2020 of our Scottish child payment.

Devolution of Social Security Powers

7. Alison Harris (Central Scotland) (Con): To ask the Scottish Government whether it will provide an update on the timeline for the devolution of the powers set out in the Social Security (Scotland) Act 2018. (S5O-03573)

The Cabinet Secretary for Social Security and Older People (Shirley-Anne Somerville): Sections of the Social Security (Scotland) Act 2018 will be commenced as and when appropriate in order to ensure a safe and secure transition of powers.

I set out a timeline for delivery of the remaining devolved benefits in February this year. In June, the Cabinet Secretary for Communities and Local Government set out our assumptions on how the new Scottish child payment will affect that timeline. I will update Parliament shortly on our work since June with those assumptions.

Alison Harris: As the cabinet secretary said, Aileen Campbell said in June that the Scottish child payment would have implications for delivery of other aspects of the social security programme. The social security programme director recently said that his team does not know whether it can hold to the dates for several benefits that were provided by Aileen Campbell, and that feasibility work on timescales around the Scottish child payment has yet to be finalised.

Has the Scottish child payment caused any knock-on delays to disability benefits, carer benefits or transfers? Can we be sure that there will be no further delays, given that the current team seems to be unsure of whether or when it can deliver the benefits?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: I absolutely assure Alison Harris that the current team and the Government are determined to deliver devolution of disability payments, and to deliver the Scottish child payment. We had to make timetable changes because of the introduction of the Scottish child payment. That was inevitable, with the introduction of such a major policy and the radical action that was required for the changes to be made. They were difficult decisions, but I hope that Parliament and wider stakeholders will appreciate why we have done it.

As I said in my original answer, in June, Aileen Campbell set out the implications for the rest of the devolved benefits that are to come here. We are working to test those assumptions, and I will update Parliament on our final assessments. I can say at this point that work is going well on that, so I hope to be able to update Parliament on the finer details very soon. Alison Harris can be assured that that work is on-going and is being treated very seriously.

Social Security Scotland (Information Technology)

8. Alexander Stewart (Mid Scotland and Fife)

(Con): To ask the Scottish Government what progress Social Security Scotland is making with the information technology infrastructure for wave 2 benefits. (S5O-03574)

The Cabinet Secretary for Social Security and Older People (Shirley-Anne Somerville):

The Scottish Government is making good progress on scaling the existing wave 1 technology and systems for wave 2 benefits to introduce more capability, to continue to provide a consistent multichannel experience for our clients, and to ensure, above all, that they are paid on time, every time.

Alexander Stewart: In July, there were concerns that the internal knowledge management system, which supports and supplies staff with policy documents, benefits information, eligibility criteria and links to legislation, was causing issues for staff at Social Security Scotland. How have those concerns been addressed?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: They have been addressed because we recognise that we will continuously build on what we have achieved in wave 1 in order to be able to deliver what we are looking to do in wave 2. The entire devolution process in social security has been set up to ensure that what we do lays the foundations for the more complex work. That is an agile process that will be iterative over time, and the work is going exactly as the programme was intended to go, to ensure that we build on those strong foundations. I am absolutely confident that we will deliver on wave 2, just as we have successfully delivered on wave 1.

Finance, Economy and Fair Work

Productivity

1. **Jamie Greene (West Scotland) (Con):** To ask the Scottish Government what its response is to the new CBI Scotland and KPMG Scottish productivity index, which reportedly shows productivity as starting “a lap behind” competitors. (S5O-03575)

The Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Economy and Fair Work (Derek Mackay): The index and the associated report are positive and constructive contributions to the debate on raising Scotland’s rate of productivity growth. It is encouraging that the report’s recommendations are broadly in line with Scottish Government policy.

Scotland is making progress on productivity. The historical gap between Scotland and the United Kingdom has reduced in recent years.

Between 2007 and 2018, Scotland’s productivity growth was higher than that of any other country or region of the UK, including London. However, the Scottish Government is far from complacent, and it will continue to pursue higher productivity growth through our economic action plan and related commitments.

Jamie Greene: I thank the cabinet secretary for that update. CBI Scotland and KPMG say:

“Scottish productivity hasn’t shifted for decades and we don’t expect drastic changes in the near-term.”

In nine of 15 key areas that the report analysed, including skills, training and wellbeing, Scotland is falling far behind the rest of the UK. Will the Scottish Government formally respond to the report? Will it act on any of the specific recommendations that the report makes? More generally, is the cabinet secretary more positive about Scotland’s productivity prospects than CBI Scotland is?

Derek Mackay: I am equally positive, because I was at the launch of the report with CBI Scotland and other partners, such as KPMG and businesses that welcomed the Government’s response. Jamie Greene would do well to share my positivity and positive approach.

Some of the economic indicators that were mentioned were subsequent to a UK and, indeed, global financial crash. That gives some of the explanation as to why we are going through a particular economic cycle. The current threat of Brexit is, of course, threatening our current economic indicators which, over the most recent piece, have been outperforming those of the rest of the UK in record low unemployment, soaring exports and progress on productivity. Even gross domestic product growth in some quarters has outperformed that in the rest of the UK. Some of those economic indicators are on the turn because of the UK Government’s decisions and incompetence.

Of course I will respond on productivity—indeed, I have already done so. Jamie Greene possibly missed the Scottish Government’s response. We will have more to say through the Scottish budget process and the refreshing of the economic action plan.

I welcome the recommendations, the constructive approach and the new indicators to show how we can tackle productivity, but surely the Conservatives recognise that the UK Government has a role to play, as business does, in enhancing productivity. We are certainly a willing partner in that shared journey.

Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab): Can the cabinet secretary point to any area of Government

economic policy that might be failing and which he accepts responsibility for?

Derek Mackay: It is perfectly open to the Opposition to try to pick on our record, but it is disappointing that, with the greatest threat to Scotland's economy right now being a no-deal Brexit that could bring about a recession in the UK and Scotland to catastrophic effect, Neil Findlay chooses to attack the Scottish National Party. That tells us about the priorities of the Labour Party in Scotland right now.

Barnett Consequential Funding (Education)

2. Liz Smith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con): To ask the Scottish Government how much of the £1.2 billion of recent Barnett consequential funding will be allocated to education. (S5O-03576)

The Minister for Public Finance and Digital Economy (Kate Forbes): The consequentials that we will receive after the United Kingdom spending round for next year will be allocated through the Scottish budget process. Any additional funding is to be welcomed and will be spent wisely, but it will not reverse the damage that has been done by a decade of UK Government austerity, which is now being compounded by the threat of a no-deal Brexit.

Liz Smith: Given the on-going concerns across Scotland about teacher shortages, including those that were mentioned by the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Skills' international council of education advisers and those that were cited in the survey of headteachers that was published today, what discussions is the minister having with the cabinet secretary about addressing teacher shortages in key subjects and in additional support for learning?

Kate Forbes: The Deputy First Minister will have a number of conversations as we go through the Scottish Government's budget process. If Liz Smith feels passionately about any line in the budget, she and her party are welcome to engage constructively in the budget process.

The Scottish Government does not ring fence consequentials according to UK Government decisions. We set our own priorities for the people of Scotland, and the value of that is seen in the fact that school spending per pupil is consistently higher in Scotland than it is in other UK countries.

James Dornan (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP): Just 22 days ago, Liz Smith stated in a question to the First Minister that the consequentials that are coming to the Scottish Government amount to £1.9 billion. Today, her question states that the amount is £700 million lower than that. Does that not highlight, again, why we should always wait to see the colour of the Tories' money before we start spending it?

Kate Forbes: I could not agree more. The money to which Liz Smith referred will be agreed after this year's spending round, and we will await receipt of that money before we decide how it will be allocated.

Financial Support for Companies (Fair Work First Principles)

3. Alex Rowley (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab): To ask the Scottish Government whether trade union access and the promotion of collective bargaining, as set out in the fair work first principles, are conditions for companies receiving Government financial support, including grants from enterprise agencies. (S5O-03577)

The Minister for Business, Fair Work and Skills (Jamie Hepburn): Through the fair work first principles, the Scottish Government will attach conditionality to as many grants, funding streams and public contracts as we can by the end of this parliamentary session. The fair work first programme will ask employers to commit to investment in skills and training; payment of the real living wage; no inappropriate use of zero-hours contracts; action to tackle the gender pay gap; and, in relation to Mr Rowley's question, genuine workforce engagement.

Alex Rowley: The Government seems to have difficulty in giving a straight answer to that question. Yesterday, Colin Smyth asked whether the National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers' collective bargaining agreement would continue in place for the northern isles ferry services, but he did not get a straight answer. The trade unions have been writing to ministers, but they have failed to get a straight answer. An essential part of the fair work first principles, as set out by the Scottish Government, is trade union access and support for collective bargaining agreements. Is the Government absolutely clear about that? Is it making clear that those will be conditions for any public funding that goes to any company in Scotland? It is a straightforward question.

Jamie Hepburn: I find it an odd question. I have been very clear in the points that I have set out. We have published our fair work action plan, which sets out the great importance that we place in the principles that the independent fair work convention laid out in relation to genuine workplace engagement. Trade union representation and collective bargaining are important elements of such activity.

We are taking forward our fair work first agenda, and we are working with partners to ensure that the agenda is rolled out. We are engaging with a range of early adopters who are committed to the fair work agenda, and we will continue to work with

the Scottish Trades Union Congress and the fair work convention.

If Mr Rowley is particularly keen to discuss the matter with me—I do not think that, hitherto, he has contacted me directly—I would be very happy to speak to him about it.

Diversity in the Workplace

5. Clare Adamson (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP): To ask the Scottish Government what it is doing to encourage diversity in the workplace. (S5O-03579)

The Minister for Business, Fair Work and Skills (Jamie Hepburn): The Scottish Government is committed to increasing diversity in the workplace as part of our ambition for inclusive growth. We aim to encourage diversity in the workplace through the implementation of actions across a range of activity, including those in the “Fair Work Action Plan”, “A Fairer Scotland for Disabled People: Employment Action Plan”, “A Fairer Scotland for Women: Gender Pay Gap Action Plan” and “A Fairer Scotland for All: Race Equality Action Plan 2017-21”. Those actions, which include extending the workplace equality fund and promoting the benefits of diversity in the Scottish business pledge, will help to make Scotland a better and fairer place to live and work.

Clare Adamson: Does the minister agree that schemes such as the CRER—Coalition for Racial Equality and Rights—political shadowing scheme and the disability internship programme in the Parliament are an excellent way to engage with underrepresented groups in our workforce? Would he encourage other members to take part in such activities, as I have done?

Jamie Hepburn: Yes, I would. I have taken part in those programmes in the past, and I have found them to be invaluable to me. I hope that those who have participated in them, working with me, have found them useful, too. I think that they are of great benefit. That is why the Government provides funding to the equal representation coalition to do things such as produce the toolkit to help political parties to improve the diversity of their membership; it is why we fund Inclusion Scotland to operate internships in the Scottish Government; and it is why I would encourage others to take part in the CRER shadowing scheme, as Clare Adamson, I and other members have done in the past.

Rhoda Grant (Highlands and Islands) (Lab): How can the Scottish Government encourage diversity when one of its agencies, Marine Scotland, aided by the Scottish Government’s personnel department, continues to abuse my constituent, a whistleblower who stood up against abusive sexist behaviour in a male-dominated

workplace? That case alone discourages women from applying for work in male-dominated sectors.

Jamie Hepburn: I will not comment on the specific case, because I believe that it could be the subject of on-going activity and I do not think that the Presiding Officer or anyone else would want me to do that. However, I have laid out the range of activity that we are utterly serious about in relation to the fair work action plan, at least halving the disability employment gap, the gender pay gap action plan and the race equality action plan. The agenda is one that we are very serious about.

The Deputy Presiding Officer (Linda Fabiani): To avoid confusion, I should have noted earlier that question 4 was not lodged. We now move on to question 6.

Scottish Enterprise (Exclusivity Agreements)

6. Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green): To ask the Scottish Government what criteria Scottish Enterprise uses to determine the appropriateness of its exclusivity agreements with developers, and how such agreements can be challenged. (S5O-03580)

The Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Economy and Fair Work (Derek Mackay): All property and land transactions that are undertaken by Scottish Enterprise are governed by the “Scottish Public Finance Manual”. They are also subject to Scottish Enterprise’s own internal governance processes. Exclusivity agreements are commonplace in the property industry and are considered by Scottish Enterprise on a case-by-case basis, with reference to the “Scottish Public Finance Manual”. As an exclusivity agreement is a contract between two or more parties, anyone who is considering a challenge to such a contract would need to seek the appropriate legal advice.

Patrick Harvie: I am sure that the cabinet secretary is aware of the specific example of Flamingo Land Ltd’s proposed development at Loch Lomond, which has received nearly 60,000 objections, making it the most unpopular planning application in Scottish history. Despite the fact that the application has been withdrawn in the face of such huge, widespread opposition, the community cannot pursue other alternatives, such as a community-owned option, because of the exclusivity agreement that Scottish Enterprise has. Surely that community should have options other than having to go to court. Surely it should be in the driving seat in determining the future of that site.

Derek Mackay: To be fair, Patrick Harvie’s question was framed in general terms and I replied in general terms.

On the proposition in question, I am sure that I heard Jackie Baillie ask the First Minister about the possibility of public ownership and a community buyout. If I remember correctly, the First Minister said that that option should be explored, and I concur with that.

Of course, ministers cannot prejudice any planning application or interfere with the operational independence of Scottish Enterprise in relation to a matter that might be live, but I can say, without prejudice to any planning application, that every planning application should be considered on the merits of the case and the appropriate planning material considerations. Everyone involved in the process should maybe reflect on the outcomes and on public opinion and the level of objections that was generated. I hope that that is helpful for everyone's understanding.

Living Wage Employers

7. Rona Mackay (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP): To ask the Scottish Government whether it will provide an update on the number of employers paying the living wage. (S5O-03581)

The Minister for Business, Fair Work and Skills (Jamie Hepburn): As of 19 September 2019, there were 1,586 living wage accredited employers in Scotland. Proportionately, that is more than five times more than there are in the rest of the United Kingdom. In total, 80.6 per cent of all employees in Scotland receive the living wage, which is ahead of England at 77.1 per cent, Wales at 74 per cent and Northern Ireland at 72.3 per cent, making Scotland the best performing of all the UK nations.

Rona Mackay: Although those figures are really encouraging, they still amount to around 20 per cent of people who work in Scotland not receiving the living wage. Does the minister agree that every responsible employer should pay it, as the clue is in the title—it is the “living” wage?

Jamie Hepburn: Yes. The Scottish Government is a great advocate of the real living wage, which is why we were the first accredited Government across these islands. I agree with Ms Mackay that, although it is welcome that 80 per cent of employees are paid it, it is still the case that 20 per cent—or one fifth—of the workforce are not paid it. We want to do better than that, and I encourage employers to follow the example of those who have become accredited and get on board, become accredited, and make sure that they pay all their staff at least the real living wage.

Small Town Economies (Support)

8. Iain Gray (East Lothian) (Lab): To ask the Scottish Government how it is supporting the economies of small towns. (S5O-03582)

The Minister for Public Finance and Digital Economy (Kate Forbes): We understand the economic challenges that are faced by businesses in our small towns, and we are providing a £50 million town centre fund to stimulate growth as part of a wider £5 billion capital infrastructure investment. In addition, our non-domestic rates relief—which is worth more than £750 million—is the most generous in the United Kingdom, and the small business bonus scheme removes, or reduces, rates burdens on small businesses across Scotland.

Iain Gray: In spite of that, small towns struggle to access funds to regenerate their communities. However, it is not always just about money. Dunbar community council recently took me around a number of derelict residential and business properties in the town that speculators have bought and then refused to maintain or sell, undermining the community's efforts to regenerate the town's economy.

How does the Scottish Government intend to address the blight of derelict properties and recalcitrant owners?

Kate Forbes: Iain Gray is right to point out that it is not just about money; in many cases, it is about empowering communities to take action in such circumstances. Of course, communities were empowered to do that through the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015. That, in conjunction with supporting businesses in the centre of towns through our rates and funding and grants systems, should—hopefully—provide Dunbar community council with the support that it needs.

Murdo Fraser (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con): In July, the United Kingdom Government announced a £3.6 billion package of support for town deals in England, which will benefit 100 different communities. Given that a number of small towns in Scotland face similar challenges to small towns south of the border, does the Scottish Government have any plans to follow suit and introduce town deals?

Kate Forbes: We await further clarity from the UK Government on that specific proposal. However, the commitment of the Scottish Government is to ensure that every area of Scotland is covered by a deal, including regional deals, which—of course—include some of those towns. On the case that the member mentioned, we await further detail from the UK Government.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: That concludes portfolio questions on finance and the economy. I will give everyone a little time to shift seats before we move on to the next item of business.

Business Motion

14:39

The Presiding Officer (Ken Macintosh): The next item of business is consideration of business motion S5M-19024, in the name of Graeme Dey, Minister for Parliamentary Business and Veterans, on behalf of the Parliamentary Bureau, setting out a timetable for stage 3 consideration of the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill. I call Maurice Golden, as a member of the bureau, to move the motion.

Motion moved,

That the Parliament agrees that, during stage 3 of the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill, debate on groups of amendments shall, subject to Rule 9.8.4A, be brought to a conclusion by the time limit indicated, those time limits being calculated from when the stage begins and excluding any periods when other business is under consideration or when a meeting of the Parliament is suspended (other than a suspension following the first division in the stage being called) or otherwise not in progress:

Groups 1 to 3: 50 minutes

Groups 4 to 6: 1 hour 30 minutes

Groups 7 to 9: 2 hours

Groups 10 to 12: 2 hours 30 minutes.—[*Maurice Golden*]

Motion agreed to.

Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill: Stage 3

14:40

The Presiding Officer (Ken Macintosh): The next item of business is stage 3 proceedings on the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill.

In dealing with the amendments, members should have: the bill as amended at stage 2; the marshalled list; the supplement to the marshalled list; and the groupings of amendments.

I remind members that the division bell will sound and proceedings will be suspended for five minutes for the first division of the afternoon. The period of voting for the first division will be 30 seconds. Thereafter, I will allow a voting period of one minute for the first division after a debate. A member who wishes to speak in the debate on any group of amendments should press their request-to-speak button as soon as possible after I call the group.

Members should now refer to the marshalled list of amendments.

Section 3—The interim targets

The Presiding Officer: Group 1 is minor and technical amendments. Amendment 2, in the name of the cabinet secretary, is grouped with amendment 5.

The Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform (Roseanna Cunningham): This group contains two very minor technical amendments, which need little explanation. Amendment 2 will fix a duplicative section heading in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009. Amendment 5 will ensure wording consistency between the provisions on calculating annual targets.

I move amendment 2.

Amendment 2 agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: Group 2 is on interim targets. Amendment 17, in the name of Claudia Beamish, is grouped with amendment 18.

I remind members that amendments 17 and 18 are direct alternatives. “Direct alternatives” means two or more amendments that seek to replace the same text in a bill with alternative approaches. A vote will be taken on both amendments 17 and 18 in the order in which they appear in the marshalled list. If both amendments are agreed to, the second amendment—that is, amendment 18—will

succeed the first, and amendment 17 will cease to have effect.

Claudia Beamish (South Scotland) (Lab): At stage 2, it was momentous to see the cross-party consensus that a net zero target is right for Scotland. I am whole-heartedly delighted that that consensus has continued in relation to the setting of an interim target, to set our trajectory for the new decade. That is a measure of the bill's strength and this Parliament's success in stepping up to the climate emergency.

We are 10 years on from the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, and we are armed with a wealth of new research and improved understanding of the task ahead. The Parliament well knows that the United Nations says that we have 11 years to stop irreparable climate damage and that what happens in the next decade is crucial.

The Opposition parties came to agree that the Scottish National Party's proposal for a 2030 emissions target of 70 per cent lower than the baseline—only a little up from what was set for that date back in 2009—was not good enough. The evidence base for that decision came from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the climate catastrophes that we have witnessed and the public mandate from the brilliant climate strikers. It is a political decision, but it is based on science.

In amendment 17, I propose a 75 per cent target, in the hope that we can find a consensus on the mid-point of the fair shares calculation—Scottish Labour has come down from our initial position of 77 per cent. I am delighted that our approach has been successful and that all parties have come to agree on it.

I am proud of the energy and vision that were shown at United Kingdom Labour's conference this week and of the motion that was agreed to on the green new deal.

Labour is sympathetic to amendment 18, but we will abstain in the vote on the amendment. We look forward to consulting on a unique Scottish position, including on how we can take action to deliver more than 75 per cent by 2030, the interim target year.

14:45

Across the parties, there is a clear grasp of the challenges that the agriculture and land use sectors face in relation to the need for funding and advisory support in a just transition. Many also acknowledge that the carbon accounting system for farms must be altered to recognise peat restoration and tree planting.

We have all received significant numbers of emails that call for bolder interim targets. Many of us have been in dialogue with extinction rebellion members about their radical, brave demands.

I also expect that members from across the parties were at the climate strike last Friday, and I hope that the demonstrators' enthusiasm, frustration and unity rocked us all. Above all, the interim target is about justice for those young people. If we set a business-as-usual target, we will shake their trust in this Parliament—another of the institutions that, so far and for too long, have failed to take the issue seriously. I do not want this Parliament to shake its head and turn its back on those brilliant young people, on the generations to come and on the global south.

I urge members to support a stronger interim target for Scotland, to show that we are world leaders and to go on from there.

I move amendment 17.

Mark Ruskell (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green): We have 10 years left—just two parliamentary sessions—in which to tackle the climate emergency. That is the challenge that has been laid down by the scientists and by the thousands of young people who are protesting on our streets. The emergency is the debt that we carry from our industrial history and it demands that we do our fair and equitable share. If we do not come out of today with a bill that rises to that challenge, we will have spectacularly failed ourselves, the young and future generations.

The Greens have led the call to strengthen the 2030 targets in the bill. Eighty per cent by 2030 would dramatically improve our chances of keeping the world within 1.5° of warming. That would give us the best hope that we can survive extinction. A lower target and the advice from the United Kingdom Committee on Climate Change are based on a gamble—a 50:50 chance of keeping the world safely within 1.5° of warming. Presiding Officer, would you gamble your children's future on the flip of a coin? I would not.

In its stage 1 evidence, the UK Committee on Climate Change was clear that ramping up action now in areas such as tree planting, agriculture, housing and energy means that we can go much faster. Many of the amendments that we will consider later today will drive that greater ambition.

Parliament is waiting for the Scottish Government to fully review all policies and propose new actions. We cannot wait for yet more delay and years of analysis of our options. We know what needs to be done. We know that a Scottish Green new deal, using every lever available to transition to a zero carbon economy, is the transformational change that we need.

Labour proposed a moderate increase—to 75 per cent—to the 2030 target. I welcome that and the commitment from the SNP today, but it is not enough. We need a clear and bold direction today: to do what is necessary and fair; to reduce the risk; to send the strongest signal that the climate emergency demands an emergency response—the only response. It starts here, by raising that ambition to 80 per cent by 2030.

Maurice Golden (West Scotland) (Con): Business as usual will only make worse the dangers presented by the climate emergency declared earlier this year by the UK and Scottish Governments. That is why the Scottish Conservatives supported the Scottish Government's commitment to setting a more ambitious emissions target for 2045 and, earlier this year, voted in favour of amendments to bring forward interim targets. We recognise that urgent action is needed to tackle the climate emergency and to make real progress on reducing emissions. Today, we will vote for the more ambitious interim target of 75 per cent by 2030.

Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP): My five years as the climate change minister fundamentally changed my life. When we set a 2050 target, I told colleagues that I hoped to be 104 years old then. I am very grateful that we have brought the target forward by five years—I will be only 99 years old in 2045. In 2030, I hope to be 84. That tells members that this is not about a wrinkly old soul such as me, but about the generations who will follow.

I admire unambiguously and without reservation the efforts of youngsters. At the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee, we had a primary-age school student come to talk to us. She was a most impressive person. We owe it to her and to all the youngsters who have been campaigning to set targets that are realistic, that are founded in science and that will be hard for us to deliver on.

Initially, I had reservations about the 75 per cent target. The 70 per cent figure is already a world-leading target, but a 75 per cent target would entrench Scotland's position as a world leader in climate change. However, there is nothing good about being a world leader if we do not use that leadership to persuade others, because we produce but one seven hundredth of the world's emissions.

I hope that the Parliament will unite, because, at the end of the day, if we have a unanimous view, we will have the credibility to persuade others. We must do that to support future generations.

Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD): I rise to support amendment 17, in the name of Claudia Beamish, which I was delighted to co-sign. I

commend her on her shuttle-diplomacy efforts over recent days, which I think have reaped rewards.

It is widely recognised that we face a climate emergency. Some reached that conclusion earlier than others, but we must now use that general acceptance as a platform from which to launch a more ambitious response to the challenges that we face.

Scottish Liberal Democrats welcome the fact that, during its scrutiny of the bill, Parliament has already chosen to adopt a target of net zero emissions by 2045. That represents an important step forward in ambition and urgency, and it is supported by the UKCCC's advice.

However, setting such a target is largely symbolic unless we also commit to greater ambition and urgency in the early stages—that is, over the next decade. The IPCC report in 2018 could not have been clearer when it said that

“Limiting global warming to 1.5°C would require rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented changes in all aspects of society”.

It also said that

“What happens between now and 2030 is crucial”.

In response to that advice, setting a target of a 70 per cent reduction in emissions by 2030 is inadequate. It represents only a marginal increase in what we set in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, and, as the UKCCC has itself acknowledged, it emerged from the approach of simply

“drawing a straight line from emissions in 2020 to the date of net-zero”.

Setting a more ambitious target for 2030 still needs to be based on what is realistic and achievable. If nothing else, that will allow us to take people with us, to ensure that they can and will play their part in the necessary transition.

There has been much discussion with colleagues across the parties about what an appropriate figure might be, and I welcome the cross-party engagement that has characterised the scrutiny of the bill. I believe that 75 per cent sets the right balance. It is stretching—it will be extremely challenging—but it is achievable and sets us on course for net zero emissions by 2045.

Of course there should be scope in the bill for targets to be reviewed as evidence and opportunities change, but to go beyond 75 per cent at this stage would lack credibility. I support the amendment in Claudia Beamish's name.

Roseanna Cunningham: Throughout the bill process, the Government has remained committed to following the independent expert advice of the Committee on Climate Change on what

constitutes the most ambitious, yet credible, targets.

We immediately lodged amendments at stage 2 to put the CCC's recommended targets, including net zero by 2045 and a 70 per cent reduction by 2030, into the bill. The approach of following the CCC's advice is also what the ECCLR Committee called for in its stage 2 report on the bill.

One of the key strengths of Scotland's approach to emissions reductions—and one of the reasons why it has been so successful to date—is the reliance on an evidence-based approach that is based on the best available scientific advice. The Government remains committed to maintaining that link between the evidence and the pathway that we place Scotland on for the years to come.

The CCC has set out the most robust scientific assessment of the right targets for Scotland and the UK. It is clear that our 2045 net zero target is correct and the most ambitious scientifically feasible. The CCC has also set out that there is a gap in its detailed analysis of the path for emissions in the years up to 2045. In the absence of that detailed work, which the CCC has committed to undertake, its initial analysis suggested that the right target for Scotland for 2030 was 70 per cent. The CCC explicitly said that it had chosen a "prudent" target of 70 per cent, and we have always been clear that we believe that that meets the requirements of the Paris climate agreement.

Mark Ruskell: Will the cabinet secretary reflect on whether it is credible to seek advice that is based on only a 50 per cent chance of keeping global temperatures within 1.5°? Is that not selling out future generations?

Roseanna Cunningham: I will ensure that the Committee on Climate Change is aware of Mark Ruskell's views of its expertise.

It is clear that now is the time for even greater ambition in tackling the world's climate emergency and that signals matter. That is why we will commit, today, to going further and will adopt a target of a 75 per cent reduction in Scotland's greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 by supporting Labour's amendment 17. However, we will also commit to seeking further, more detailed, advice from the CCC next year on that new 2030 target. A reduction of 70 per cent and a reduction of 75 per cent both more than meet what the IPCC special report says is needed globally over the next decade to prevent warming of more than 1.5°.

All parties supporting amendment 17 must understand how enormously challenging a 75 per cent target will be and must be prepared to join us in making the difficult delivery decisions that will follow. In agreeing to what is by far the most

ambitious statutory target for 2030 of any country anywhere in the world, Parliament is committing itself to supporting the pathway that is set out in the bill and the tough policies that that pathway requires.

Let me say clearly to the Opposition parties that when recent proposals have been put forward to tackle emissions—the introduction of a workplace parking levy, for example—they have been met with fierce opposition. For us to have any hope of achieving a higher target for 2030, the parties that call for that higher target and claim to be serious about tackling climate change will need to back such assertions with action. If Parliament sets a higher target, it is no longer an option for any party to stand in the way of the measures that we need to take to tackle climate change.

The 75 per cent target also represents a clear challenge to the UK Government to step up and match Scotland's high ambition. The current UK target for 2030 of a 57 per cent reduction will not support the delivery of a 75 per cent reduction here in Scotland. I invite members to note that the CCC's recommended 70 per cent target—let alone a 75 per cent target—for 2030 would be the most ambitious target in law of any country in the world. I have already referred to the UK's current target of 57 per cent; the EU's current target is 40 per cent, and Sweden's main target for that year, which applies to some sectors only, is 63 per cent. I therefore urge members to reject the Green Party's amendment 18.

The Presiding Officer: I call Claudia Beamish to wind up and to press or withdraw amendment 17.

Claudia Beamish: I thank Liam McArthur and the Tories for supporting the Scottish Labour amendment. I recognise that the Greens have gone further today, and Scottish Labour will consult on an 80 per cent target, partly in view of what happened at the Labour Party conference yesterday in relation to the green jobs revolution. We will see where we go with that. It is imperative that, across the chamber, we all continue to assess whether we can go further than we will go today. However, I have listened to what the cabinet secretary said. We have to do this in a way that supports communities, workers and the global south. That is important.

Stewart Stevenson highlighted that we call ourselves world leaders—I certainly think that we are up there.

Very excitingly, next year, the COP—the conference of the parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change—will be coming to Glasgow. We should all push forward as hard as we can to ensure that we are the very best so that we are a strong example to

the world. As a developed country, we must ensure that we do not impact heavily or, if possible, that we do not impact at all on the global south.

I am sitting next to Sarah Boyack, who was involved in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, as was Stewart Stevenson. I recognise their work and the work of others who introduced that law. I recognise how far we have come, but I also recognise how far we have to go. Sarah Boyack has just reminded me we will have three sessions of Parliament before the targets come to fruition, as we hope and expect they will. Which of us will be here? In a sense, that does not really matter. What matters is that our children and our children's children will be more likely to have a real future and real quality of life, and that children across the world will be less likely to be climate migrants. We hope that, wherever they are, they will be able to stay there and have a good quality of life.

Let us be sure that we reach the targets in an equitable way. I press amendment 17.

Amendment 17 agreed to.

Amendment 18 moved—[Mark Ruskell].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 18 be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division. As it is the first division of the afternoon, I will suspend the Parliament for five minutes while I summon members to the chamber.

15:01

Meeting suspended.

15:06

On resuming—

The Presiding Officer: We will proceed with the division on amendment 18.

For

Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)

Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)

Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Abstentions

Baillie, Jackie (Dumarton) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 7, Against 92, Abstentions 19.

Amendment 18 disagreed to.

Section 5—The target-setting criteria

The Presiding Officer: Group 3 is on sustainable development and climate justice. Amendment 19, in the name of Claudia Beamish, is grouped with amendments 3, 20, 4, 1, 6, 9, 10 to 12, 12A, 14, 14A and 16.

Claudia Beamish: Are we on group 3, Presiding Officer?

The Presiding Officer: Yes.

Claudia Beamish: Thank you. I am sorry—I am feeling overwhelmed, already. Okay. On we go.

My amendments in group 3 are designed to ensure that Scotland stands up for climate justice, and that ministers act with respect to Scotland's historically high emissions and support the global south in its climate action. Members will recall that I lodged amendments that covered those issues at stage 2, so I thank the Government for the dialogue that we had over the summer.

We must play our part and do no further harm. Amendment 10 seeks to add to the bill a “climate justice principle”, which the amendment defines as

“the importance of”

mitigation and adaptation to climate change

“in ways which ... support ... people who are most affected by climate change but who have done the least to cause it and are the least equipped to adapt to its effects, and ... help to address inequality.”

Amendment 10 is significant: the importance of adding that principle to the bill cannot be overstated. Climate change is inextricably linked to human rights, and it exacerbates inequality by disproportionately affecting people who are already marginalised. In the global south especially, people's lives, health, housing, sanitation, food and water are all put on the line by developed countries dragging their feet and making decisions that suit themselves.

Amendment 10 would add the climate justice principle, which would mean that ministers would have to have regard to it when preparing climate change plans. That would be welcome, so I urge all members to support it today.

I also urge members to support amendment 19, which would add reference to the principle to the target-setting criteria. That would be a much more meaningful way to deliver climate justice—by including it in the approach to the overall ambition and speed of tackling climate change, rather than just in our domestic emissions reduction plan.

Amendment 4 would further amend the definition of

“fair and safe Scottish emissions budget”,

which is already in the bill, to include reference to article 3 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which includes extremely worthy principles, including

“equity ... common but differentiated responsibilities ... special circumstances of developing country Parties”,

the precautionary principle, sustainable development and support for sustainable economic growth.

Amendment 20, however, goes somewhat further than amendment 4, and I hope that there will be support for it from across the chamber. It makes explicit reference to the principles of

“equity and ... common but differentiated responsibilities”.

Those principles are the essence of ensuring the “fair” part of a “fair and safe ... budget”. I understand that the cabinet secretary has concerns about competing hierarchies, but without amendment 20, those vital aspects will be absent from the face of the bill, and will exist only in a reference.

Amendment 6 is also a result of dialogue with the cabinet secretary following stage 2, and would add

“supporting ... action in developing countries”

to tackle climate change to the scope of climate change plans. It would specifically require ministers to set out how they will do that

“by the sharing of expertise and technology”.

That is more in line with Scotland's delivery of climate justice, on which we have a strong record, led by the Scottish Government, and with supporting those who are least equipped to deal with a crisis that is not of their own making.

Finally, I have in group 3 a number of amendments relating to sustainable development. Amendment 3 would add sustainable development considerations, including the UN sustainable development goals, to the target-setting criteria.

Amendment 12 would require that climate change plans set out how they are expected to contribute to achieving sustainable development goals, and amendment 14 would add reference to those goals to the general duty in relation to sustainable development in section 92 of the 2009 act.

Amendments 12A and 14A would add the stipulation that considerations should be given to ensuring that Scotland's actions

“do not negatively impact on the ability of other countries to achieve sustainable development.”

The amendments would add a much stronger duty to properly account for the “do no harm” principle, which, in reality, is “do no more harm.”

Amendments 9 and 11 are minor consequential amendments, and amendment 16 includes a definition of the UN sustainable development goals.

I will also support Angus MacDonald's amendment 1, which makes important reference to the 1.5°C limit, under which we must all stay if we are to have a safe and prosperous world in the future.

I urge members to agree to the amendments in group 3 to show the world that Scotland is a member of the global community and is taking a moral approach to the climate emergency.

I move amendment 19.

Angus MacDonald (Falkirk East) (SNP): Amendment 1 is similar to amendment 97, which I lodged at stage 2. I thank the Government for its assistance in refining the amendment.

Amendment 1 will ensure that regular independent expert advice will be sought and published on how Scotland's targets relate to

global efforts to limit warming to 1.5°C. Needless to say, I am pleased that the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee and the Scottish Government have recognised the importance of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's special report “Global Warming of 1.5°C”. The UKCCC describes its subsequent target recommendations for Scotland, which are reflected in the bill, as being

“towards the high end of the estimated range of necessary reductions for a limit of 1.5°C”.

Therefore, it is incredibly important that the targets continue to be kept under regular review in the light of further developments in science, and progress through efforts that are made in other countries.

15:15

The bill will ensure that updated advice from the Committee on Climate Change is sought at least every five years. Those requests for advice will include requests for the CCC's views on the appropriate level for the fair and safe emissions budget for Scotland, which is defined in relation to the internationally agreed global temperature aim that is set out in the Paris agreement. That aim references “well below” 2°C, as well as 1.5°C.

In effect, amendment 1 will provide a way to ensure that expert advice on how Scotland's targets relate to the 1.5°C limit in the Paris agreement will continue to be sought and made available.

I urge members to support amendment 1.

Mark Ruskell: I thank Claudia Beamish and Angus MacDonald for their amendments. The bill is a response to the Paris agreement, and the spirit and substance of that agreement must be delivered in the heart of the bill.

Our industrial revolution created a huge climate debt that has been passed on to communities around the world, including ones that have barely begun their own development journeys. We have to allow countries in the developing world the room to breathe in the climate emergency. Our target setting must be equitable, and we have to be mindful of the climate injustice and suffering that is happening with just 1°C warming, let alone what might come in the decades ahead. Our role must also be to smooth the path to sustainable development for all countries, and not put barriers in their way through our actions at home.

For those reasons, Greens strongly back all the amendments in group 3.

Sarah Boyack (Lothian) (Lab): I support all the amendments in group 3 because they are about cross-cutting and global action. The key issue with the UN sustainable development goals is that

there is no one policy lever. We have to ensure that climate action cuts right across all the relevant issues around the world—housing, transport, energy, economy, biodiversity, flooding and equalities. All the SDGs must be acted on.

At the forefront, we need the concept of global justice, so that when we work, through the United Nations, on support for the global south, we acknowledge that it is already facing huge poverty issues and inequalities. Action must be factored into all our trade, aid and business policies.

I thank the Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund for the work that it has done in promoting amendments. I am thankful for the work that many of our charities do in supporting countries and people who are already experiencing what climate change will eventually be like all around the globe. Groups including Oxfam, Tearfund and Christian Aid do essential work.

As sea levels rise, people will be shifted from their countries. We already see the impact of rising sea levels in places such as Bangladesh, and there are already climate refugees. This year is being seen as one of the worst and most disastrous in memory with regard to the number of people who have had to leave their homes because of climate change. We need to focus on that. Floods, landslides, tornadoes and other natural disasters are not all direct results of our climate emergency, but they give us an insight into what the future holds if we do not act.

Let us all support the amendments in group 3. I hope that colleagues in every party will support them, because they are practical and they are ethical. They are what we need to do. If we are going to say that we are one of the most radical countries in the world in terms of tackling the climate emergency, we have to follow through in all our policy delivery and Government actions.

Maurice Golden: Conservatives support the principles of international environmental law and the intention behind many of the amendments in group 3. I am not fully convinced that codification in the bill of international environmental law is necessary or required, but we are sympathetic to many of the amendments in group 3, nonetheless.

However, we have grave concerns that amendments 12A and 14A, which seek to “not negatively impact” the sustainable development of other countries could create a legal precedent, whereby Scottish ministers and the Scottish Government would be unable to make necessary changes to tackle climate change and instigate the creation of new sectors, industries or jobs, because those changes might have an impact on other countries. I do not want the bill to lead to further legal disputes or constrain our ability to

tackle climate change. On that basis, we will not support the amendments.

Roseanna Cunningham: I am happy to support amendment 1 from Angus MacDonald, which represents a sensible way to further reflect in the bill the importance of limiting global warming to 1.5°C. The Scottish Government has accepted the vital message of the IPCC’s special report on 1.5°C, and is committed to contributing to global efforts to reach that goal.

We must, however, be realistic about what one small country can do to affect global emissions levels. The statutory framework around targets needs to reflect that reality, as well as Scotland’s leadership. At stage 2, we amended the bill to explicitly link the definition of Scotland’s fair and safe emissions budget to the Paris agreement global temperature goal, which is to limit warming to “well below 2 °C” and to pursue

“efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 °C”.

Angus MacDonald’s amendment provides a useful and complementary addition to the target framework, by requiring ministers to regularly ask the CCC for additional advice on how Scotland’s targets will contribute to global efforts on the 1.5°C aspect of the Paris goal in particular.

I turn to the suite of amendments from Claudia Beamish, with whom there was constructive engagement over the summer. I was, however, just a little disappointed to see that she had lodged further amendments that undermine some of the areas in which I thought that we had established consensus.

I am sympathetic to the underlying purpose of this group of amendments. Climate change is a global challenge and it is right that that is clearly reflected in our domestic legislation, including through recognising the interactions between actions to reduce emissions and sustainable development. Scotland is a responsible global citizen and we recognise our moral obligation to contribute to the challenge of climate change, and to influence others to do the same.

I am content to support Claudia Beamish’s amendments where they will work to reflect those considerations in the target framework of the bill in a workable and appropriate way. The Scottish Government’s national performance framework is Scotland’s way to localise and implement the UN sustainable development goals. The framework has a focus on tackling inequalities so that no one in Scotland is left behind as we work together to achieve the goals.

Amendments 3, 11, 12, 14 and 16 from Claudia Beamish provide a strong package to reflect the importance of that policy coherence around

sustainable development at the heart of our climate change legislation.

Amendment 6 ensures that climate change plans will include a section on action to support developing countries on tackling climate change, as well as the actions to reduce emissions here in Scotland.

Amendments 9 and 10 place Scotland's proven commitment to climate justice on the face of the bill, recognising that those who have done least to cause climate change are often the ones who suffer the most from its effects. As I have said, tackling inequalities must be central to our approach and these amendments further recognise that.

Amendment 4 updates the definition of Scotland's fair and safe emissions budget, the level of which is recommended independently by the Committee on Climate Change, to link to the internationally agreed set of principles that are set out by the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Those amendments will significantly strengthen the role of sustainable development and climate justice in Scotland's climate change legislation. However, I cannot support amendments 20, 19, 12A or 14A and I urge members to reject them. Amendment 20 seeks to further amend the definition of the fair and safe emissions budget to highlight specific and selective wording from the UNFCCC principles. That approach risks creating presentational and legal hierarchies, by suggesting that those elements of the principles are more important than others. It also fails to recognise all aspects of article 3.1 of the UNFCCC, in which those principles are outlined, which sets out that developed countries should lead action to tackle climate change—precisely what Scotland is doing.

As I have indicated, I urge members to support Claudia Beamish's amendment 4, which refers to the UNFCCC principles in the round, and to reject amendment 20. The two amendments cannot both be sensibly agreed to.

Amendment 19 is unnecessary and potentially counterproductive. It seeks to add the climate justice principle to the target-setting criteria. Although I am supportive of the principle, I consider that that ground is sufficiently well covered by the existing set of criteria and that adding further principles to that would at best add no value and could at worst cause confusion.

The statutory target-setting criteria already include economic circumstances, including a particular requirement to consider jobs and employment opportunities; social circumstances, in particular the likely impact on those who live in poorer or more deprived communities; and the

likely impact on those who live in remote rural and island communities. If amendment 4 is agreed to, the UNFCCC principles will also be referred to within the criteria through the fair and safe emissions budget.

I invite members to consider that the statutory just transition principles, which we will discuss further in a later group, do not form part of the criteria. It would seem inconsistent to highlight one of our climate change plan principles over the other ones in the way that is proposed.

Amendments 12A and 14A, which seek to directly amend Claudia Beamish's own amendments, are entirely impractical. I cannot support proposals that would require, in law, assessments to be made of the impact of Scottish policies on the ability of other countries to achieve sustainable development outcomes. It is entirely unclear from the amendments how such assessments could robustly and meaningfully be undertaken. For example, it is unclear whether that duty should apply to all other countries and, if not, to which ones it should apply. Amendment 6 requires ministers to set out the positive actions that they are taking to support developing countries in tackling climate change, and we think that that is the right way forward.

To be clear, I could not support amendment 12 or amendment 14—which are otherwise positive measures—if amendments 12A and 14A were to be agreed to.

In summary, I urge members to support all the amendments in the group other than amendments 20, 19, 12A and 14A, which risk undermining the positive effects that will be achieved by the other amendments.

Claudia Beamish: I was, indeed, pleased to work with the cabinet secretary over the summer on the amendments. We went as far as it was possible to go together. However, in discussion with SCIAF and other groups, we decided that we wanted to go further, and the Parliament will have to decide whether it wants to join us in supporting the global south in what we see as the most robust way possible.

As Sarah Boyack highlighted, the sustainable development goals have no single policy lever. Climate justice encompasses all our actions and policies, and as a developed country our actions should be judged against those.

I was puzzled by what Maurice Golden said about being prevented from supporting our amendment because it would affect the global south negatively. However, he gave no examples of what he meant. If he wants to clarify that in any way, I would be happy to listen.

The Presiding Officer: Briefly, please—we are running out of time.

Maurice Golden: I can give the member an example. If a new circular economy product is produced in Scotland, that could clearly have an impact on other countries that might be producing a similar product. Therefore, putting the principle in statute could be counterproductive.

Claudia Beamish: I thank Maurice Golden for that explanation, but I still do not agree with him. I do not think that creating a product that is similar to an existing one will prevent anyone else from producing that existing one. The idea of global climate justice is not that we seek not to impact on people by producing a product that they might want to produce, but that we do not impact on them by doing things that will affect them negatively in terms of climate change. We have a global responsibility to ensure that we do not impact negatively on the ability of other countries to act.

I disagree with the cabinet secretary regarding the UNFCCC principles that she mentioned. Those principles are so important that we should highlight them in the bill.

It is fundamentally important that we recognise the issue of climate justice in the setting of every target, so I hope that members will support the provisions that I have proposed on that, as well as all my other amendments in the group.

15:30

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 19 be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)

McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinrossshire) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)

Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 34, Against 87, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 19 disagreed to.

Amendment 3 moved—[Claudia Beamish]—and agreed to.

Amendment 20 moved—[Claudia Beamish].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 20 be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)

Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)

MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 34, Against 86, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 20 disagreed to.

Amendment 4 moved—[Claudia Beamish]—and agreed to.

Section 6—Duty to seek advice from the relevant body

The Presiding Officer: I call amendment 1, in the name of Angus MacDonald.

Angus MacDonald: Firmly pressed, Presiding Officer.

Amendment 1 moved—[Angus MacDonald]—and agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: It is passed, Mr MacDonald.

After section 8

The Presiding Officer: Group 4 is on a citizens assembly. Amendment 21, in the name of Mark Ruskell, is the only amendment in the group.

Mark Ruskell: Angus MacDonald's amendment 1 was indeed firmly pressed—I could hear it from here.

I am pleased to be moving amendment 21 on the establishment of a climate citizens assembly. I welcome the cross-portfolio discussions that have been taking place, which have involved Patrick Harvie, Michael Russell, Roseanna Cunningham and me. I thank activists from outside the Parliament—some of whom might be inside the Parliament today—who have pushed hard for such an assembly to be set up.

It is clear that we will face unprecedented societal change in the years ahead. How we take people with us in designing and preparing for hard choices will be critical. A citizens assembly is essential if we are to understand the issues, set agendas and test the solutions that will go beyond our current thinking on what is possible.

The Irish Citizens' Assembly's work on climate should be a strong inspiration for our own. By feeding its work to ministers and Parliament, it set in train new actions for Ireland's climate action plan, and it was able to consider issues such as tax policy that were too thorny at first for the politicians to consider, although they eventually caught up on that.

I look forward to the establishment of Scotland's first-ever climate citizens assembly, and I hope that it will light the path to tackling the climate emergency.

I move amendment 21.

Liam McArthur: I thank Mark Ruskell for lodging amendment 21 and for setting out very clearly the case for a citizens assembly. The Scottish Liberal Democrats very much support the amendment. The circumstances are precisely the sort in which the use of a citizens assembly is justified. As Mark Ruskell has said, such assemblies can make a real contribution in identifying ways of achieving a genuinely shared objective. Perhaps the circumstances are in contrast to other instances in which such assemblies are currently being proposed.

How such citizens assemblies would interact with other sources of advice, evidence and expertise is an obvious question. However, there seems to be nothing in what Mark Ruskell has proposed that would preclude that from happening in ways that would inform and support the citizens assembly's work and ensure that ministers are able to draw on the advice that they will continue to need when they need it.

I look forward to hearing the cabinet secretary's comments, but I very much welcome Mark Ruskell's amendment.

Claudia Beamish: In the climate emergency, a climate citizens assembly is a necessary step to be inclusive and in terms of behaviour change. It will help people to connect with the Parliament.

We invited young people into the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee, and that was really effective. Sometimes, people do not feel that they can come to the Parliament, so we need to take a further step to allow people to have such discussions beyond the Parliament. We therefore support the proposal.

I want to look back to the Supreme Court's decision on parliamentary sovereignty on Tuesday, which is not far back. I feel uncomfortable about the view of some people who have approached us in relation to a citizens assembly on climate change: they would like the Scottish Parliament to be bound by its deliberations. We cannot possibly support that in a parliamentary democracy. We can be inspired and influenced by a citizens assembly, but in a parliamentary democracy we cannot be bound by it. I simply wanted to highlight that point. However, we will support the proposal.

Roseanna Cunningham: The Scottish Government supports the use of deliberative democracy in Scotland. When a problem requires a longer-term approach, a change of perspective or a development in the way that we as a country discuss the issue, involving the people of Scotland directly in the debate is the right thing to do. We will not solve the most challenging issues of the day if we do not listen to one another and hear and understand what the experts have to say and what the people are most concerned about, or if we do not as a country commit ourselves to a more respectful, balanced and informed dialogue.

The Cabinet Secretary for Government Business and Constitutional Relations set out the case for citizens assemblies generally in a recent debate in the chamber. There was support from across the parties for assemblies to look at the most challenging issues of our day, including support for an assembly on climate change.

Climate change is an issue that is well suited to a citizens assembly. It is certainly one of the most challenging issues of our day. It requires difficult decisions to be made, and it affects the daily lives and futures of every one of us.

I am happy to support the amendment to mandate the establishment of a Scottish citizens assembly on climate change. Assemblies work when they are independent, and the amendment requires that. More than anything else, citizens assemblies need to be established with a strong commitment by a country's Government and Parliament that they will take seriously the evidence that the assemblies have gathered and the recommendations that they have produced. The amendment guarantees that, too. It requires the assembly to lay its report before Parliament and to provide the Scottish ministers with a copy, to which they must respond.

I therefore support the amendment and look forward to working with parties across the Parliament to establish Scotland's citizens assembly on climate change during the remainder of this parliamentary session.

Mark Ruskell: I thank members across parties for their support for the amendment.

We are seeing deliberative democracy really taking off in Scotland. There is participatory budgeting and, in the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee, we have held our own citizens jury on the future of agricultural subsidies. The approach is genuinely engaging. It accesses views that we would not otherwise hear and brings new voices into decision making and thinking, which is hugely important.

When such initiatives are established, there is sometimes a danger of expectations running incredibly high. In this case, the expectations of the citizens assembly are very clear. It will not be a decision-making body; it will produce reports, advice and thinking that the Government and committees of Parliament will then be able to consider. I do not believe that the citizens assembly should have the responsibility of taking decisions; that responsibility rightly lies with us in Parliament. However, we should actively engage with and consider the results and work of the citizens assembly through our business in Parliament.

Amendment 21 agreed to.

Section 9—Annual targets: 2021 to year before net-zero year

Amendment 5 moved—[Roseanna Cunningham]—and agreed to.

After section 12

The Presiding Officer: Group 5 is on the approval of relevant public body budgets. Amendment 22, in the name of Mark Ruskell, is the only amendment in the group.

Mark Ruskell: Last year, I think, the national grid noticed a sudden huge drop in electricity consumption in Dundee. It took the national grid a while to work out that it was due to something happening at Ninewells hospital. A few phone calls later, there was confirmation that the hospital was okay. There was no problem, but the hospital had had its new energy system switched on, which immediately had a massive impact on the grid.

The decisions that public bodies make, particularly in relation to their infrastructure, are significant in how we tackle climate change. Such decisions can either lock in emissions for decades or make big emissions savings, which can deliver

equally big financial savings. Tackling the climate emergency means getting every institution's actions and spending going in the right direction. We need to understand how public bodies contribute to the solution through both the capital and revenue sides of their budgets. Amendment 22 will drive the conversation between public bodies and Government in support of delivery of the targets in the bill.

I move amendment 22.

Sarah Boyack: We support amendment 22, because every single one of our public bodies should, as a matter of course, be mainstreaming action on climate change. That should be agreed before their budgets are agreed. It is about leadership, culture and thinking proactively about public procurement, so that there is consideration of the impact on climate change of every investment and expenditure decision, whether it is about resilience to climate change or lowering carbon emissions.

We very much support amendment 22. It is a short amendment, but it could have a big impact on leadership and delivery on the ground.

Roseanna Cunningham: Although I have sympathy for the motivation behind amendment 22, I cannot support it, because a better way forward is not only available but already in train.

The Scottish Government is consulting on the role of public sector bodies in tackling climate change. That work includes asking a specific question about whether such bodies should report annually on how they use their resources to contribute to reducing emissions. Once the consultation is complete, the Scottish Government will introduce secondary legislation to update the statutory reporting duties under the 2009 act.

There are several reasons why taking that approach, rather than the one in amendment 22, is the right way to progress the entirely legitimate questions about how the public sector supports emissions reductions. First, the review covers the full range of public sector bodies in Scotland. In contrast, amendment 22 would exclude many significant players by being framed in terms of only those bodies for which ministers must approve

“proposals for the use of resources”.

Secondly, amendment 22 would not capture any United Kingdom public bodies that operate in Scotland, such as Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs and the Department for Work and Pensions. Just yesterday, I wrote to the UK Government to ask it to decarbonise its estates and operations in Scotland in time to allow our net zero date of 2045 to be met, rather than its target date of 2050.

Sarah Boyack: How does the cabinet secretary think that the Scottish Parliament can legislate to instruct UK Government agencies to do something? We can influence them, but it is up to them to decide.

Roseanna Cunningham: Perhaps the member should listen to what I have said. I have written to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, at Westminster, to ask the UK Government to agree to what we will discuss in relation to public sector bodies. Of course we cannot legislate for UK public sector bodies, but their emissions will add to our emissions stats. I am asking the UK Government to come on board with what we are doing.

15:45

My point is that there is a group of public sector bodies that do not submit their budgets to us. Amendment 22 would not even capture all public bodies in the devolved arena—it would exclude those such as Scottish local authorities, health boards and Crown Estate Scotland, whose budgets are their own to set. In contrast, all such bodies are captured by the public sector reporting duty, so pursuing that route forward would be substantially more effective.

For those reasons, I urge members to reject amendment 22.

Mark Ruskell: I feel as though I have been listening to this debate for some time now. Sarah Boyack has talked about mainstreaming and public procurement, which we talked about in the second session of the Scottish Parliament, yet the Government is still not taking significant action to crack the issue. The bill was the Government's opportunity to put in provisions around public bodies and in a raft of other areas in which action needs to be taken to ensure that all institutions in the country work together to tackle the climate emergency.

The opposition to my amendment is disappointing. We had a discussion on the matter over the summer. I respect the fact that consultations are under way, but this is the moment to put something into legislation. Amendment 22 might not capture absolutely all public bodies, but it would move the situation forward significantly. The committee received evidence from the national health service in particular about the importance of reducing energy use, tackling climate change and improving the financial bottom line of many of our public institutions. We should be driving that forward right now. Just because amendment 22 is not complete in its scope does not mean that we cannot agree to it now and then consult on other areas that are

not covered by it with a view to improving action over time.

I press amendment 22.

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 22 be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Ferguson (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)

Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 28, Against 93, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 22 disagreed to.

After section 15

The Presiding Officer: Group 6 is on a nitrogen balance sheet. Amendment 23, in the name of Maurice Golden, is grouped with manuscript amendment 23A.

Maurice Golden: Amendments 23 and 23A seek to introduce a requirement on the Scottish ministers to create a balance sheet to measure nitrogen flows across all sectors and media in Scotland within 18 months of the bill being passed. I thank the Presiding Officer for accepting my manuscript amendment, which seeks to change the relevant timescale from 12 to 18 months. I think that a period of 18 months is more appropriate, as it will allow more time for research, modelling and consultation.

Nitrogen balance sheets are an established technique for understanding nitrogen flows across all sectors of the economy. A nitrogen balance sheet would allow us to calculate nitrogen use efficiency across Scotland and to develop a baseline figure for it, as well as showing areas where nitrogen should be used more efficiently. That would help us to develop fair and evidence-based policies to identify and tackle nitrogen loss across the whole of the economy, and to ensure that nitrogen efficiency is monitored and reported on, so that policy always reflects practice.

In this year's programme for government, the Scottish Government committed to developing a national nitrogen balance sheet. I hope that we have support for these amendments from not just the SNP, but members across the chamber.

I move amendments 23 and 23A.

Stewart Stevenson: I very much welcome amendments 23 and 23A. In particular, I welcome the change to 18 months. It is worth saying that in committee, John Scott and I have been concerned about the way that the international greenhouse gas inventory works in relation to agriculture. The inventory is very unfair in reflecting the cost and benefit of agriculture, because it does not attribute to agriculture things such as forestry and renewable energy.

The balance sheet will play its own part in giving us a better understanding of the positive impact that agriculture—and, for that matter, agroforestry—can have on this particular agenda. Outwith this chamber, there has been too much lazy commentary—to put it bluntly—which has not considered the full facts relating to agriculture. I am happy to support Maurice Golden's proposal on that basis, and for many other reasons as well.

Mark Ruskell: I welcome the amendments. The case for a nitrogen budget for Scotland has been building for several years, and this approach will cut pollution, waste and energy usage while saving money—especially for farmers.

Our fields are currently drenched with a staggering excess of 87kg of nitrogen per hectare. Not only is that an expensive waste of inputs; the subsequent costs of pollution and clean-ups of water and air are then, of course, borne by taxpayers.

I hope that the starting point of the budget will be compulsory soil testing, which is one of the recommendations of the UK Committee on Climate Change that the Scottish Government has not yet adopted. It should also lead to innovation and new technologies that value nitrogen as the important resource that it is.

Claudia Beamish: I will speak very briefly in support of Maurice Golden's important amendments. I identify myself with the remarks of other members who have highlighted the issues. It is a challenge for farmers when a lot of what they do is not recognised, and the nitrogen balance sheet will help. Of course, the issue affects other sectors as well.

For quite a time in committee, in this parliamentary session and in the previous one, we have grappled with nitrogen. It is not before time that we are able to support these amendments, and I really hope that they are agreed to.

Liam McArthur: Like others, I rise to speak in support of the amendments. The manuscript amendment is very welcome in that it buys a little bit more time. Although there seem to be concerns around flexibility over the longer term, none of them are insurmountable.

As Stewart Stevenson rightly pointed out, the issue of providing greater balance in relation to the pros and cons of the role that agriculture plays in helping us to meet our climate change challenges is—in part—addressed through the amendments. Therefore, I very much welcome them, and confirm that the Liberal Democrats will support them.

Roseanna Cunningham: As indicated by Maurice Golden, the Scottish Government committed in the programme for government to preparing a nationwide nitrogen balance sheet. We recognise the value that such information can have in relation to better understanding Scotland's nitrogen cycle and allowing us to take a systemic approach to improving nitrogen use efficiency, and reducing nitrogen waste throughout the entire economy.

The first stage of the work to create a balance sheet is, necessarily, research to explore the

available evidence, which will, if it is to be done well, take some time. The amendment as it was originally lodged posed some technical difficulties, as it would have meant that the Government had substantially less time to undertake the necessary initial research. I am, therefore, very grateful to Maurice Golden for being willing to listen to those concerns and lodging a manuscript amendment to make the timing requirement more realistic. On that basis, I have no reservation in supporting the amendments.

Maurice Golden: I welcome members' comments and press amendments 23 and 23A.

Amendment 23A agreed to.

Amendment 23, as amended, agreed to.

After section 17A

The Presiding Officer: Group 7 is on emissions attributable to consumption of goods and services: reports and proposals and policies. Amendment 24, in the name of Mark Ruskell, is grouped with amendment 34.

Mark Ruskell: It would be blinkered of us to focus solely on cutting emissions at home while increasing emissions through the consumption of products that are made abroad. It is unfortunate that the picture in that regard is worsening. We live in a consumer society. Consumption emissions are not falling fast enough, and those that are embedded in imported goods and services are rising.

If we are to get a grip on that picture, we need consumption emissions to be reported by sector and we then need to consider how those emissions can be cut, addressing the matter through the climate change plan.

I welcome the constructive discussions with the Government on consumption and I thank the Government for its support for amendments 24 and 34.

I move amendment 24.

Roseanna Cunningham: I am content to support amendments 24 and 34 and I am grateful to Mark Ruskell for working with the Government on the amendments over the summer.

Consumption-based emissions associated with imported goods and services—commonly referred to as our carbon footprint—form an important part of the wider climate change picture. Scotland is already a leader in that it is one of the very few countries that publish regular official statistics on their carbon footprint. One of the national indicators is based on the metric.

It is appropriate that the bill should strengthen reporting duties, as is provided for in amendment

24, and that it ensures that measures to reduce consumption-based emissions are included in the scope of climate change plans, as is provided for in amendment 34.

We must remember that international practice, including under the Paris agreement, is to report emissions on a territorial basis, in part because doing so avoids risks of double counting. Reducing territorial emissions—that is, those from sources located here in Scotland—needs to remain the main focus of our target framework and efforts.

Amendments 24 and 34 strike a sensible balance between those considerations. They will strengthen the complementary role for carbon footprint reporting without jeopardising the necessary focus on reducing emissions at source.

Amendment 24 agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: Group 8 is on land use strategy. Amendment 25, in the name of Claudia Beamish, is grouped with amendment 27.

Claudia Beamish: Amendments 25 and 27 are designed to better align our land use strategy with climate change action. I am pleased that they have the support of a number of non-governmental organisations, including WWF Scotland, Scottish Land & Estates, NFU Scotland and Nourish Scotland.

A key part of the 2009 act was the recognition of the key role that land use plays in climate mitigation and adaptation. However, there has been little progress on policy delivery. There has been no reporting since 2016, and in our view the issue is underresourced. The Government has not taken seriously enough the need for the land use principles to underpin planning.

However, we welcomed the commitment in this year's programme for government to develop proposals to establish land use partnerships by 2021 and task them with the creation of frameworks by 2023. The amendments in my name support that commitment, and I will be confused if the Scottish Government does not support them.

Amendment 25 would strengthen the mandate of the land use strategy to facilitate delivery of climate change targets. Amendment 27 would require the Scottish ministers to set out, in the climate change plan, proposals and policies on the establishment, support and resourcing of regional land use partnerships and frameworks.

Regional land use partnerships and frameworks are key to the identification of land use priorities, in partnership with landowners and communities, to bring multiple carbon dioxide benefits, through targeted public spending to support delivery. An appropriate land use strategy would support

climate action and the transition to a carbon-positive rural landscape as well as the development of the important role of carbon sequestration, as the UK Committee on Climate Change has highlighted.

I move amendment 25.

16:00

Roseanna Cunningham: The programme for government commits us to establishing regional land use partnerships and frameworks by 2023. Amendments 25 and 27 are broadly in line with those commitments, and I am content to accept them.

The development of regional land use partnerships and frameworks is likely to be complicated, and that is reflected in the phased approach that the programme for government sets out. To ensure that we get it right, it is important that we maintain that phased approach, so that regional partnerships and frameworks are as effective as possible in contributing to tackling climate change.

I am content that amendment 27 provides a reasonable way to ensure that progress on delivering those commitments is reflected in future climate change plans.

On amendment 25, in relation to annual reporting on progress on the land use strategy, I have concerns that such reporting might prove to duplicate what will be set out, in any case, in the monitoring reports on the climate change plan. Nonetheless, I recognise the desire for regular reporting on the land use strategy in its own right and, on that basis, I am prepared to support amendment 25.

Claudia Beamish: This has been a long time in the coming. I am delighted that the cabinet secretary is supporting the amendments and I hope that members across the chamber will do the same. As we go forward, it is vital that tackling climate change is at the heart of our land use strategies and regional partnerships. To have that commitment in the bill is significant.

Amendment 25 agreed to.

Section 19—Climate change plan

The Presiding Officer: Group 9 is on the timing of the first climate change plan and monitoring report. Amendment 26, in the name of Mark Ruskell, is grouped with amendment 13.

Mark Ruskell: The past few months of this climate emergency have seen everybody, including the Greens, reassess whether our proposals are fit to deliver an unprecedented rate of change. The amendments that have already

been passed today lay down fresh challenges. A revised climate plan is needed. A tweak here and there to a revised plan will not cut it. It has to be a priority for Government to deliver a fresh plan, with fresh ambition, in the next six months.

I move amendment 26.

Roseanna Cunningham: First, I will respond to amendment 26, which I was disappointed to see lodged again after the stage 2 discussions in the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee. In line with what the committee called for in its stage 2 report, the First Minister has made a clear commitment to update the current climate change plan within six months of royal assent. Amendment 26 would instead require an entire new climate change plan process to be completed within six months. That proposition is significantly different from the committee's recommendation and is not just unreasonable but flat-out impossible.

Extensive statutory requirements govern a full plan process. A draft version of the plan would need to be laid and scrutinised by Parliament within the proposed six-month window. Amendments that were agreed at stage 2 in response to the committee's recommendations mean that at least four of those months must be occupied by parliamentary scrutiny. That would leave the Government with less than two months to design, prepare and consult on the plan. That is clearly untenable, particularly given the additional elements to the process that were added to the bill via amendments at stage 2.

For example, the bill requires that the CCC's views be sought on draft plans. A reasonable amount of time would need to be given to the CCC to do that, and the Government would want to consider the CCC's advice before laying the plan in Parliament. If we allowed a month for that process, we would be in a position where the draft plan would have to be produced, consulted on and to have all its statutory assessments completed in just one month.

The Parliament agreed to the Environmental Assessment (Scotland) Act 2005, which requires the Government to conduct strategic environmental assessments of plans and programmes that are likely to have significant environmental effects. It would not be possible to meet that statutory requirement and a statutory requirement to finalise a new climate change plan, including parliamentary scrutiny of four months, within a six-month period.

There is a global climate emergency and, in response, meaningful, swift action is needed. The current climate plan was published just over 18 months ago, following a process of parliamentary scrutiny. The ECCLR Committee called for an

updated plan, and the First Minister and I have made clear commitments to delivering that. Doing so within six months will be very challenging, but that is what we are committed to.

Amendment 26 is not practicable or reasonable, and I strongly urge members to reject it. In contrast, amendment 13, in my name, represents a pragmatic adjustment to the timing of future climate change plan monitoring reports in light of the commitment to update the current climate change plan within six months.

The bill places annual reporting on a statutory footing. As recommended by the ECCLR Committee, the timing of the reports has now been moved to fall before summer recess each year. Our commitment to updating the current plan within six months of royal assent means that that can be expected in late spring next year. It would not make sense for there to be a requirement to lay a set of monitoring reports at the same time as we lay the updated plan. To avoid that scenario, under amendment 17, the first set of monitoring reports under the bill arrangements will be required in May 2021.

That does not mean that no monitoring of the current climate change plan will occur until 2021. Building from the first plan monitoring report in October 2018, I confirm today that we will publish a second annual report later this autumn. The monitoring information in that report will help to inform the process of updating the plan itself.

Maurice Golden: We will support amendment 13. However, I appreciate Mark Ruskell's intention behind the amendment for a new climate change plan. The Conservatives agree that there should be a new plan. There is a requirement on the Government to set out and chart our progress towards the new targets that we have agreed to today. However, the associated timescale of six months is just too stretching. As the Opposition, we want to put as much pressure on the Government as possible, but we also want to be fair and reasonable. Amendment 26 does not meet that test.

Claudia Beamish: Anything new that comes forward in relation to the climate emergency can be put into an updated plan with the agreement of the ECCLR Committee and Parliament. Having reflected on what the cabinet secretary has said today—I understood her to say that there will be an updated plan within six months—we will abstain on amendment 26 and support amendment 13. I see that she is nodding in agreement—I thank the cabinet secretary.

Mark Ruskell: I welcome the cabinet secretary's clarification about the Government's plans for the process. We have to ensure that the revision to the climate change plan is meaningful

and that there is enough time and involvement from committees to scrutinise what comes out of the bill. We are making big changes today, and the bill will have big implications.

I welcome Opposition parties' support for the intention behind amendment 26 but, having reflected on the cabinet secretary's contribution and her reassurances, I will not press it.

Amendment 26, by agreement, withdrawn.

Amendment 27 moved—[Claudia Beamish].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 27 be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)

Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Abstentions

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)

Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 92, Against 0, Abstentions 27.

Amendment 27 agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: Group 10 is on climate change plan: proposals and policies. Amendment 28, in the name of Mark Ruskell, is grouped with amendments 29 to 31, 31A, 31B, 32 and 33.

Mark Ruskell: There is a frustration among Opposition parties in the Parliament. For years now, we have continually highlighted what we see as poor ambition on climate change, especially in the areas of housing and farming. Stronger action, as called for by the UK Committee on Climate Change, should have been embedded in the climate change plan, but it was not and so we needed to take action through this legislation.

I will start with the amendments on farming in this group, all of which we accept. It is clear that, while countries such as France have forged ahead, creating ambitious agro-ecology action plans to cover emissions, restore biodiversity and support farm businesses, in Scotland we remain stuck in preserving the status quo. We know how to change, as we have excellent, if underfunded, research institutes. We can restore our soil by integrating trees into farm systems and we can expand organic production. We can design advice and financial support to drive the farming transition, while recognising the whole contribution that farm holdings can make to the nation's carbon balance sheet.

On housing, draughty, cold homes are dragging down our efforts to cut household emissions, which need a fresh focus alongside a determination to end the disgrace of fuel poverty. A tolerable standard of energy performance certificate ratings of at least C must be the norm for the vast majority of households in Scotland. We can learn from mass retrofit approaches across Europe, as well as the targeted approaches to helping people in hard-to-heat properties to access advice and financial support.

We must also be pioneering and look to new frontiers in preserving and locking up carbon. Today, the IPCC has launched its new report on the oceans, demanding that future climate plans recognise and support those ecosystems in their role as carbon sinks, as well as their ability to help us to adapt to extreme weather. Kelp has never been more important.

Finally, we need clarity from the Government on its policies for fossil fuel extraction including unconventional oil and gas. There has been a welcome change in tone from the First Minister, but while we still wait for a legally watertight

fracking ban to be delivered, the Government's policies on fossil fuels cannot exist in a silo away from the climate plans. The need for transition has to be addressed in the heart of those plans, regardless of the level of ambition. I have therefore lodged amendments across a range of policy areas.

I move amendment 28.

Maurice Golden: I start with amendment 33, on an agricultural modernisation fund. It would introduce a requirement for the Scottish ministers to set out in the climate change plan their proposals and policies for such a fund to reduce greenhouse gas emissions on Scottish farms. This year's programme for government set out the Scottish Government's plans to consider such funding in the budget as part of a new agricultural transformation programme. Amendment 33 would ensure that policies and proposals for any future agricultural modernisation fund are considered in the next climate change plan. Taking forward policies and proposals for funding to support climate-friendly farming practices could contribute to on-farm carbon sequestration and emissions reductions. Funding is not at present available to support farmers and the up-front costs that are associated with reducing emissions from agriculture are often prohibitive.

Amendment 31 seeks to introduce a requirement for the Scottish ministers to set out in the climate change plan their proposals and policies for a whole-farm approach to emissions accounting on Scottish farms. The amendment would require the climate change plan to set out the Scottish ministers' proposals and policies regarding the establishment of a whole-farm approach to emissions accounting on Scottish farms and regarding the reduction of Scottish whole-farm greenhouse gas emissions through the use of, among other things, research, knowledge transfer and advice, and circular economy initiatives.

16:15

I am pleased to have cross-party support for amendment 31. However, I will not support amendments 31A and 31B, which are amendments to my amendment, as I believe that they would make the provision that will be inserted into the bill overly prescriptive.

Amendment 32 seeks to introduce a requirement on the Scottish ministers to set out in the climate change plan their proposals and policies on the potential for capture and storage of carbon when designating marine protected areas. The amendment would encourage the Scottish Government to take account of the potential for

carbon sequestration alongside biodiversity concerns when designating MPAs.

Claudia Beamish: We will support amendment 28, in the name of Mark Ruskell, which will oblige us to have a discussion on the future of our fossil fuel industry. That discussion needs to be had across the Parliament in relation to the climate emergency and a just transition. The amendment also highlights the Parliament's position on onshore fracking.

We support amendment 29, in the name of Mark Ruskell, because research is needed to build on what we know about marine ecosystems. We need to mirror the journey from research to action that there has been on peatlands. In the climate change plan, we have teetered around providing real support for marine ecosystems and blue carbon. That should be a priority, and there should be more research into the issue.

On amendment 30, in the name of Mark Ruskell, we are positive about the possibilities for measures on housing to reduce climate change emissions and about the multiple benefits that come to communities across Scotland, particularly rural communities, and to people who are in fuel poverty. Such measures will lead to a better quality of life for people and will support the UN right to a home, which in Scotland should of course be a warm home.

Amendment 31, in the name of Maurice Golden, which is supported by Mark Ruskell, builds on Mark Ruskell's stage 2 amendment relating to whole-farm commitments and on work by colleagues on the committee, including John Scott—I send my good wishes to him—and Finlay Carson. It is an important amendment, because agriculture is one of the heaviest and most intractable emitters of greenhouse gases. The amendment would give cause for optimism, as it would clarify robustly the range of issues in relation to the way forward. It is valuable for those issues to be set out. The inclusion of support and advice mechanisms will help with a just transition for the land use and agriculture sector.

My amendments 31A and 31B are additions to amendment 31. They would add carbon sequestration and agroforestry to the list of areas through which Scottish farms can reduce whole-farm greenhouse gas emissions.

We will support amendment 31, as it proposes a worthwhile addition to the plan that will provide a more rounded approach to the understanding of farm emissions and ministers' support for farmers in the climate emergency.

Mike Rumbles (North East Scotland) (LD): I am genuinely not clear about what amendment 31A on carbon sequestration by whole farms

entails. Will she be a little more specific about what she is advocating?

Claudia Beamish: I will explain what I am advocating. Up until now, it has often been the case that farmers have been doing work on carbon sequestration and peatlands, but it has not been recognised or supported. It is important that amendment 31A is agreed to so that that work is recognised.

I find it disappointing that, if I understand it correctly, Maurice Golden is not going to support either my amendment on peatland restoration or my amendment on agroforestry, because those are ways forward through which farmers can contribute, and they can bring great benefits for farmers. My amendments are not overprescriptive. Peatland restoration and agroforestry are important methods of land management and they deserve attention. They should be included in the bill, and including them would bring further discussion and increase the common understanding of options for greener farming and working with nature.

Combining woodlands, tree planting and hedging for growing or grazing in agroforestry and seasonal shade and shelter as well as riparian planting to avoid erosion are only a few examples of the value that agroforestry can bring, and it should be at the heart of the bill given the climate emergency. I stress that, with the great deal of work that has been done by Nourish Scotland, my two amendments have been supported as strengthening additions to amendment 31.

Roseanna Cunningham: The amendments in group 10 all seek to constrain the content of future climate change plans by setting out policies and proposals on specific matters. Parliament already has substantial input to the design of plans through scrutiny of draft versions. The amendments in the group run the risk of overly prescribing a set of policy areas, restricting the process of plan preparation and introducing a hierarchy of policy options, with those that are chosen to be in the bill taking precedence over all others. Concerns about that remain.

Nevertheless, I have reflected on the decisions that the committee made at stage 2 and on the ongoing desire for more such amendments. As such, I have looked closely at each of the amendments in group 10 with a view to supporting them when possible.

I can accept amendment 28, which will require our future climate change plans to include our policies on onshore and offshore oil and gas.

I am sympathetic to amendments 29 and 32 on blue carbon. Our oceans are vital in mitigating climate change, and Parliament's interest in the marine environment is welcome.

However, it would not be sensible for both amendments to be agreed to. I am of the view that Maurice Golden's amendment 32 reflects the status of the emerging and evolving evidence base better than Mark Ruskell's amendment 29. In particular, I ask colleagues to remember that international scientific guidelines on measurement of carbon storage in marine environments do not yet support its being included in national greenhouse gas inventories.

Claudia Beamish: My understanding is that there is a vital focus on planning for and monitoring marine protected areas in Maurice Golden's amendment 32, whereas Mark Ruskell's amendment 29 is more widely drawn and highlights the whole marine environment and the opportunities there. That is why Scottish Labour will support both amendments.

Roseanna Cunningham: I am in the process of explaining why I think that Maurice Golden's amendment 32 suits the present situation better. International scientific guidelines for measurement simply do not exist.

I am glad that Claudia Beamish mentioned the reference to marine protected areas in amendment 25, because it is welcome. If the MPA network needs to be adapted in the future, it is right that potential sequestration of carbon be a material consideration in site selection, designation and management. I urge members to support amendment 32 and to reject amendment 29.

I can accept amendment 30, which will require our climate change plans to set out measures that are linked to a majority of homes achieving energy performance certificate ratings of C or above, where practical, by the end of the plan period. The CCC has been clear that the Scottish Government has already put forward a strong plan for creating more energy efficient homes. We have also accepted the committee's recommendation on heat decarbonisation, and we will publish a heat decarbonisation policy statement in the summer of 2020. We are currently developing our plan to ensure that any new build homes that are consented from 2024 will be required to use renewable or low-carbon heat.

The Scottish Government's policy position is that, by 2040, our buildings will be warmer, greener and more efficient, so we will continue our strong delivery approach to achieving those goals as a key part of achieving net zero emissions by 2045 across Scotland's economy as a whole. However, I make it clear that all those who support amendment 30 must also support any future necessary measures to compel homeowners to invest in the energy efficiency of their homes.

I can also accept amendment 31, and amendments 31A and 31B, on establishment of a whole-farm approach to emissions accounting. I must say, however, that I remain sceptical that legislation will deliver the best outcomes in that space. We are all eager to give proper recognition and credit to Scotland's farmers and land managers for the wide range of activities that they undertake to tackle climate change. We are already developing a complementary reporting system of emissions accounting on a whole-farm basis. Amendment 31 would mean that such reporting would happen only every five years, with each new climate change plan. I am not sure that that is quite what stakeholders are looking for, and the Government would look to report rather more frequently than that.

Furthermore, as discussed at stage 2, members must understand that any such complementary accounting scheme cannot replace the greenhouse gas inventory, which is determined by international classifications.

Finally in group 10, I can also accept amendment 33, which is on an agricultural modernisation fund. Although there is a slight danger that that might prove to be too prescriptive in a bill that requires reporting to continue until 2045, we are content to factor that into development of the existing commitment to a long-term agricultural transformation programme, which was set out in the programme for government.

Mark Ruskell: I am sensing a good amount of consensus in many areas. I reassure the cabinet secretary and her officials that my amendments in the group are not about constraining the content of climate change plans, but about filling the very obvious gaps that have existed for years. The committee has reflected on them and is concerned that the Government has not filled them.

There is good consensus on the amendments on agriculture, particularly around the fact that our farms are a solution to climate change. We often look at them as if they are a problem, or as though farms have emissions problems, but there are also fantastic opportunities around carbon sequestration. A whole-farm approach to measuring carbon accounting is important. John Scott is not here today; his contribution to the issue in committee has been very strong.

On blue carbon and amendment 32, I am concerned that, as an alternative to my amendment 29, it focuses almost entirely on MPAs and the MPA designation process. Our kelp forests and blue carbon resources exist all around the coast of Scotland and in our seas; they are not restricted to MPAs, so I am concerned about supporting amendment 32. If it was combined with a broader strategic approach, as I propose in amendment 29, I would accept it, but not on its

own. Claudia Beamish is nodding at that. The definition in amendment 32 is far too constrained.

On oil and gas, it is significant that the Labour Party and the SNP support the start of a discussion about oil and gas in the context of climate change in the climate change plan. That is not to build policies into the climate change plan for the future at this point, but to acknowledge that we need to start somewhere with the discussion. It is about the just transition, the future of that industry and taking communities with us in that transition. I welcome that.

On housing, I take the cabinet secretary's point on board. If we are serious about delivering homes that are EPC rated C or better, there is a wider issue about budgets that will, of course, concern all parties.

16:30

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 28 be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)

Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Against

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)

Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 93, Against 27, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 28 agreed to.

Amendment 29 moved—[Mark Ruskell].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 29 be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)

Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)

Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 34, Against 87, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 29 disagreed to.

Amendment 6 moved—[Claudia Beamish]—and agreed to.

Amendment 30 moved—[Mark Ruskell]—and agreed to.

Amendment 31 moved—[Maurice Golden].

Amendment 31A moved—[Claudia Beamish].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 31A be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)

Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Against

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)

Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 93, Against 28, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 31A agreed to.

Amendment 31B moved—[Claudia Beamish].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 31B be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)

Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Against

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)

Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 93, Against 28, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 31B agreed to.

Amendment 31, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment 32 moved—[Maurice Golden].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 32 be agreed to? Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinrossshire) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)

Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)

Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Against

Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 114, Against 7, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 32 agreed to.

Amendment 33 moved—[Maurice Golden]—and agreed to.

Amendment 34 moved—[Mark Ruskell]—and agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: Group 11 is on just transition principles. Amendment 35, in the name of Claudia Beamish, is grouped with amendments 7, 8, 36 and 37.

Claudia Beamish: I have four amendments in this group designed to embed the just transition into the core of the bill, and I will speak to them shortly.

In Scottish Labour's opinion, there is a glaring oversight in the bill in the exclusion of a statutory just transition commission.

We are embarking on a pathway to reach net zero emissions by 2045 at the latest, which is a hugely positive shift but one that will require change in all areas of life—for the individual, the worker, communities and businesses across all sectors.

That shift must benefit from the guidance of people in those industries and of those with relevant experience and expertise, and these questions of justice must be asked multiple times throughout the shift and beyond.

In Scottish Labour's view, it is nonsensical that the Scottish Government thinks that its commission, through its membership, can provide the answers within three years. It is worrying, when it is so important to so many, that the

Scottish Government will not protect its commission with legislation to shield it from any future Government or ministerial change. It is baffling that the cabinet secretary has disregarded that as too heavy, cumbersome and time consuming, when we are looking at such a long-term issue as the climate emergency. It is disappointing that, despite its warm words about a climate emergency, the Scottish Government refused to give this bill a financial resolution, thereby limiting the spend significantly.

That has meant that I have been unable to bring my proposals for a statutory commission to a vote at stage 3. I see the Scottish Government's rejection of a statutory commission as a fundamental misunderstanding of the concerns of workers, communities and businesses.

I turn to the amendments that I have been able to lodge within the confines of the bill's somewhat limited scope in this area.

Amendment 8 includes further information relevant to the just transition within climate change plans, requiring ministers to set out how the policies will affect "different regions of Scotland", the employment in those regions and sectors of the economy. It also requires ministers to set out how they will support

"the workforce, employers and communities in these sectors and regions."

Amendment 7 is a minor consequential amendment.

Amendment 35 includes specific "reference to the just transition principles"

in the preparation of the plan, which is the section of the bill in which the consideration of the principles will be most significant. The setting of domestic policies to deliver those targets must be influenced by social justice.

Amendment 37 adds trade unions to those persons with whom the Scottish ministers must develop and maintain social consensus through engagement.

The existing list includes workers, communities, NGOs, representatives of business and industry interests and appropriate others. The just transition movement was born from the trade unions, so the fact that they were not on that list is a glaring omission, and I hope that members will support the amendment, and the others in the group.

These four amendments are important additions, and I am glad that they have received the backing of not only a number of NGOs but NFUS, in particular, as securing a just transition will be important for farmers, who potentially have a great role to play in solving the climate

challenges, as custodians of our land who operate in an area—agriculture—that is one of the heaviest emitters.

However, I know that there will be many who will be disappointed that the just transition commission cannot be put on a statutory footing, not least the just transition partnership of NGOs, unions and the Scottish Trades Union Congress itself, all of which have done a lot of work towards putting the commission on a long-term and properly resourced statutory footing, for the benefit of the people of Scotland.

I move amendment 35.

Mark Ruskell: I have been pleased to work with Claudia Beamish on our attempts to embed the just transition principles in the bill at stage 2 and to establish a statutory commission. I share her frustration, and I will be returning to that issue in the debate that we will have after the stage 3 amendment phase.

The amendments in this group that have been agreed with the Government go a little way to ensuring that climate change is recognised in the climate plans. My amendment in this group, amendment 36, ensures that the reporting must also spell out how communities, workers and employers are being assisted in that transition. It is a small improvement, but I hope that it is a step towards the much wider approach to transition that is needed and the work that is needed on the ground to plan and progress the changes that are profound but also just.

Liam McArthur: Earlier, I talked about the importance of taking people with us as we seek to make the changes that we need in order to deliver our climate change ambitions. That is true in relation to the targets that we set and it underpins the case for establishing a citizens assembly. It is very much central to the concept of ensuring a just transition. Achieving net zero emissions by 2045 and achieving the interim target that we have now set for 2030 will be enormously challenging and will require significant changes in behaviour, practice and the way in which our overall economy functions. Recognising that and finding ways of mitigating the impacts where possible, allowing those who are directly affected an opportunity to shape the way in which that change happens, will be essential.

The amendments in this group are helpful in that respect, further fleshing out what a just transition should look like. I am particularly pleased to see amendment 8 in Claudia Beamish's name, as it seeks to break down the process to a more regional and sectoral level, recognising that the effect of those changes will not be felt uniformly across the board.

I absolutely share the frustration of Claudia Beamish and Mark Ruskell about the failure to make progress on embedding the just transition commission in statute.

I look forward to hearing what the cabinet secretary has to say, but I confirm that the Scottish Liberal Democrats are generally supportive of the intention behind the amendments in this group.

Roseanna Cunningham: I was not anticipating speaking to the amendments that have been lodged. The amendments in this group seek to further strengthen the emphasis on the just transition approach that is at the heart of our climate change plans. I am grateful to Claudia Beamish and Mark Ruskell for their constructive engagement with the Government over the summer to adapt their stage 2 amendments on these matters into a form that will better fit with the wider bill framework.

The amendments build usefully on the Government's amendments at stage 2, which added to the bill a set of just transition principles that ministers must have regard to when preparing climate change plans. Those plans must also then set out how the principles have been taken into account. The principles outline the importance of taking action to reduce Scottish emissions in a way that supports environmentally and socially sustainable jobs; supports low-carbon investment and infrastructure; develops and maintains social consensus through engagement with workers, communities, non-governmental organisations, representatives of the interests of business and industry and others; creates decent, fair and high-value work in a way that does not negatively affect the current workforce and the overall economy; and contributes to resource-efficient and sustainable economic approaches that help to address inequality and poverty.

Amendment 37 adds trade unions to the bodies that must be engaged as part of those principles. That would have been the case anyway, and I am happy to support the change to the bill.

16:45

Amendment 8 will ensure that existing assessments of the impacts of climate change plans on sectors of the economy will include regional dimensions, and employment in particular. The amendment also ensures that plans must include policies and proposals to support workforces, employers and communities through the transition to net zero emissions.

Amendment 36 ensures that such measures are also within the scope of the sector-by-sector annual monitoring reports on progress on delivering a plan.

All those amendments represent sound additions to the statutory framework.

I urge Claudia Beamish not to press her amendment 35, however. It seeks to require the specific element of a plan relating to assessing impacts on the economy to be prepared with reference to the just transition principles. My objection to amendment 35 is purely technical. I hope that I have been clear that I see the just transition principles as firmly underpinning climate change plans. However, the bill already requires that ministers take into account the just transition principles when preparing all aspects of climate change plans and that they set out how they have done so. It is those duties that give substance to the principles. As such, amendment 35 would be largely duplicative of the existing provisions and therefore does not represent good legal practice.

I encourage Claudia Beamish not to press amendment 35, for those strong technical reasons. If she does so, however, I will not oppose it.

As regards the amendment that is not before us, on putting a just transition commission into a statutory framework, I remind everybody that there is a just transition commission, which has been working hard over the past year and will continue to work hard. I look forward to the commission's report when it comes.

Claudia Beamish: I have listened with care to what the cabinet secretary has said, but I am disappointed that she has not given a further explanation as to why a long-term, statutory and properly resourced just transition commission is not something that the Scottish Government can support. Net zero will be some time in the coming in the climate emergency. Mark Ruskell and Liam McArthur have also highlighted that point, and I am perplexed and bewildered as to why the cabinet secretary said what she did on the matter.

Perhaps the Scottish Government might reconsider the matter when the present commission presents its report. I understand that, at that point, it will not be necessary to have primary legislation in order to have a just transition commission in law. We need to have a robust, prioritised commission as we move, in the climate emergency, to a better way of working and a better way of life for workers and communities—I also note what Liam McArthur has said about the regions.

The just transition principles are more clearly laid out in the bill. I appreciate the work that we did with the cabinet secretary on that over the summer. I will be pressing amendment 35, however, and I make no apology for that, as it is very important that the just transition principles are enshrined, particularly in relation to the climate

change plan—I have not been convinced by what the cabinet secretary said on that.

A just transition must be at the heart of the bill and at the heart of our plans for the future. All policies must be assessed against the effects that the climate change plans will have on our communities, workers and individuals, particularly those on lower incomes. I am glad that there is considerable support for the proposals in that regard across the chamber.

Amendment 35 agreed to.

Amendments 7 to 11 moved—[Claudia Beamish]—and agreed to.

Amendment 12 moved—[Claudia Beamish].

Amendment 12A moved—[Claudia Beamish].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 12A be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)

Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)

Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 27, Against 91, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 12A disagreed to.

Amendment 12 agreed to.

Amendment 36 moved—[Mark Ruskell]—and agreed to.

Amendment 13 moved—[Roseanna Cunningham]—and agreed to.

Amendment 37 moved—[Claudia Beamish]—and agreed to.

After section 19A

Amendment 14 moved—[Claudia Beamish].

Amendment 14A moved—[Claudia Beamish].

The Presiding Officer: The question is, that amendment 14A be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)

Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)

Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 27, Against 92, Abstentions 0.

Amendment 14A disagreed to.

Amendment 14 agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: Our final group is group 12, on impact of infrastructure investment on emissions. Amendment 15, in the name of Claudia Beamish, is the only amendment in the group.

Claudia Beamish: Amendment 15 relates to the Scottish Government's infrastructure investment plans. It emerged thanks to discussion involving Mark Ruskell, the cabinet secretary and me following our amendments at stage 2.

Infrastructure investments that are made from the public purse need to be fit for the future and for the public good. In the context of the climate emergency, that public good must be in alignment with emissions reductions efforts. Amendment 15 goes some way to achieving that by requiring ministers to set out an assessment of how the infrastructure investment plan will contribute to our targets.

I am pleased that that works in conjunction with my amendments in the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019, which require an assessment of the lifecycle of emissions of major developments to give a much clearer picture of emissions resulting from their construction, usage and—I stress—decommissioning.

There is further work to be done to ensure the future proofing of our public infrastructure, but I hope that members will support amendment 15, which will give a better understanding of the strategic and financial decisions that are made.

I move amendment 15.

Mark Ruskell: I had hoped that we would have made greater progress on financial budgeting in the bill. At stage 2, we discussed the imperative of setting a clear target to shift infrastructure spend from high-carbon to low-carbon infrastructure, so that we lock out, rather than lock in, emissions for decades to come. Sadly, we are no further forward on that in the bill, but I welcome the fact that the Government is commissioning work to flesh out methodology for assessing high-carbon and low-carbon infrastructure projects and, crucially, the emissions that are generated from the use of such infrastructure. Amendment 15, which will help to reveal the climate impact of the infrastructure investment plans, is a welcome baby step forward, but there is still much work to do in this area.

Roseanna Cunningham: I am content to support amendment 15 as a pragmatic measure to improve reporting arrangements around how Scottish budgets support emissions reductions. However, the amendment should be seen as fitting into a wider body of work on these important matters. The Scottish Government has placed tackling climate change at the heart of the programme for government, and it will likewise be central to the upcoming spending review and budget.

A range of stage 2 amendments were lodged regarding the relationship between budget information and climate change action. I met Green and Labour MSPs over the summer to discuss matters in which it is recognised that there is scope for improvement. As a result of those discussions, the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Economy and Fair Work and I have offered a review of climate change information in the budget. Such a review will necessarily take some time in order to be effective, but we expect it to be able to inform the 2020-21 budget.

I have also offered to commission programmes of research to better understand how capital expenditure can be assessed in relation to emissions impacts and how information on the emissions impacts of all relevant policies is currently being identified and communicated through existing statutory impact assessment processes. Those review and research programmes will help to identify steps to deliver improvements in cross-portfolio processes and transparency.

The first step—gathering and reviewing evidence—is the right one to take. There are real and very challenging issues of methodology that need to be resolved before we can determine the best reporting requirements.

In the meantime, I am content to support amendment 15, on the emissions impacts of the Scottish Government's infrastructure investment plans. The amendment recognises the particular

importance of strategic capital investment decisions for Scotland's journey to net zero emissions, but it does so in a way that is not overly prescriptive, given the current uncertainties around methodologies for assessing such impacts.

Claudia Beamish: I welcome Mark Ruskell's comments about our not having gone far enough. I also welcome the cabinet secretary's comments and her commitment to the review to inform the budget and the review of assessment. I am sure that the two reviews that she highlighted will take us forward to future budgets. As she highlighted, strategic capital investment issues are profoundly important as we tackle the climate emergency.

Amendment 15 agreed to.

Section 20—Meaning of certain terms

Amendment 16 moved—[Claudia Beamish]—and agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: That concludes consideration of amendments.

At this point in proceedings, I am required under standing orders to decide whether, in my view, any provision of the bill relates to a protected subject matter; that is, whether it would modify the electoral system or franchise for Scottish parliamentary elections. In my opinion, the bill would not do so, so it does not require a supermajority to be passed at stage 3.

I had hoped that we would be well ahead of time, but we have lost time again, so there will be a short suspension.

16:59

Meeting suspended.

17:10

On resuming—

Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill

The Deputy Presiding Officer (Christine Grahame): The next item of business is the stage 3 debate on motion S5M-19025, in the name of Roseanna Cunningham, on the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill.

The Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform (Roseanna Cunningham): We are 10 years on from the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009. Stewart Stevenson, who was the minister who took the Climate Change (Scotland) Bill through the Parliament then, has reminded me that stage 3 for that bill took a morning and an afternoon. I hope that members are pleased that stage 3 was considerably slimmer this time round.

The 2009 act established Scotland as a world leader in tackling climate change, and we continue to be a world leader because of the effective and rigorous framework that the act created. Scotland is still the only country in the world to set legally binding annual targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and we were the first country to include in our targets a fair share of the emissions from international aviation and shipping.

Since 2009, three climate change plans have been brought forward. Some annual targets have been met and some missed, but—crucially—Scotland's emissions are down by 47 per cent from the 1990 baseline. We are already almost halfway to reaching net zero emissions. Equally important, that progress has been achieved while we grew the economy and increased employment and productivity.

The bill makes the 2009 act stronger and more transparent. Crucially, it increases the ambition of Scotland's targets. Last year's special report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, on global warming of 1.5°, made clear that the world is now facing a climate emergency. That is recognised not only by the scientists but by the large numbers of citizens, here in Scotland and across the world, who have taken to the streets to demand more action and greater ambition.

In light of the IPCC's report, the Scottish Government commissioned expert advice on targets from the independent advisory body mandated by this Parliament. The Committee on Climate Change recommended that Scotland set 2045 as the target year to reach net zero emissions of all greenhouse gases. The CCC also recommended that we increase our interim

emissions reduction targets for 2030 and 2040 to 70 per cent and 90 per cent respectively. The CCC advised that those targets represent the “highest possible ambition” that is called for under the Paris agreement and are a fair contribution towards what is needed globally to limit warming to 1.5°. I immediately lodged amendments at stage 2 to give effect to the CCC’s recommendations.

Today, we have committed to going even further and adopting a target of a 75 per cent reduction in Scotland’s greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. I have set out my reasons for that approach. It is clear that now is the time for even greater ambition in tackling the world’s climate emergency, and that signals matter. I will look forward to receiving further, more detailed, advice from the CCC next year on the 2030 target.

At stage 2, we accepted a large number of the recommendations that the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee made in its reports at stage 1 and stage 2, which had the effect of, among other things, directly linking Scotland’s fair and safe emissions budget to the global temperature goal that is set out in the Paris agreement; tightening the safeguards around any potential lowering of target levels in future; clarifying and strengthening the CCC’s role in the climate change plan process; and requiring that climate change plans include estimates of the costs and benefits of the policies to reduce emissions.

Over the summer, we worked with colleagues on a cross-party basis to bring back amendments from stage 2 for discussion today, including amendments that will embed sustainable development considerations throughout the legislation and place climate justice at the heart of climate change plans; strengthen the reporting duties around consumption-based emissions; and ensure that the Scottish Government’s strategic infrastructure investment plans are assessed against emissions targets. Wherever possible, the Government has made every effort to accept Opposition proposals.

Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green): The cabinet secretary says that the Government has tried to accept amendments wherever possible. However, she rejected the proposal for an 80 per cent target for 2030. I remind her that, in the longer debate in 2009, I put forward amendments for a 50 per cent target for 2030 and a 90 per cent target by 2050. At the time, I was told by the Government, which was falling back on the advice of the United Kingdom CCC, that those targets were unachievable and too ambitious to back.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Mr Harvie, this is a bit of a speech.

Patrick Harvie: Given that we were right before and that the Government has now accepted that it can go beyond those targets, is it not possible that we are right again this time?

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Cabinet secretary, I will give you your time back.

Roseanna Cunningham: Thank you, Presiding Officer.

I hear what Patrick Harvie says; I understand and accept that he will want to say that. However, those of us who are in government at the time that we pass legislation must think about what will be realistic and achievable. We have done that.

If it is agreed this afternoon, the bill will set the framework and target pathway for Scotland’s journey to net zero. That represents a vital step, but it must be matched by actions to deliver on extremely challenging targets. The transition to net zero will require changes to virtually every aspect of everyday life for Scotland’s people. That will be achieved only if it is a national endeavour.

The Scottish Government’s commitment is clear. Tackling climate change lies at the heart of our programme for government, and we have committed, in line with the committee’s recommendations, to update our current climate change plan within six months of the bill receiving royal assent. We are looking across our full range of responsibilities to make sure that we continue with the policies that are working and identify areas where we can go further, faster. In my closing remarks, I will return to specific actions that we are already taking.

Central to our approach is a just transition, in which no one is left behind. To reflect that commitment clearly in law, the bill was amended at stage 2 to place a set of internationally recognised just transition principles in the bill and at the heart of climate change plans. Amendments that have been agreed to today have further strengthened those arrangements.

Public engagement will be vital. Building from the big climate conversation over the summer, we have committed to a national forum on climate change and, today, we supported an amendment to mandate the establishment of a citizens assembly.

I express my special thanks to all the members of the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee for their contributions to the bill process. John Scott would have wished to be here to see the bill through to the end, because he took a great interest in it.

The bill maintains Scotland’s position as the country with the most stringent framework of statutory climate change targets anywhere in the world. Sometimes, when we are discussing

climate change, we should remember that. If agreed, the bill will mean that Scotland's contribution to climate change ends within a generation. Today will mark the start of the second half of Scotland's journey to net zero emissions.

I move,

That the Parliament agrees that the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill be passed.

17:18

Maurice Golden (West Scotland) (Con): The Scottish Conservatives are committed to tackling climate change and protecting our planet for future generations.

We know that human activity has caused around 1° of global warming, and that, if we do not drastically cut our emissions, temperatures will continue to rise. Those increases in temperature will have a devastating impact on humanity.

Today, a new IPCC report warns us that the earth's oceans are already under severe strain from climate change. Our seas have become hotter and more acidic, and contain less oxygen and fewer fish, because of human activity.

The report warns that, if emissions continue at their current rate, there will be enormous risks to food security, and coastal communities around the world will be in danger from a rise in sea level and tropical cyclones. Scotland will not escape unscathed—our communities will face increased flood risks, putting our coastal towns, villages and homes at risk, and extreme weather will endanger our wildlife, flora and fauna.

Scotland is performing well on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and we should be proud of what we have achieved as a nation in almost halving our emissions since 1990. Large emission reductions, particularly across the energy and waste sectors, are a welcome achievement made possible by a range of public, private and third sector actions and a favourable policy landscape from the UK and Scottish Governments.

However, our success so far hides a lack of progress in major areas, such as the housing sector, where emissions are down only by 21 per cent. Last year, we won cross-party support to enact stronger energy efficiency targets for homes by 2030, to help drive down emissions from our housing sector. Alexander Burnett has worked hard to promote that issue, and I was pleased that the Scottish Government has listened to the will of the Parliament and pledged in this year's programme for government to introduce a commitment to that end. We were pleased to support a Green amendment from Mark Ruskell, which will ensure that the climate change plan sets

out measures for improving the energy efficiency of housing across Scotland.

We must continue to ensure that we take action that creates opportunities for individuals and businesses. As the only Opposition party to have released policy ideas in a comprehensive policy document, we have always been clear that we want actions to limit global warming that provide for the creation and sustainability of jobs, support for innovation and investment in cutting-edge technology.

We have always supported the bill in principle, and believe that many of the changes that have been made throughout the legislative process have strengthened the bill and made it better. Our amendments at stage 3 seek to promote and support the transition to a low-carbon economy and encourage further action.

We recognise the importance of supporting all sectors of the economy to transition to a low-carbon economy. That is why I lodged an amendment on an agricultural modernisation fund. I was pleased that that gained cross-party support this afternoon. The fund will support investment in mitigation measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions on Scottish farms. We want to make sure that farmers are supported as part of a transition to a low-carbon economy—and supported to produce better environmental and economic outcomes.

We also recognise the importance of supporting emerging technologies. We lodged an amendment that would require future climate change plans to set out proposals and policies regarding the consideration of carbon capture and storage when Scottish ministers designate marine protected areas. I was pleased that that amendment gained support, too. Development of such technologies has the potential to create and sustain jobs across Scotland, which is particularly important in the north-east.

The bill and the achievement of the targets that are set in it will help Scotland meet its duty to protect present and future generations from climate change. However, it is important that the targets are achievable, so that the bill does not become a missed opportunity.

The Scottish Conservatives are pleased to be supporting the bill at decision time, and we will continue to support actions that work towards achieving the targets that are set out in it.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: One thing about having a quiet debate is that I can hear a conversation at the back of the chamber. I suggest to those members that they should go away, get a cup of tea and have their wee chat elsewhere, and not let me eavesdrop.

17:24

Claudia Beamish (South Scotland) (Lab): Scottish Labour's vision for the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 has, from the outset, been about meeting ambition and about being just. It has also been about confessing what we see before our eyes and responding honourably. The climate emergency is here, and it is a terrible threat to millions of lives. The cost of ignoring it vastly outweighs the cost of tackling it head on, and the transformational change that is required will deliver a better and fairer society, if it is managed for the many and not the few.

I express my utter admiration for the young climate change strikers and extinction rebellion and for all those voices in the global chorus who are calling for us to do better. Who can dismiss a mandate from millions around the world and the indomitable Greta Thunberg, who was frustrated to tears when speaking at the United Nations this week?

I am proud today to be in the Labour Party. It is the first major political party to set ambition at a level anywhere near what needs to happen, which it did at our national conference yesterday, accompanied by a raft of proposals fit for our future. Members of the Scottish National Party Government have called me gung-ho a number of times. I dare them to use that line today, with the eyes of thousands of climate strikers and the global south on us all.

The fact is that the SNP's interim target was not ambitious enough. The IPCC demanded rapid and transformational change to prevent irreversible damage. Already, children in Iceland have held a funeral at the site of the first glacier lost to climate change. Some irrevocable damage is already happening and affecting ecosystems and humans across the globe, yet the Government's 70 per cent target was only a few numbers off the target that was set 10 years ago in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009.

I am proud that, this week, the Labour movement demonstrated the utmost commitment to taking on climate change, and Scottish Labour will now consult on our position. Climate strikers, the Labour Party is listening to you; in many ways, this whole Parliament is listening. I am heartened that the Opposition parties came together to go some way towards ensuring that. I lodged my amendment for a 75 per cent reduction by 2030 with the intention that consensus could be found to show that the Parliament is serious and is listening. It will also send a signal to all—innovators, financiers, people gathering research funding, businesses, communities, public bodies and individuals across Scotland and, I hope, across the world, with the Glasgow conference of the parties coming up next year.

Let us all commit today to going further as soon as we can. The SNP Government says that the pathway to net zero delivery is not clear, but it also intentionally limited the scope and budget of this bill and denied the establishment of a statutory long-term just transition commission specifically designed to guide that pathway ethically. That is a lost opportunity for the bill. Knowing that the voices of people in the affected industries, communities and regions were front and centre would have been a comfort to those who feel uncertainty. The Government's refusal to give the bill a financial resolution, thus limiting its budget, has denied the establishment of a just transition commission the chance even to go to a vote.

We will not have the answers to an equitable pathway by 2021, when our economy and society will be transitioning through the coming years. We need input from unions, businesses, workers and communities into the equitable transition for workers in oil and gas, farming, transport and other sectors and people in every home and community, whatever income they are on. Those people would be grateful if the cabinet secretary would make clear her reasons against having a statutory and long-term just transition commission. Is it because she is not willing to meet its cost? Is it because she thinks that it would take too long to set up? Those issues should be addressed, and I hope that, at the end of the two years that the present just transition commission still has to run, they will be and we will move forward together and make the commission statutory.

I am delighted that there was collaboration with the Government on securing more meaningful climate justice for the global south. We now have the principle of climate justice in statute, and duties set out to ensure that Scotland always stands in solidarity with those on the climate front line. It bears repeating that those people who have done the least to cause climate change, and are least equipped to tackle it, are the people who are being struck first and worst by its terrible effects.

Scottish Labour will vote for the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill today and celebrate what successes it has delivered for our transition, knowing that we have much more to do. For decades, individuals have been turning down their thermostats at home to save the planet. Let us no longer rely on the individual alone to keep the heating down. It is time for structural and collective action to keep temperature rise below 1.5° and to protect the future of this planet for all.

As the saying goes,

"Treat the earth well. It was not given to us by our parents, it was loaned to us by our children."

17:29

Mark Ruskell (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green): It would be remiss of me not to thank everyone who has lobbied, protested and provided evidence on the bill. There is an incredible youthful climate movement out there, which is certainly inspiring Green members. Those involved in the movement are a huge strength and testament.

As many of the hundreds of emails that I have received this week spell out, the science shows that, at the current rate of emissions, Scotland will have used our entire carbon budget for 2°C in the next 10 years. There is no turning back from that—we will be locked into a world with more suffering. The climate crisis is deepening. A new report that the IPCC published today warns that accelerating impacts on the oceans put 1 billion people at risk. This week, the UN has said that, even if all the Governments around the world meet their targets, we will go well beyond manageable levels of climate change.

This crisis demands political risk taking. However uncomfortable it may feel to challenge sectors such as farming or oil and gas to change, that will pale by comparison to the outrage that will be felt in the years to come as the real impacts of climate breakdown kick in. As many other members have done, I can look at the long list of improvements to the bill and recognise that, 10 years ago, they would have felt like big wins and steps of progress that we could all celebrate together.

The tweaks to budgeting and how we measure things, the recognition of key principles around global justice and equity, the focus on action in sectors such as farming and housing, and the involvement of people in designing solutions through a citizens assembly are all welcome gains. However, when I look at the enormity of the challenge that we face, the worsening scientific picture and the risks that we are taking with our children's future, I am saddened and angry that an opportunity to deliver real transformative change has been passed up. Instead, we have a narrow piece of legislation that sets distant targets while failing to deliver the rapid, transformational and unprecedented change that the IPCC has demanded.

Even within the narrow scope of the bill, big opportunities have been missed. A statutory just transition commission should have been the centrepiece of the bill. We should have had a body with the teeth and the focus to take on the challenges of change while ensuring that no community is left behind in the transition.

Finlay Carson (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con): Will the member take an intervention?

Mark Ruskell: If I can get the time back, Presiding Officer, I will take the intervention.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: You certainly can, if it is a brief intervention.

Finlay Carson: It sounds from what the member is saying that he will not support the bill at decision time. Why is that, when we have all worked so hard across the parties, when there is now so much more to agree on in the bill and when it will be so much more robust and enforceable if we all agree? Why is the member making grandstanding comments when it is more important to have a consensus?

Mark Ruskell: That is disappointing from Mr Carson. Did he not listen to any of the evidence that was given to the committee? The nature of the crisis demands an emergency response. Mr Carson's party might be happy with this weak legislation, but my party is not.

Let me get back to action, because we need to talk about the action that comes from the bill. A just transition commission should be at the heart of a Scottish green new deal to plan new regional strategies to rebuild and reindustrialise communities in a low-carbon age. Instead, it has been left to the Green and Labour parties in the Parliament to try desperately to amend the bill to give it the tools that it needs on transition. As a result, we are left with virtually nothing. Monitoring reports and principles in plans will not create the lasting change that is needed in the Fife communities that I represent.

We will not stand in the way of the small steps of progress that have been made through the bill, but we will not endorse a bill that is preoccupied with distant targets but does nothing to deliver transformative action and does not go far enough for the critical period of the next 10 years. Time is running out and, although the targets in the bill are eye-catching, they are not backed by anything that suggests that the status quo is being challenged. When we look back at the bill in the years to come, we will see missed opportunities to drive strong progress, but there will be no time machine to call on. It is Government's job to lead and to deliver the change that is necessary. If we do not see that necessary change, politics and democracy will have failed.

17:34

Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD): It is regrettable that Mark Ruskell has chosen to take the tone that he has. I respect very much the differences of opinion that he has not just with the Government but with those of us in other parties. However, as Claudia Beamish mentioned in an earlier comment, the Parliament's united front has been a strength. There has been evidence to

suggest that we should do many things and, on many issues, the evidence has not been unambiguous, so Mr Ruskell does a disservice to the work of the committee and the Parliament.

Mark Ruskell: Will the member give way?

Liam McArthur: No.

At stage 1, I quoted Jessie Dodman, a young constituent from Papa Westray in Orkney, who wrote to me saying:

“The ... Climate Change bill offers a good first step but needs to be delivered more quickly and effectively before the predicted deadlines for irreversible change in 2030.”

Jessie’s plea, which has been echoed by young people from across Scotland and beyond in recent weeks and months, stems from an understanding that urgent action over the next decade is essential if we are to have any realistic prospect of averting the catastrophic consequences of climate change, if we are to hit our net zero emissions target by 2045 and if we are to deliver an appropriate response to the IPCC’s latest report.

I am delighted, therefore, that Parliament has voted today to increase the interim target to 75 per cent by 2030. I again congratulate Claudia Beamish on lodging the amendment, which I was happy to co-sign, that has enabled that highly significant change to be made to the bill. Some have argued that we should be going further and faster, and those debates have been happening within as well as between parties.

I am conscious, though, of what the chair of the UKCCC said to the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee on target setting. Lord Deben cautioned that

“It is not sensible to espouse a target without being clear about what it really means.”

He added:

“You can have any old target, but it will not work if you cannot come down to the terms for how you will get there.”—[*Official Report, Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee*, 23 October 2018; c 33.]

We need to be ambitious, challenging and resolute, and we need to adapt as the evidence and opportunities that are available change. Ultimately, though, the public must have confidence in the basis on which we set legislation.

I think that the more ambitious 75 per cent target for 2030 strikes the right balance for now in terms of ambition, urgency and achievability. Meeting it will not be easy. It will require greater effort and more resources and it will involve many difficult decisions. We will need to change our cars, retrofit our homes and industry and plant more trees than ever before, and we will still rely

on technology that does not even exist yet, but it is the right thing to do.

It is right, too, that we are taking steps in the bill to better reflect the principle of equity and climate justice. As a developed nation, Scotland bears a larger responsibility for global warming, so it should be doing more in response. The Scottish Catholic International Aid Fund, Mercy Corps, Tearfund and others are right to remind us that those in the global south, who have contributed the least to the creation of climate change but are already experiencing its worst impacts, have a right to expect us to step up to the plate.

As with the 2009 act, the process of scrutinising the bill has genuinely been a cross-party effort. I thank colleagues for their efforts and constructive engagement, as I thank the many external stakeholders and members of the public who have engaged so passionately and enthusiastically over recent months. I am pleased to have been able to help to strengthen the bill in areas such as international aviation, public procurement of low-emission vehicles and the use of district heating schemes. Others will point to their own successes, among which I warmly welcome the addition of a climate assembly. Overall, however, as in 2009, it has been a collective effort, and that is one of the bill’s strengths.

Of course, as with any piece of legislation, passing it is the easy part. Delivering on the commitments in the bill—and delivering them on time—will be enormously challenging. However, the clear and present threat that is posed by climate change here and internationally has been laid bare by the IPCC. The expectation of the public—Jessie Dodman and millions like her—could not be clearer. Scottish Liberal Democrats are determined to make sure that we rise to that challenge, and we look forward to supporting this historic bill at decision time.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: We turn to the open debate. I ask for speeches of four minutes.

17:38

Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP): I start by wishing John Scott well. I hope that he will be sitting beside me when we look at the climate change plan update, because his wise counsel—which is not to say that I agree unequivocally with everything that he says—will be important at that stage.

Farming has been an important part of the discussion, and John Scott has contributed to that debate, as have others across the political parties. I very much welcome the fact that we have, as a result of agreement to a Maurice Golden amendment, incorporated nitrogen accounting.

That will help us to get a proper understanding of farming emissions.

We have had a bit of talk about the role of young activists in relation to climate change, which is entirely proper, but I want to take us back to something that I have not heard mentioned this afternoon, even though it is of equal and immediate importance. It is that this is a feminist issue as well as a youth issue.

In parts of the world, particularly in Africa, where aridification is taking place because of the diminution of rainfall and the drying up of wells, it is generally the women who are the farmers and who do the hard labour. They now have to walk many times the distances that they previously had to walk to get water or kindling. It is a feminist issue and it affects women across the world.

John Finnie (Highlands and Islands) (Green): I agree, but does Stewart Stevenson think that maintaining the existing road-building programme will be a positive or negative contribution to women in sub-Saharan Africa?

Stewart Stevenson: If sub-Saharan Africa had better roads, I suspect that climate change would be less of a feminist issue, but I expect that that is not really the point that John Finnie was trying to make.

Patrick Harvie correctly said that the Greens advocate a 50 per cent target for 2030. However, we also need to think about the fact that there have been several changes to the baseline, which has added to the inventory of CO₂. We therefore need to translate the targets that were set in 2009 to what they would be against today's baseline: they would be rather different. In 2015, we added another greenhouse gas—nitrogen trifluoride—to the inventory. There have been various changes that affect how the numbers work, so the situation is a bit more complex than we sometimes like to pretend.

I also want to talk briefly about unanimity. I strongly believe that we must be driven by scientific consensus and not by individual scientists who are at one edge or the other of the argument. That is not because those scientists are wrong—they might be correct, within their areas of research. However, the consensus that comes through the IPCC—I welcome the report that came out today—will drive further change, as it must. If we start to pick scientists who take extreme positions, valid though they are, we will allow others to choose scientists who disagree with the whole agenda altogether. That is why we should always go with the consensus.

There is nothing to stop us exceeding scientists' recommendations, so I encourage my Green Party colleagues to think carefully about withholding

their support for the bill while continuing to campaign for more.

I will conclude by saying that, like others, I have been inspired by Greta Thunberg and the millions of young activists around the world. When I cast my vote shortly, I will be thinking of her and her young companions. I will be dead before it all matters: they have to inherit a world that is worth inheriting.

17:42

Alexander Burnett (Aberdeenshire West) (Con): First, I acknowledge the hard work on the bill by our clerks and researchers, as well as all the constituents and organisations who have contributed. I also thank members who have worked across party lines to strengthen the bill in respect of our shared goal of limiting global warming to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels. We are all committed to protecting our planet for future generations.

As members will know, I have been a strong advocate in Parliament of improving residential homes' energy efficiency to EPC rating C or above by 2030. In addition to winning a debate on the matter with cross-party support, I lodged stage 2 amendments to similar effect. I am glad to see that despite the SNP having opposed it for the past two years, our position has been adopted in the programme for government. The Scottish Conservatives have backed the proposal by committing 10 per cent of capital spending to energy efficiency.

I was delighted to support the Green amendment to reduce emissions from housing, and requires the climate change plan to set out what measures Scottish ministers propose to ensure that emissions from housing are reduced, and that housing achieves EPC rating C or above, when that is practicable. I refer members to my register of interests in relation to renewable energy and housing.

I also add my particular thanks to the Existing Homes Alliance, which has worked on finding ways to achieve the target. In its report last month, the alliance touched on some of the many benefits of the approach. They include: reducing carbon emissions and fuel poverty; reducing household energy bills by more than £400 a year; creating economic growth, with every £1 of investment giving a return of £5 in gross domestic product; creating more than 6,000 new jobs because we need to double the current rate of upgrades to 200 per day; and tackling the costs of poor housing to health and wellbeing, which costs us up to £80 million a year.

The report also sets out many policies and programmes that would ensure that we find a

successful pathway to zero carbon by 2045. I was particular interested to read the five recommendations for programme development, delivery and support for a zero carbon future. The Scottish Conservatives are strong advocates of devolution of powers: we believe that delegation and distribution of powers are important to ensure maximum success. Therefore, we welcome the first recommendation, which is to

“Extend the local authority-led area-based programmes to deliver both energy efficiency and heat measures.”

As the report states,

“Procurement should prioritise community benefit and local economic development”,

so introducing a programme to

“incentivise deep renovation where appropriate”

is important.

The Scottish Conservatives believe that actions to limit global warming will have a higher probability of success if they create jobs and support innovation. Therefore, we welcome the suggestion about increasing support for self-funding households by expanding the energy efficient Scotland pilots, which will

“deliver community engagement, develop local supply chains, and ensure quality control combined with the availability of loan finance.”

Therefore, we must work with the supply chain to provide support in training and skills development in order to address gaps in certain trades and geographic areas.

The move to a zero carbon future is one that all of society must work towards in a co-ordinated effort. I look forward to working with the energy sector to make that a reality.

17:46

Daniel Johnson (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab):

There is no greater political cause than climate change, and there is nothing in which there is more urgent need for action. In that context, the bill is to be welcomed. It is vital that our action on tackling climate change be put on a legal footing, with clear and practical steps towards achievement of our goals.

We cannot ignore the tenor of the debate and the calls to go further, although I understand the Government's caution. We all know how the political game works: the Government sets a target, the Opposition parties chase to demonstrate that it was not achieved, and the Government comes back with claims that it was. Things cannot be like that in this case, because it is not a normal target. It is much more important. That is why we must set targets that are based not

on what we think we can achieve, but on what we must achieve to save the planet.

The science could not be clearer. Just today, more reports have been put before the UN that demonstrate what will happen and what has been happening: ocean temperatures have been continually rising since 1970 and there has been accelerated loss of polar ice and glaciers. The consequence will be rising oceans and the possibility of a catastrophic snowball effect with warming, thawing and the release of more greenhouse gases, which would lead to irrevocable climate change. That is why we need a challenging target, even if we do not know how to deal with it or measure up to it.

I will draw a parallel, because other political projects have presented such challenges. In 1962, John F Kennedy gave a groundbreaking speech setting out the seemingly impossible objective of landing human beings on the moon, but just seven years later, it was achieved. Ever since, politicians have butchered quotes from that speech to their own ends, and I will do exactly the same now. We choose to tackle climate change not because it is hard, but because it is essential. Net zero must be treated as our moon shot. We have a decade to reshape our economy and save our environment and planet. We must treat that with the same urgency, imperative and collective effort, because failure is not an option.

When I was thinking about and preparing for the debate, Greta Thunberg's words rang in my ears. To the politicians assembled at the UN, she said:

“You all come to us young people for hope. How dare you?”

Although I understand that being cautious and pragmatic is how government must be done in normal times for normal issues, that cannot be how we approach climate change. We have to listen to people. We must not only strive for a 75 per cent reduction by 2030, or even for 80 per cent; we must also listen to the calls that we must achieve net zero emissions by 2030, and set ourselves the challenge of doing everything that we can towards that target.

That is the tenor that the remarks in the chamber this afternoon should have. Criticisms and observations should not be taken by the Government as rebukes. They are not political points. I regard them as collective criticisms and collective observations of our collective failure to do what is required to tackle climate change.

That is our imperative, and we must play our part. As the nation of coal and steel, and of the locomotives and ships that ushered in the first wave of globalisation on this planet, we have moral responsibility to do our bit to tackle the climate change that they set in motion. We must

take the practical steps to ensure that investment is made, so that what we achieve in Scotland is an example to the rest of the world.

17:50

Gillian Martin (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP):

We are on the cusp of passing legislation that will have a massive impact. The hugely ambitious and challenging targets set out in the bill will cross every sector in Scotland, every business, every household and every person. The targets are the goal that we cannot miss, and committing to and achieving them will require massive system and behavioural change. Scotland will need to change and we will need to take those targets into account in so much of what we ask for from our Government, from now on, across all portfolios.

System change will have to happen urgently, and nowhere more than in my area, where public transport is not an option if you live in Rothienorman but work in Ellon, or if your surgery appointment is in Oldmeldrum but you live in Cross of Jackston.

Your choices are limited if you want a home made of materials that lock up carbon, rather than add to the carbon burden. You might be able to heat your home only by burning oil from a big tank out in the garden. You might live in rented accommodation where you have no choice about how you heat your home at all. Heat pumps and electric vehicles are still the preserve of the wealthy, and you can only dream of such choice.

You might want to cycle to work, but given that you do not live on a cycle route, you cannot take the risk of being hit by a car on the dark winter mornings.

You might want to rid your home of single-use plastics, but the supermarkets are full of them, and even though you recycle everything that you can, you find yourself with two or three bin bags of mixed refuse a week that you know is going to landfill.

Your job and the money that you take home to pay your mortgage and feed your kids depend on oil and gas. That applies to a lot of people in my area. You hear people campaigning to keep it in the ground, but you know that if we do that too soon, your city will be a ghost town and unemployment will be rife. You only just got a decent job after losing one in 2016, so you have first-hand experience of what that is like. You want to take your skills and work in an organisation that will be part of the low-carbon revolution, but that is not happening as fast as you had hoped.

Where you can change your life, you do; you make all the choices that you can make to reduce your carbon footprint. You holiday at home instead

of flying. You modify your diet and you minimise your food waste. You try to fix things rather than replace them. You go round the house switching off lights, turning down the heating and shouting at your children to put jumpers on, but the big things that you want to do are outwith your hands.

Those big things are up to us, here in this chamber, and the choices that we urge the Government to make. I look forward to the updated climate change plan that will set in place what we need to do to achieve the aims of the bill, because we have no option but to achieve those aims, and the people of Scotland want to play their part. They have told us that.

Before I sit down, I pay tribute to my colleague and friend John Scott, who would have loved to be sitting with us here, but who I know for a fact is at home, watching us debate the bill. He made a tremendous contribution. I thank my committee colleagues for the contributions that we all made as we went forward together, not always agreeing with one another, but reaching a consensus, as Finlay Carson mentioned. I also want to thank the clerks who have steered us through the progress of the bill, and the many people who contributed. We probably opened our doors a little wider than we had time for, but I think that it was very important to have everyone with a locus in this issue round the table, including the many young activists from across Scotland, who sat round the table with us and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. I am very proud that we all sat in the same room.

I am proud to vote for a bill that has ambitious targets, but, from tomorrow, it is all about action, just transition, system change and asking tough questions of every business, corporation and agency that the citizens of Scotland rely on for work, food, transport, health and housing. That change starts with a Government bill but the actions lie with us all.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: We come to closing speeches, which must be kept tight to time. I call Sarah Boyack. You have four minutes, Ms Boyack.

17:54

Sarah Boyack (Lothian) (Lab): The 2009 act was groundbreaking at the time, but it now looks old-fashioned, because things have moved fast. At that time, the Opposition party—my party—pushed the Scottish Government hard and ended up with a reduction in emissions of 42 per cent. We felt that that was radical, and I have a sense of that today. Today, we are going to support a bill that has a radical target, although I know that Claudia Beamish was up for 77 per cent, and that the Greens were up for 80 per cent. We do not know

where we will be in a decade. The point is, what we have agreed today is not the limit; it is the absolute lowest bar that we can set for our emissions reductions over the next decade. If we can go further, we should.

To pick up on what Gillian Martin just said, it is the case that, in too many of our communities, people do not have the choices that we want them to have. They do not have the low-carbon present that they need and which they have the right to.

Patrick Harvie: Will the member take an intervention?

Sarah Boyack: I need to get on.

I was struck by the cabinet secretary's comments in her opening speech. Through collective work on the part of business, Government and all the rest of us, emissions have been lowered, but there are key areas that need to be activated. However, the cabinet secretary was right to highlight that there has been economic progress in the past decade, and we need to look to the next period of economic progress. However, we also need to add in a requirement that our communities not be left behind in that process. If there is one thing that I would like us to focus on more, it is how we do that. Heating our homes, making them more energy efficient through renewable low-carbon technology and using that process to create real, decently paid jobs as well as eliminating fuel poverty is something that was described as a triple-win by Citizens Advice Scotland when it lobbied us today.

We also need to re-engineer our communities to deliver low-carbon, affordable and healthy active travel choices and to make that approach apply right across our cities, towns and villages—it needs to be taken right across the country. There must be better buses and more affordable and reliable trains. We need to focus on all those issues, not only on the target, although the target will help to drive us.

We must use our land to better effect, by investing in tree planting and sustainable flood management and by providing support for our farmers as they transition to low-carbon food production and land stewardship.

No one has mentioned urban food production today, but that must not be missed out when we are thinking about low-carbon communities. That needs to be focused on, too, and it can be empowering.

There is agreement across the chamber that we have a climate emergency. We face not global warming or climate change that we can get around to tackling at some point, but a climate emergency that we must tackle now. Even in the past year, lives have been lost and climate refugees have

been created. Scotland will need to step up to the plate. Colleagues have, rightly, quoted from today's IPCC report and from the work of the UKCCC.

The bill is important, but it is not the end. It is the start of the next push to ensure that we deliver in terms of climate change. We have to think about how we accelerate our investment in climate resilience as well as climate change. We have even had fires this year in Scotland. It is unthinkable that places such as Scotland and Siberia should have fires that go out of control. We are in an emergency.

There is a powerful call to action today. Last week, in Edinburgh, 20,000 young people marched in the city. Across the globe, we have seen the next generation doing likewise. They are challenging us. The placard that I remember from the march in Edinburgh said, "You will die of old age. We will die of climate change." We need to act now and we need to act together. We need to compete with one another to ensure that we push one another further, but we must also sometimes work together.

I particularly want to thank the climate change coalition in Scotland, all its members, our constituents and members of the public, and I also want to thank the committee—

The Deputy Presiding Officer: I am afraid that your thanks will have to be global, if you do not mind.

Sarah Boyack: We have a duty to act—

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Sorry, no; your time is absolutely up.

Sarah Boyack: So, we do not get 30 seconds any more.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: No—you have not got 30 seconds. I would give them to you willingly if I had them.

Sarah Boyack: Let us support this legislation and get on with it.

17:59

Finlay Carson (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con): I declare an interest as a member of NFU Scotland and as a partner in a former farming business.

I am pleased to be closing for the Scottish Conservatives in the final stages of what I believe to be the most important bill that the Parliament will pass this session. I believe that, now that the bill has been strengthened through committee amendments at stage 2 and through today's stage 3 amendments, the legislation will be the springboard that ensures that Scotland continues

to lead the way on tackling climate change, now and in the future. It is also important that the bill recognises, and goes some way towards addressing, the pressures that the targets will place on individuals and businesses across Scotland.

Despite the narrative from some climate change activists, I can say, as a member of the ECCLR Committee, that we have been listening and continue to listen. We are listening to a broad spectrum of experts, organisations and intergenerational panels to understand the measures that we need to and are able to take.

The committee took almost 25 hours of evidence and spent 20 hours deliberating on its reports. All that was long before the Government declared a climate emergency. I can assure members that the committee has taken its responsibilities very seriously. On that note, I take the opportunity to pay tribute to the committee clerks, the Scottish Parliament information centre and my fellow committee members, past and present—in particular my colleague John Scott—for the commitment that they have shown in ensuring that the bill is fit for purpose. The bill will ensure that Government policies must now start to deliver.

The Committee on Climate Change outlined how Scotland can go faster and further in achieving net zero emissions. I support the principle that we need to go further and faster, for the good of both the economy and the global environment, so I fully understand the demands from many organisations, and indeed from some MSPs, to set interim targets of 80 per cent for 2030, but we must not ignore the importance of an evidence-based and realistic approach. That realistic approach favours an emissions reduction target that is 75 per cent lower than the baseline over the next decade. We cannot and should not set targets for emissions reductions that are not achievable, not sustainable and not believable. It is research and science that have shown us that there is indeed a climate emergency, and it must be research and science that lead us to the right policies to address that emergency.

Let me be clear: by setting a more ambitious interim target for 2030, we have not thrown our agriculture industry under a bus. Solutions to deliver the more ambitious 75 per cent target will be focused across a combination of all sectors, including industry and transport, each doing what it can.

As Stewart Stevenson touched on earlier, the impact of agriculture on the environment has been badly misrepresented. Most concerningly, much of that misrepresentation has emanated from our mainstream media sources, which have seriously misrepresented the IPCC report by naively and

somewhat lazily applying its findings almost exclusively to the UK, rather than on a global basis, as was intended.

I can assure you that the best way for us, as a meat-eating nation, to address global climate change is not to introduce policies to put our livestock farmers out of business. It is important to be aware that Scotland is not self-sufficient in beef, so it is crucial that we do not displace meat production to countries with poor environmental credentials, but that we ensure that we eat meat that is always high-quality, grass-reared Scotch beef and lamb. Throughout the process, John Scott and I have continually reinforced that message, and I am delighted to see that, with amendments such as that on a nitrogen balance sheet, we now have the opportunity to recognise the hugely significant contribution that Scottish farmers make to tackling climate change right here, right now. With improved knowledge transfer and support, that contribution can be further improved in the future.

Over the years, the agriculture industry has faced many challenges, and I know that it will rise to this pressing challenge of climate change. My colleague Maurice Golden's amendment calling for the creation of an agricultural modernisation fund will do exactly that for our farming sector, through knowledge transfer, the adoption of new technology and targeted support, which will allow farmers to enhance their underreported efforts in tackling climate change.

As an MSP with children in their 20s and also a four-month-old daughter, I have had future generations firmly in my thoughts as the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill has made its way through my committee and, ultimately, to the chamber where we will vote. This generation needs to get it right, and get it right right now for future generations.

The Scottish Conservatives and Unionists welcome the fact that the bill has been strengthened as it has progressed through the legislative process, and we are confident that it lays the foundations for a climate change plan that will support innovation, create jobs and use technology, as well as addressing the undeniable climate change emergency that we face.

18:04

Roseanna Cunningham: I am grateful to members across the chamber for their mostly helpful and constructive contributions to the debate. I think that I am right in saying that all members who lodged amendments have had at least some successes—I refer to Maurice Golden, Claudia Beamish, Mark Ruskell and Angus MacDonald.

The Government has continuously sought consensus through the bill. We face a global climate emergency, and we must all work together to tackle it. It is my strong hope that the bill can now achieve the same cross-party support that the 2009 act has enjoyed and which has, I believe, contributed significantly to its subsequent success.

Claudia Beamish has repeatedly returned to the question of putting a just transition commission into legislation. I remind her that we are still the only country in the world that has a just transition commission. It is up and running, and it is working hard. I am not sure how many times I have already explained to Claudia Beamish why we are not inclined to put it on a statutory basis, but I will try again. That would cost at least £770,000 to set up. By comparison, the annual contribution that we make to the Committee on Climate Change is a mere £300,000. It is for Claudia Beamish to make the case about the value that putting the commission on a statutory basis would add. I do not think that that case has been made.

Claudia Beamish: Will the cabinet secretary take an intervention?

Roseanna Cunningham: I will move on, because I need to get through quite a bit.

I very much regret the tone of Mark Ruskell's intervention. For goodness' sake: the legislation is the strongest and toughest anywhere in the world. I find it extraordinary that Green Party members appear to be contemplating not supporting the bill, which sets the most ambitious statutory targets of any country in the world and includes many of their own proposals. No amendments were lodged at stage 3 to propose any changes to the net zero emissions target date, the 2020 target or the 2040 target. It appears that the sole sticking point is the exact level of the 2030 target. The Scottish Government has gone even further today and adopted a target of 75 per cent. To be absolutely clear, a 75 per cent target exceeds what is needed globally over the next decade to limit warming to 1.5°C. No other country—even recognised leaders such as Sweden—has set a higher target in law for that year.

Our focus must now shift to delivery. The Scottish Government will now update our current climate change plan in light of the debate today. The update will draw on the many new and emboldened initiatives that have already been announced since the First Minister's declaration of a global climate emergency. Those include a bold package of measures on low-carbon transport, including investing £500 million to improve bus services; decarbonising passenger rail services by 2035; making a further £17 million available for zero-interest loans to support the purchase of ultra-low-emission vehicles; and working to decarbonise flights within Scotland by 2040. They

include a range of actions to maximise the potential of every part of Scotland's land to contribute to the fight against climate change, with increased funding for peatland restoration and even more ambitious tree planting targets. We will create an agricultural transformation programme that reduces emissions while focusing on sustainability, simplicity, profitability, innovation, inclusion and productivity. There is a lot more, up to and including the introduction of a new deposit return scheme.

Ambitious as those actions are, I am under no illusion that they will be sufficient. The second half of Scotland's journey to net zero emissions will undoubtedly require different and, in many cases, much more difficult choices than has been the case to date. All of us here will need to step up our willingness to make those decisions if the targets are to be met.

No one should be in any doubt about the Scottish Government's commitment to using all the policy levers at our disposal to rise to that challenge. However, I remind everybody, as I did earlier today, that, when the CCC provided its advice on targets in May, it was absolutely clear that

"Scotland cannot deliver net-zero emissions by 2045 through devolved policy alone."

It is welcome that the UK Government has followed our lead to legislate for a net zero target, but UK-wide delivery policies must also now ramp up significantly.

Scotland is already recognised as a world leader in tackling climate change. By the time that the United Nations climate talks come to Glasgow in late 2020, we will have an even stronger message with which to welcome the international community to Scotland.

We will have the most stringent framework of statutory targets of any country in the world. All of us, whatever we think, should be proud of that and should support the bill. The bill maintains and strengthens Scotland's place at the forefront of global efforts to do what we need to do to bring down emissions.

I am very proud to have moved the motion in my name.

Business Motions

18:10

The Presiding Officer (Ken Macintosh): The next item of business is consideration of business motion S5M-19047, in the name of Graeme Dey, on behalf of the Parliamentary Bureau, setting out a business programme.

Motion moved,

That the Parliament agrees—

(a) the following programme of business—

Tuesday 1 October 2019

2.00 pm Time for Reflection
followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions
followed by Topical Questions (if selected)
followed by Public Audit and Post-Legislative Scrutiny Committee Debate: Post-Legislative Scrutiny: Control of Dogs (Scotland) Act 2010
followed by Committee Announcements
followed by Business Motions
followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 5.00 pm Decision Time
followed by Members' Business

Wednesday 2 October 2019

2.00 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 2.00 pm Portfolio Questions: Rural Economy; Transport, Infrastructure and Connectivity
followed by Scottish Labour Party Business
followed by Business Motions
followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 5.00 pm Decision Time
followed by Members' Business

Thursday 3 October 2019

11.40 am Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 11.40 am General Questions
 12.00 pm First Minister's Questions
followed by Members' Business
 2.30 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 2.30 pm Portfolio Questions: Justice and the Law Officers
followed by Stage 3 Proceedings: Children (Equal Protection from Assault) (Scotland) Bill
followed by Business Motions
followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 5.00 pm Decision Time

Tuesday 8 October 2019

2.00 pm Time for Reflection
followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions
followed by Topical Questions (if selected)
followed by Scottish Government Business
followed by Committee Announcements
followed by Business Motions
followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 5.00 pm Decision Time
followed by Members' Business

Wednesday 9 October 2019

2.00 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 2.00 pm Portfolio Questions: Government Business and Constitutional Relations; Culture, Tourism and External Affairs
followed by Stage 3 Proceedings: Transport (Scotland) Bill
followed by Business Motions
followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 5.00 pm Decision Time
followed by Members' Business

Thursday 10 October 2019

11.40 am Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 11.40 am General Questions
 12.00 pm First Minister's Questions
followed by Members' Business
 2.30 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 2.30 pm Portfolio Questions: Education and Skills
followed by Stage 1 Debate: Non-Domestic Rates (Scotland) Bill
followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions
 5.00 pm Decision Time

(b) that, for the purposes of Portfolio Questions in the week beginning 30 September 2019, in rule 13.7.3, after the word "except" the words "to the extent to which the Presiding Officer considers that the questions are on the same or similar subject matter or" are inserted.—[*Graeme Dey*]

Motion agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: The next item is consideration of business motion S5M-19054, in the name of Graeme Dey, on behalf of the Parliamentary Bureau, on the stage 1 timetable for a bill.

Motion moved,

That the Parliament agrees that consideration of the Children (Scotland) Bill at stage 1 be completed by 28 February 2020.—[*Graeme Dey*]

Motion agreed to.

Parliamentary Bureau Motions

18:10

The Presiding Officer (Ken Macintosh): The next item of business is consideration of Parliamentary Bureau motion S5M-19049, on approval of a Scottish statutory instrument.

Motion moved,

That the Parliament agrees that the Debt Arrangement Scheme (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2019 [draft] be approved.—[*Graeme Dey*]

The Presiding Officer: The question on the motion will be put at decision time.

The next item is consideration of six Parliamentary Bureau motions. Motions S5M-19048 and S5M-19050 are on approval of SSIs, motion S5M-19051 is on committee meeting times, motion S5M-19052 is on committee membership, motion S5M-19053 is on substitution on committees and motion S5M-19095 is on designation of a lead committee.

Motions moved,

That the Parliament agrees that the Additional Powers Request (Scotland) Regulations 2019 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Historical Sexual Offences (Disregarded Convictions and Official Records) (Scotland) Regulations 2019 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that, under Rule 12.3.3B of Standing Orders, the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee can meet, if necessary, at the same time as a meeting of the Parliament during Members' Business and Portfolio Questions on Thursday 3 October 2019 for the purpose of considering the UEFA European Championship (Scotland) Bill.

That the Parliament agrees that—

Jenny Gilruth be appointed to replace Stewart Stevenson as a member of the Justice Sub-committee on Policing; and

James Kelly be appointed to replace Daniel Johnson as a member of the Justice Sub-committee on Policing.

That the Parliament agrees that—

Sarah Boyack be appointed to replace Anas Sarwar as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee;

Claudia Beamish be appointed to replace Rhoda Grant as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Rural Economy and Connectivity Committee;

Alex Rowley be appointed to replace Neil Findlay as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee;

Neil Findlay be appointed to replace Daniel Johnson as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Education and Skills Committee;

Anas Sarwar be appointed to replace Pauline McNeill as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Local Government and Communities Committee; and

Beatrice Wishart be appointed to replace Willie Rennie as

the Scottish Liberal Democrat substitute on the Equalities and Human Rights Committee.

That the Parliament agrees that the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee be designated as the lead committee in consideration of the UEFA European Championship (Scotland) Bill at stage 1.—[*Graeme Dey*]

The Presiding Officer: The question on the motions will be put at decision time.

Decision Time

18:11

The Presiding Officer (Ken Macintosh): The first question is, that motion S5M-19025, in the name of Roseanna Cunningham, on the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill at stage 3, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)

Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Abstentions

Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 113, Against 0, Abstentions 6.

Motion agreed to,

That the Parliament agrees that the Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Bill be passed.

The Presiding Officer: The next question is, that motion S5M-19049, in the name of Graeme Dey, on approval of a Scottish statutory instrument, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Gougeon, Mairi (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)

Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (Ind)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rowley, Alex (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smith, Elaine (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Wishart, Beatrice (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Abstentions

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Ballantyne, Michelle (South Scotland) (Con)
 Bowman, Bill (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Davidson, Ruth (Edinburgh Central) (Con)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Halcro Johnston, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Mason, Tom (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Simpson, Graham (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 89, Against 0, Abstentions 28.

Motion agreed to,

That the Parliament agrees that the Debt Arrangement Scheme (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2019 [draft] be approved.

The Presiding Officer: As no member objects, I propose to ask a single question on the other six Parliamentary Bureau motions.

Motions agreed to,

That the Parliament agrees that the Additional Powers Request (Scotland) Regulations 2019 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that the Historical Sexual Offences (Disregarded Convictions and Official Records) (Scotland) Regulations 2019 [draft] be approved.

That the Parliament agrees that, under Rule 12.3.3B of Standing Orders, the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee can meet, if necessary, at the same time as a meeting of the Parliament during Members' Business and Portfolio Questions on Thursday 3 October 2019 for the purpose of considering the UEFA European Championship (Scotland) Bill.

That the Parliament agrees that—

Jenny Gilruth be appointed to replace Stewart Stevenson as a member of the Justice Sub-committee on Policing; and

James Kelly be appointed to replace Daniel Johnson as a member of the Justice Sub-committee on Policing.

That the Parliament agrees that—

Sarah Boyack be appointed to replace Anas Sarwar as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Standards, Procedures and Public Appointments Committee;

Claudia Beamish be appointed to replace Rhoda Grant as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Rural Economy and Connectivity Committee;

Alex Rowley be appointed to replace Neil Findlay as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee;

Neil Findlay be appointed to replace Daniel Johnson as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Education and Skills Committee;

Anas Sarwar be appointed to replace Pauline McNeill as the Scottish Labour Party substitute on the Local Government and Communities Committee; and

Beatrice Wishart be appointed to replace Willie Rennie as the Scottish Liberal Democrat substitute on the Equalities and Human Rights Committee.

That the Parliament agrees that the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Affairs Committee be designated as the lead committee in consideration of the UEFA European Championship (Scotland) Bill at stage 1.

Product Recall Database

The Deputy Presiding Officer (Linda Fabiani): The final item of business is a members' business debate on motion S5M-17805, in the name of John Mason, on the need for a product recall database. The debate will be concluded without any question being put.

Motion debated,

That the Parliament notes that the UK Government has served Whirlpool, which manufactures domestic appliances, with a notice to recall faulty tumble dryers; understands that this comes four years after the company issued a safety warning regarding some of its Creda, Hotpoint and Indesit devices; believes that research by the consumer charity, Electrical Safety First, suggests that only 10 to 20% of recalled products are actually returned or repaired, largely due to consumers being unaware of the recalls, and notes calls for the creation of a centrally-managed product recall database, which could allow consumers in Shettleston and across the country to check that their appliances are safe.

18:16

John Mason (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP): I am very pleased to have the opportunity to lead off in this evening's debate on an issue that I believe has potentially dire public safety consequences.

First, I thank all the members who supported the motion and are in attendance. I realise that some members might be reluctant to put their name to motions in my name, but I am grateful to those who have done so. I also thank Electrical Safety First and Wayne Mackay, the organisation's deputy public affairs manager, who is in the gallery and who is a constituent of mine, for all their work in highlighting the issue and preparing for today's debate.

As the motion mentions, central to the debate is the Whirlpool recall. I will provide some background. In June of this year, the United Kingdom Government ordered the recall of Whirlpool's affected tumble dryers in a highly unusual move. More than 169 Creda, Hotpoint, Indesit, Proline and Swan—brands that are all owned by Whirlpool—tumble dryer models that were made between April 2004 and October 2015 could pose a fire risk. The fault in the dryers could lead to fires if excess fluff comes into contact with the heating element.

Just two weeks ago, Whirlpool said that it had found 65,000 of the estimated 500,000 potentially dangerous flawed dryers, which it began recalling on 22 July after dozens of blazes. However, no accurate data can be provided, as low registration rates mean that it is not possible to give a definitive figure or location for the machines in question. The fact remains that hundreds of thousands of tumble dryers that are at risk of

catching fire are still in use eight weeks after Whirlpool began recalling the faulty machines. The affected dryers are claimed to have been responsible for at least 750 fires over an 11-year period.

The recent events involving Whirlpool's tumble dryer recall only amplify the failings of the current product recall system in the UK. Research by Electrical Safety First shows that product recalls are woefully ineffective—on average, they achieve a success rate of between 10 and 20 per cent, compared with a rate of between 89 and 98 per cent for recalls of cars and light goods vehicles. That means that there are potentially thousands of recalled electrical items still in Scottish homes. As most of those products have been recalled because they could lead to electrical fire or shock, they present a serious risk. In 2018, in Scotland alone, more than four fires a week were caused by white goods such as dishwashers and tumble dryers, so concerns around the safety of white goods have—understandably—increased.

The fact is that consumers are rarely aware of recall campaigns. Product recalls are often complex, and it can be difficult to trace the customers who own the recalled item. Many will not have provided contact details when they purchased the product, and others may have moved or passed the item on to a friend or family member.

Without contact details for customers, manufacturers have to broadcast details of the recall through retailers or through a range of traditional media and social media channels. Electrical Safety First has been calling for a centrally managed product recall database, which would allow consumers in my Shettleston constituency and beyond to check that their appliances are not subject to a recall. It would certainly make accessing information much easier for consumers. I understand that the UK Government has—at last—promised to introduce such a measure. I am interested to hear whether the Minister for Business, Fair Work and Skills has had any discussions with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy about timings for the measure's introduction, and about why it took so long to reach the decision.

There are also concerns about recalled dryers being sold by private sellers on various online marketplaces. A number of affected Whirlpool tumble dryers have been found for sale on popular online platforms. Unfortunately, model and serial numbers are not mandatory fields when listing an electrical appliance for sale via online platforms, so a consumer may be unaware that they are buying a recalled product, and some sellers may be unknowingly selling one. That situation emphasises the need for much more to be done to

increase public awareness of recalls, particularly for online retailers. It seems to me that product registration is key to that.

According to Electrical Safety First, faulty electrical products are responsible for more than six fires a week in Scotland. It also found that only a third of people in Scotland register their electrical products. MSPs do not fare much better—apparently only 37 per cent of MSPs claim to register their new electrical purchases.

Consumers who do not register their appliances clearly cannot be contacted by the manufacturer in the event of a fault or safety concern being discovered. Registering at the earliest stage, such as at the point at sale, seems like the best solution to me. There is a considerable lack of awareness of the key purpose of registration forms, as well as of the process for completing them, which currently seems to put people off registering products. Many consumers seem to associate product registration with ensuring that they have the warranty, or with extending the warranty, rather than with helping to ensure their safety. Consumers also need reassurance that product registration will not lead to their data being used for marketing purposes. Registering a product is easy and takes only a few minutes. I hope that members will support a campaign that will be launched by Electrical Safety First next month. Supported by the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, it will promote an easy guide to product registration. I am sure that members will be contacted with the relevant details.

There is clear evidence to support the mandatory registration of products at the point of sale in Scotland and the UK—so that manufacturers know where their customers are—and the creation of a centrally managed product recall database, which would give consumers a single place to go to check for recalls.

The Scottish Government has shown that it is prepared to take action to enhance consumer safety. In 2015, for example, electrical safety protections for Scottish private sector tenants were introduced, while their counterparts elsewhere in the UK are still not afforded the same safeguards. In addition, good work is already being undertaken in Scotland to raise public awareness of issues with product safety, such as the Government-funded Citizens Advice Scotland consumer helpline, which provides clear and practical advice on all consumer issues.

The Scottish Fire and Rescue Service continues to work closely with Trading Standards Scotland and key safety groups to ensure that the public is made aware of any emerging safety risks. I understand that, through the white goods working group, which is chaired by the SFRS, a successful campaign was recently launched outlining the

dangers of white goods fires and the importance of product registration. Last week was trading standards week, which was organised and promoted by the Society of Chief Officers of Trading Standards in Scotland and had a focus on product safety.

While I appreciate that the powers to tackle issues relating to electrical product safety are largely reserved, the Scottish Government has taken on responsibility for consumer advice and advocacy. Could more be done to support and enhance the awareness activities that I mentioned? Electrical Safety First suggests that there may be opportunities to tackle some of the issues through the Consumer Scotland Bill, which aims to establish a body—consumer Scotland—and give it the powers to provide advice, represent the views of consumers, collect information, organise research and carry out investigations. For example, the bill could ensure that consumer Scotland has the function of co-ordinating the dissemination of information to consumers around major recalls of electrical products that present a significant risk.

I look forward to hearing other members' speeches and—of course—the minister's response.

18:24

Tom Mason (North East Scotland) (Con): I am delighted to speak in this debate on behalf of the Conservatives. I welcome the opportunity to speak about the need for a product recall database, and I thank John Mason for securing the debate.

As the Parliament knows, in June, the white goods manufacturer Whirlpool was ordered to recall 500,000 potentially faulty products. The recall related to faulty tumble dryers that had caused fires. Aberdeen has first-hand experience in that regard: in September last year, a faulty tumble dryer caught fire in one of the city's most popular Italian restaurants.

The recall notice was ordered by the UK Government. Whirlpool's initial and—frankly—poor solution had been to advise customers not to leave products unattended while in use, which might inadvertently have given some customers the impression that their machines were safe to use. In February 2017, Whirlpool changed tack and advised customers that if they were in any doubt about their appliance being faulty, they should stop using it and unplug it—wise advice, at least.

It was only after an intervention by the Office for Product Safety and Standards that Whirlpool was notified that it must issue a product recall of tumble dryers that had not yet been modified.

Under the recall, consumers with unmodified affected tumble dryers were entitled to a replacement new machine, which would be delivered and installed—with the old one removed—at no cost. In addition, Whirlpool committed to a significant customer outreach campaign.

However, the consumer charity Electrical Safety First argues that the UK recall system is inefficient, given that the average success rate of an electrical product recall in the UK is between 10 and 20 per cent, which means that potentially millions of recalled electrical items are still out there.

It is in that context that John Mason has proposed the creation of a centrally managed database that allows consumers to check that their products are safe. I am not convinced that such a database would go beyond the structures that are already in place for product recall notification. There is a Government-run website—productrecall.campaign.gov.uk—which lists products that have been recalled.

The issue is consumers' lack of awareness of recall campaigns. Perhaps more time should be spent on solutions that raise awareness of product recall campaigns, as opposed to spending taxpayers' money on setting up a centrally managed database.

Another failure of the UK recall system relates to the tracing of faulty products. Whirlpool has managed to replace only 65,000 out of 500,000 faulty machines, which means that potentially thousands of unsafe and hazardous products remain in Scottish homes—the places where people should feel most safe.

Electrical Safety First's solution to the problem is the mandatory registration of appliances at the point of sale. The intention is to aid the tracing of faulty products, but the approach gives rise to concerns about data protection and does not solve the problem of locating dangerous products when consumers have changed their contact details or address.

Moreover, only a third of Scots register electrical appliances. I presume that promotion and further awareness of the existing service, register my appliance, would lead to more registration.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak in the debate. No one can fault the intention behind calls for a database. However the UK has some of the most stringent product safety laws in the world. A central database has merits, but better use could surely be made of the existing structures. It is for the Scottish Government to raise the profile of product safety in a way that protects consumers' personal data and reduces the cost to the taxpayer.

18:28

Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab): I thank John Mason for securing the debate and drawing members' attention to this important issue.

I have to confess that the safety of household appliances is something that we all, largely, take for granted, especially when we buy our appliances from well-known, highly reputable companies. Tumble dryers, for example, are so commonplace for most households that we cannot remember not having them—that is, until there is a fault that can have disastrous, life-changing and even life-threatening consequences.

Recalls are an important means of safeguarding consumers from dangerous goods, but we must do more to make the public aware of recalls.

We have all heard the horror stories of a faulty washing machine or tumble dryer that has resulted in a family home burning to the ground. Therefore, we would think that consumers and those in the industry would pay more attention to the quality of products and to broadcasting the recalls of items when a fault has been found. However, as John Mason pointed out, research from Electrical Safety First shows that only around 10 to 20 per cent of recalled products are returned.

I suspect that that is, in part, due to a lack of consumer education and information about which products have been recalled. More can be done. The Whirlpool recall, as mentioned in John Mason's motion, is a colossal failing. As he said, it is a recall of all tumble dryers that were sold under the Hotpoint, Indesit, Swan, Creda and Proline brands between 2004 and 2015. Those are household names.

Industry experts estimated that, when the recall began, around 800,000 tumble dryers were at risk, yet the recall announcement has gone largely unnoticed, leaving consumers in the dark and at risk. As John Mason also said, to date, only around 65,000 tumble dryers have been returned, despite the appliance being named as the cause of at least 750 fires over the 11-year period in which it was being sold.

I am aware of comments in the media from Whirlpool executives that state that the recall has been five times more successful than an average product recall—as if that gets them off the hook. They also state that, since problems started to arise many years ago, they have resolved 1.7 million customer issues concerning those tumble dryers.

However, the fact that we need to have this debate to raise awareness of the recall shows that Whirlpool can and must do more. It must ensure that a larger percentage of the public is aware of the possible risk that the tumble dryers pose. It

needs to make information about the recall easier to access. I know of constituents who have phoned and phoned but not managed to get through. It is not an easy thing to do.

Therefore, I echo the concerns of my colleague Rachel Reeves MP, who chairs the Westminster Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Committee. She has said that the modification process that Whirlpool offers, whereby a Whirlpool engineer comes to the person's home and fixes possibly faulty products, is not as good as it should be. Customers who have concerns about the quality of their product, even after modification, should consider a complete replacement. When the consequences can be so destructive and severe, we can never be too careful.

Unlike the Conservatives, I welcome calls for a centrally managed product recall database. Without such a database, it is hard for consumers to check whether things that they have bought are safe, which leaves potentially dangerous, recalled products in homes and leaves consumers in danger.

A database would make it much easier for members of the public to find out whether their appliance is affected. It would also ensure that the companies engage and that people are not left hanging on the phone.

If constituents think that their tumble dryer could be faulty, the advice from organisations such as Citizens Advice Scotland is to unplug the dryer immediately, report it and get it replaced. In every other aspect of our lives, we take safety seriously. Our approach to appliances should be no different. I hope that the minister supports that co-ordinated product recall database and I look forward to hearing how he can encourage such action.

18:33

Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP): Presiding Officer, I offer my apologies. I spoke to your colleague about the fact that, when I bid for this slot, I did not realise that decision time would be moved back. The moment I have finished speaking, I have to flee.

The subject in hand is a substantial issue. I am trying to work out whether I am one of the 37 per cent of MSPs who register their appliances. The answer is, "Sometimes I does and sometimes I doesn't." I suspect that that is true of most people, because it depends on all sorts of random things. Without question, there is difficulty in tracking down white goods that are in consumers' premises or being carried around with them—there have been recalls of mobile phones—that require to be recalled.

I will address some of the practical issues, which might be helpful for what happens in future. It is all very well publishing lists of serial numbers, but it is not very obvious where the serial number is on a lot of white goods. If it is anywhere, it is probably at the back, covered in three to five years' of grime. A person has to haul out the equipment to find the number and they then find that there are four or five labels saying different things with different numbers on them. Which one is the serial number? I have a little suggestion: it would be very helpful for the serial number to be on the front of a device and in a font size such that someone of my age can read it.

We also have an issue with finding people. We could require—I am not trying to identify whether the responsibility lies with Westminster or us; that is neither here nor there—the recording of all but the last digit of a postcode of the person buying a white good. Why would that be useful? First, by excluding the last digit, there would be a big enough cohort so that individuals could not be identified. A full postcode is between one and 100 people—well, one and 99, strictly speaking. Typically, recording all but the last digit would give a cohort of 750. If we know that X number are in that cohort, we can find them. Also, if we know that, overall, we have managed to find 10 per cent of the sales, we do not know about nine of them, and we can then go and do something about that.

Statistically, there are ways in which we can use information to home in on where the people that we do not know about are likely to be. Advertising to everybody in the population is very expensive and ineffective, and there would be difficulties if only a tiny percentage—the number may be right at the decimal point—of people have the goods. There is work that statisticians and others could do on the issue.

Having a database would certainly be useful. Many people would simply not use electronic databases. However, it would be useful to the citizens advice bureaux, retailers and service engineers and to MSPs when they are answering their constituents' queries, or even taking the unsolicited opportunity to make comments to people.

It is disappointing that goods have to be recalled, but it is inevitable that that will happen. When engineering is involved, a proportion of a product will inevitably fail at some point in its life for reasons that are unexpected. I have been contacted in relation to my car. The manufacturers knew where I was, so they could write to me. When it comes to white goods, the situation is much more difficult.

18:37

Bill Bowman (North East Scotland) (Con): Apart from Jackie Baillie's little dig at us, I think that I could probably agree with virtually everything that has been said.

I will not go through chapter and verse, but will just comment on one or two of the issues that have come up. I, too, wondered about the 37 per cent of MSPs, and who asked whom, when. I certainly support Electrical Safety First.

I see that Stewart Stevenson is disappearing from the chamber. I recognise what he said about going behind the fridge to try to find the serial number. A car's vehicle identification number is put on the windscreen, where people can see it, as members will know if they have ever had to look for one. The manufacturers know that the number should be seen. Such things can be done.

Several people mentioned getting people to fill in information and keeping it up to date. Those who have looked after a database will know that it is fine when it is set up, because there is lots of enthusiasm, at that point. The issue is how to keep it up to date. It is not the case that goods stay in one house: white goods and other products can move from one address to another, for example when the owner sells them. Whose obligation would it be to keep the database up to date?

It helps to start with a quality product in the first place, because it will have fewer faults. I was interested in Jackie Baillie's comments about the campaign not being particularly well run. That is inexcusable. Once a process is started, it should be followed through thoroughly, and the means of running it should be effective.

The motion raises what, to me, is a point of common sense; any product that is sold into the consumer domain should have a means of recall that ensures the consumer's safety in the event of fault. However, in the event that a national database is established, a stipulation needs to be made on consumer privacy—as someone said—so that recalls can be issued only for safety reasons. We all know about the general data protection regulation issues that arise from making people's data available without their permission.

I believe that the UK has some tough consumer protection laws, which require a manufacturer to contact anyone who has purchased a product that has subsequently been withdrawn.

Something that has not yet been mentioned is that we are moving into the era of the internet of things, in which a fridge, for example, is not just a stand-alone item but is connected to the internet. That will happen more and more. It will be a case of Big Brother not exactly watching us, but at least knowing where appliances are, and from that, if

there is an issue, being able to contact the person or to flash up the information that there is a reason why the appliance needs to be investigated. I throw that out as something that could be helpful, going forward.

I would support the use of a national consumer database, but I will be interested to hear from the minister how he sees that working in a practical way, so that we do not just see something being set up then withering on the vine, in terms of keeping data up to date.

18:41

The Minister for Business, Fair Work and Skills (Jamie Hepburn): I join other members in congratulating John Mason on securing this important debate. He said at the outset that he sometimes detects reticence among members to sign up to his motions. I read the terms of this one and, although as a minister I am not allowed to sign motions, I readily and heartily endorse the sentiments in it.

I also join Mr Mason in welcoming Wayne Mackay from Electrical Safety First to the gallery. I have engaged with that organisation in the past: I record my thanks, and those of the Scottish Government, for the work that it undertakes.

All of us here today, and those who are not here—virtually everyone in the country—will have bought white goods at some point. Some might even have remembered to register them. I have to confess that I am in the 63 per cent who do not, so I commit to doing much better in the future. When we purchase such goods, we should be able to do so with confidence that we will not be put at risk. Jackie Baillie was right to say that we should have that expectation. However, we know that it is not always the case. Many people are left unaware that they might have a dangerous product in their home.

The point has been made by Electrical Safety First that only a third of Scottish consumers register their products, which contributes to the difficulty in recalling faulty items. Currently, no more than 20 per cent of items are recalled successfully. Even in high-profile cases, such as the obvious one of the Whirlpool tumble dryers that was mentioned, there might still be hundreds of thousands of faulty machines in UK homes, as John Mason said. On that specific case, the latest figures that I have seen show that, as at 10 September, 65,000 of the tumble-dryers in question had been located by Whirlpool, with more than 400,000 still unidentified. That shows the scale of the challenge.

I will set out some of the activities that the Scottish Government is engaged in. Earlier this year, the Minister for Community Safety launched

the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service's white goods fire safety campaign, which provides clear advice on how to reduce the risks of fires that start from white goods. That is a salient reminder of all the good work that the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service undertakes to protect communities and keep people safe.

We are committed to ensuring that everyone lives in safe, inclusive and resilient communities. One part of that is our determination to reduce the number and impact of house fires that start with white goods. I support the white goods partnership approach, which includes the Scottish Government, the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, trading standards departments and Electrical Safety First, working with communities. It is by working together with a common aim that we can best reduce the number and impact of white goods fires.

I urge everyone to take the simple step of using registermyappliance.org to get alerts should faults be identified in their white goods, and to check Electrical Safety First's website for product recalls and advice on what to do with a recalled product. That is an important way to raise awareness. We should, of course, use it and encourage others to use it.

However, I agree that a product recall database would be a more comprehensive measure. I was a bit confused when Tom Mason said that he is unconvinced about the need for such a database, given that the office for product safety and standards, which is part of the UK Government's Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy—which is, of course, under the administration of Tom Mason's party—has committed to establishing such a database. I agree with Tom Mason that the database will have to build on what exists, but there is a commitment to do that.

I agree with John Mason that there should not be a delay in building that database. He asked what engagement there has been between Governments on the matter. There has been engagement at official level, but I commit to follow up directly with the relevant UK minister, who I think is Kelly Tolhurst, and will be happy to update members who have participated in the debate on the response.

There were a number of useful suggestions that I will also follow up with Kelly Tolhurst. I will take up points that were made by Stewart Stevenson in his usual detailed and forensic fashion, and points that Bill Bowman made about the ease with which product information can be displayed on items: he made a really useful suggestion. I see that Mr Bowman is surprised by that. He made a useful suggestion about utilisation of what we call the internet of things, so I will avail myself of the

opportunity to explore that with Kelly Tolhurst. It could be a straightforward way to deal with some of the concerns that have been raised.

We have committed to establishing a body called consumer Scotland. The Consumer Scotland Bill is before Parliament, and I look forward to pursuing it. I believe that the Economy, Energy and Fair Work Committee recently closed its call for evidence on the bill and will start to scrutinise it, so I look forward to engaging with the committee.

That organisation is designed to be primarily investigatory, but it will be able to provide information on consumer matters, including on products that present a significant risk. I think that John Mason suggested that consumer Scotland could have responsibility for dissemination of information directly to consumers. I am not convinced that we are empowered to legislate for that, but I am happy to explore the issue. It is a useful suggestion and I undertake to explore it as we progress the bill.

I welcome the work that has been done to protect consumers, whether that is raising awareness of the dangers of faulty goods, as Electrical Safety First has done, or the work on the proposed database that we have debated this evening. We can all play our part in ensuring maximum protection from harm for consumers. We are doing that in Scotland by creating consumer Scotland and through the electricians working group, which I chair, and the funding that we provide for the consumer helpline, which we will always continue.

I will take away some of the points that have been raised, and I look forward to updating members who have taken part in the debate, and any member who wants to contact me, on where we get to on that.

Meeting closed at 18:49.

This is the final edition of the *Official Report* for this meeting. It is part of the Scottish Parliament *Official Report* archive and has been sent for legal deposit.

Published in Edinburgh by the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, the Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh, EH99 1SP

All documents are available on
the Scottish Parliament website at:

www.parliament.scot

Information on non-endorsed print suppliers
is available here:

www.parliament.scot/documents

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact
Public Information on:

Telephone: 0131 348 5000

Textphone: 0800 092 7100

Email: sp.info@parliament.scot



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba