FINANCE COMMITTEE

Tuesday 7 May 2002 (*Morning*)

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body 2002. Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to the Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ Fax 01603 723000, which is administering the copyright on behalf of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body. Produced and published in Scotland on behalf of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body by The Stationery Office Ltd. Her Majesty's Stationery Office is independent of and separate from the company now

trading as The Stationery Office Ltd, which is responsible for printing and publishing Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body publications.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 7 May 2002

	Col
CROSS-CUTTING REVIEWS	2031
ITEM IN PRIVATE	2032
BUDGET PROCESS 2003-04 (COMMITTEE REPORTS)	2033
,	

FINANCE COMMITTEE

9th Meeting 2002, Session 1

CONVENER

*Des McNulty (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- *Brian Adam (North-East Scotland) (SNP)
- *Mr David Davidson (North-East Scotland) (Con)

*Mr Tom McCabe (Hamilton South) (Lab)

*Alasdair Morgan (Gallow ay and Upper Nithsdale) (SNP)
Mr Jamie Stone (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)

THE FOLLOWING ALSO ATTENDED:

Professor Arthur Midwinter (Adviser)

ACTING CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE

David McGill

SENIOR ASSISTANT CLERK

Terry Shevlin

ASSISTANT CLERK

Gerald McInally

LOC ATION

Committee Room 1

^{*}attended

Scottish Parliament

Finance Committee

Tuesday 7 May 2002

(Morning)

[THE CONVENER opened the meeting at 10:30]

Cross-cutting Reviews

The Convener (Des McNulty): Welcome to the Finance Committee's ninth meeting in 2002. We open the meeting in public. David Davidson has already switched off his mobile phone. We have received apologies from Mr Jamie Stone, and Professor Arthur Midwinter is in attendance.

Agenda item 1 concerns cross-cutting reviews and is an opportunity to brief the committee on the progress of the two reviews. All committee members were involved in discussions last week and progress continues on managing the work of the reviews. We now have provisional advisers for both reviews. The next stage is to set up as soon as possible a meeting between the advisers, the reporter groups and the consultees.

The clerk has produced a paper, which has been circulated. I would welcome any relevant comments from members on whether they are content with the paper. Do members wish to offer any suggestions about the preparatory work that can be carried out in advance of the next meetings?

Brian Adam (North-East Scotland) (SNP): We should accept the paper and move on.

Mr David Davidson (North-East Scotland) (Con): I back that.

The Convener: Everybody is happy. Excellent.

Item in Private

The Convener: Item 2 is to ask members to agree to consider in private the private finance initiative issues paper at the next meeting. Is that agreed?

Members indicated agreement.

Budget Process 2003-04 (Committee Reports)

The Convener: Agenda item 3 relates to the budget process. The clerk has issued a paper that details the discussions that the committee had at its meeting on 13 November 2001 on whether consideration of subject committee budget reports should be in private.

At the time, the general feeling was that the Finance Committee should consider the reports in public if the subject committees agreed and were aware when they signed off their reports that that would happen. Members are asked to agree that the subject committee reports be made public. In so doing, members must be content that the recommendations that might be included in the subject committee reports will not have an adverse impact on the Finance Committee's report.

Do members have any views on whether the reports should be taken in private or in public?

Alasdair Morgan (Galloway and Upper Nithsdale) (SNP): We should discuss the reports in public. There is no strong reason why we should deal with them in private.

Mr Tom McCabe (Hamilton South) (Lab): We should discuss the reports in public, but we need to be careful not to upset other committees. That can sometimes be an easy mistake to make.

Mr Davidson: I agree. It is important that the committee examine how the subject committees have approached their meetings. I presume that, in future years, it will be up to us to give advice and take note of how the other committees approach the budget procedure. We will need to be fairly circumspect about how we state that. I recall that we had a discussion last year about the methodology that was used by the different subject committees. We held that discussion in private because that is not the same thing as examining the subject committees' actual reports. Perhaps we need to be aware that there are two parts to the matter.

The Convener: Obviously, there is a process of exchange between the Finance Committee and the subject committees. I suggest that we ask the clerk to tell the clerks of the subject committees that we expect to deal with their reports in public. If any subject committee has a problem with that, its clerk can inform us that there is an issue. We could make clear the basis of our expectation, and our clerk could liaise with the subject committees' clerks about the format that is to be followed.

David McGill (Clerk): At the moment, the subject committees' reports are published first by the Finance Committee as part of its report. As is

mentioned in the paper that has been circulated to members, one option is for the subject committees to put their reports on their pages on the Parliament's website. We could retain control by taking responsibility for asking the subject committees to do that, having first taken a quick look at the reports to ascertain whether they contain any issues that the Finance Committee would like to keep private. If they do not, we can then ask the subject committees to put their reports on their parts of the website. That would put the reports in the public domain, so there would be no issue about whether we could consider them in public.

The Convener: That seems to be a reasonable suggestion. Does Arthur Midwinter have any views on the matter?

Professor Arthur Midwinter (Adviser): I do not really mind either way, as long as we have a free and open discussion. I have a minor nagging concern, which reflects my experience over recent weeks. Fairly minor disagreements about procedures or about whether committees have followed guidance could be blown up in the public domain and portrayed as something like a turf war. There could be quite legitimate disagreement about whether guidance was appropriate for given committees. That is my only reservation.

The Convener: That is why I suggested that our clerks liaise with those of the subject committees in an attempt to identify issues. If concerns arise from the content of a subject committee's report, we can deal with that report in that context, with the clerks managing the process in the way that David McGill suggested. Do we agree in principle that that is how we will proceed?

Members indicated agreement.

The Convener: Item 4 is discussion of a paper that relates to our private finance initiative/public-private partnership inquiry, which we decided previously to discuss in private. I think that the member of the press has already left.

10:36

Meeting continued in private until 10:56.

Members who would like a printed copy of the *Official Report* to be forwarded to them should give notice at the Document Supply Centre.

No proofs of the *Official Report* can be supplied. Members who want to suggest corrections for the archive edition should mark them clearly in the daily edition, and send it to the Official Report, 375 High Street, Edinburgh EH99 1SP. Suggested corrections in any other form cannot be accepted.

The deadline for corrections to this edition is:

Tuesday 14 May 2002

Members who want reprints of their speeches (within one month of the date of publication) may obtain request forms and further details from the Central Distribution Office, the Document Supply Centre or the Official Report.

PRICES AND SUBSCRIPTION RATES

DAILY EDITIONS

Single copies: £5

Meetings of the Parliament annual subscriptions: £350.00

The archive edition of the Official Report of meetings of the Parliament, written answers and public meetings of committees will be published on CD-ROM.

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN THE SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT, compiled by the Scottish Parliament Information Centre, contains details of past and forthcoming business and of the work of committees and gives general information on legislation and other parliamentary activity.

Single copies: £3.75 Special issue price: £5 Annual subscriptions: £150.00

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS weekly compilation

Single copies: £3.75

Annual subscriptions: £150.00

Standing orders will be accepted at the Document Supply Centre.

Published in Edinburgh by The Stationery Office Limited and available from:

The Stationery Office Bookshop 71 Lothian Road Edinburgh EH3 9AZ 0131 228 4181 Fax 0131 622 7017

The Stationery Office Bookshops at: 123 Kingsway, London WC2B 6PQ Tel 020 7242 6393 Fax 020 7242 6394 68-69 Bull Street, Bir mingham B4 6AD Tel 0121 236 9696 Fax 0121 236 9699 33 Wine Street, Bristol BS1 2BQ Tel 01179 264306 Fax 01179 294515 9-21 Princess Street, Manchester M60 8AS Tel 0161 834 7201 Fax 0161 833 0634 16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD Tel 028 9023 8451 Fax 028 9023 5401 The Stationery Office Oriel Bookshop, 18-19 High Street, Car diff CF12BZ Tel 029 2039 5548 Fax 029 2038 4347

The Stationery Office Scottish Parliament Documentation Helpline may be able to assist with additional information on publications of or about the Scottish Parliament, their availability and cost:

Telephone orders and inquiries 0870 606 5566

Fax orders 0870 606 5588

The Scottish Parliament Shop George IV Bridge EH99 1SP Telephone orders 0131 348 5412

sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk www.scottish.parliament.uk

Accredited Agents (see Yellow Pages)

and through good booksellers

Printed in Scotland by The Stationery Office Limited

ISBN 0 338 000003 ISSN 1467-0178