

# **MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT**

Wednesday 19 May 1999

Volume 1 No 4

£5.00

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body 2000.

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

## Wednesday 19 May 1999

### Debates

Col.

<b>MINISTERS</b> .....	57
<i>Motion moved—[Donald Dewar]—and agreed to.</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Lord James Douglas-Hamilton]—and disagreed to.</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Michael Russell]—and disagreed to.</i>	
David McLetchie (Lothians) (Con).....	63
Mr John Swinney (North Tayside) (SNP) .....	64
George Lyon (Argyll and Bute) (LD).....	67
Roseanna Cunningham (Perth) (SNP).....	69
Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab) .....	69
Mr Brian Monteith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con).....	71
Mike Watson (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab) .....	73
Richard Lochhead (North-East Scotland) (SNP).....	75
Trish Godman (West Renfrewshire) (Lab) .....	76
Mary Scanlon (Highlands and Islands) (Con).....	78
Euan Robson (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD) .....	79
Mr Duncan Hamilton (Highlands and Islands) (SNP).....	80
Mr Kenneth Macintosh (Eastwood) (Lab).....	81
Tommy Sheridan (Glasgow) (SSP).....	82
Des McNulty (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab) .....	84
Michael Matheson (Central Scotland) (SNP) .....	86
Hugh Henry (Paisley South) (Lab) .....	87
Dennis Canavan (Falkirk West).....	88
Lewis Macdonald (Aberdeen Central) (Lab).....	90
Mr Swinney .....	91
David McLetchie .....	92
Mr Jim Wallace (Orkney) (LD).....	92
<b>JUNIOR MINISTERS</b> .....	103
<i>Motion moved—[Donald Dewar]—and agreed to.</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Phil Gallie]—and disagreed to.</i>	
The First Minister (Donald Dewar) .....	103
Phil Gallie (South of Scotland) (Con) .....	106
Mr Kenny MacAskill (Lothians) (SNP).....	108
Mr Keith Raffan (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD) .....	109
Mr Andy Kerr (East Kilbride) (Lab) .....	111
Nicola Sturgeon (Glasgow) (SNP).....	112
Bill Aitken (Glasgow) (Con) .....	114
Johann Lamont (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab).....	115
Fiona Hyslop (Lothians) (SNP).....	117
Mr Kenneth Gibson (Glasgow) (SNP) .....	119
Dr Richard Simpson (Ochil) (Lab) .....	120
Alex Neil (Central Scotland) (SNP) .....	121
Phil Gallie.....	123
Ross Finnie (West of Scotland) (LD).....	123
<b>SCOTTISH PARLIAMENTARY CORPORATE BODY</b> .....	131

---

---

<b>SITTING DAYS</b> .....	142
<i>Motion moved—[Mr McCabe]—and agreed to.</i>	
Mr Tom McCabe (Hamilton South) (Lab) .....	142
Andrew Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP).....	143
Mr Keith Raffan (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD) .....	143
Fergus Ewing (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP).....	144
Dorothy-Grace Elder (Glasgow) (SNP) .....	145
Dennis Canavan (Falkirk West).....	145
Johann Lamont (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab) .....	146
Mr Alex Salmond (Banff and Buchan) (SNP) .....	146
Robin Harper (Lothians) (Green).....	147
Mr McCabe .....	147

---



## Scottish Parliament

*Wednesday 19 May 1999*

[THE PRESIDING OFFICER *opened the meeting at 10:00*]

**The Presiding Officer (Sir David Steel):**

Before we start on the business of the day, I have one announcement to make. I want to correct the announcement of the vote on prayers that was made yesterday. The figures were transposed, and should have been announced as follows: For 69, Against 37, Abstentions 15. The motion was carried. The incorrect announcement makes no difference to the vote, but I am sorry that it was made.

We are also having teething troubles with the business bulletin, and I ask for your indulgence on that. It has now been suggested and agreed in informal discussion with the Parliamentary Bureau that we will not take the motion on the summer recess today because it has not yet been agreed. Mr McCabe will withdraw the motion that is on the business bulletin, and Mr Russell will withdraw his amendment. Instead, there will be a short business motion dealing with the formal meetings over the bank holiday. It will be lodged by Mr McCabe now and be taken at the end of this afternoon's debate.

I have been considering the fact that a very large number of members want to speak in today's main debate. For that reason, I am proposing that the debate should be extended until 12 pm, that we should then adjourn for lunch, and that we should debate the appointment of junior ministers in the afternoon for an hour from 2.30 pm. That will enable more members to participate. Normally such motions would be ordered in advance, but I hope that members will find this a more convenient arrangement that will allow a more extended debate.

I also propose that there be one debate, with separate votes at the end on the amendments that I have selected. At the start of the debate, after the First Minister has moved his motion, I shall ask that the two amendments that I have selected be moved formally. We will then have a general debate, taking the votes on the amendments at the end. Instead of splitting up the proceedings into short debates on each amendment, there will be one general debate. I hope that that, too, will be to the convenience of Parliament.

Is it agreed? It is agreed.

**Michael Russell (South of Scotland) (SNP):**

On a point of order. Amendments S1M-4.1 and S1M-5.1 conflate the names of two individuals—in the case amendment 4.1, those of James Wallace

and Ross Finnie, and in the case of amendment 5.1, those of Nicol Stephen and Iain Smith. It would be far more appropriate to take separate votes on the appointment of those individuals, particularly in the case of amendment 5.1, as the business bulletin shows that a number of motions were lodged relating to Nicol Stephen, but only one relating to Iain Smith. Conflating them in this way creates difficulties for members who wish to vote for one or other candidate. I ask you to separate out those votes.

**The Presiding Officer:** I took that into account, but decided that there had to be a limit to the number of amendments that I could accept if we were to have rational debate. I took the amendments that were broader in scope; in other words, those that included two names. You can, Mr Russell, distinguish in the debate between Nicol Stephen and Iain Smith, but I am afraid that as far as the vote is concerned, Mr Smith will have to suffer guilt by association.

In accordance with section 47 of the Scotland Act 1998, the First Minister may, with the approval of Her Majesty, appoint ministers, but before doing so he must have the agreement of Parliament. I call the First Minister, Mr Dewar.

## Ministers

10:04

**The First Minister (Donald Dewar):** I hope that we do, in fact, have rational debate this morning and on all occasions. This is a motion of some interest. It is a motion to approve or give support to a ministerial list which, if that support is forthcoming, will be submitted to Her Majesty the Queen. That is a significant innovation to our constitutional practice and I welcome it. It is an opportunity to commend a team that will work hard for Scotland and deliver what Scots want.

On the whole—I am perhaps trying my luck in saying this—the ministerial list has been reasonably well received, although there has been the odd mixed notice. That is inevitable, and I would describe it as Opposition parties on automatic pilot, or, old habits die hard.

Mike Russell was quoted as describing me and my colleagues as “party hacks and apparatchiks”. That is certainly a subject in which he is expert. He has practised the art with great distinction for a number of years, but I suggest to him that he is wrong on this occasion.

The ministerial list has also been condemned as a central belt clique, I think by David McLetchie or by some of his apparatchiks and party hacks. I suggest that if that is his best argument, he is getting very short of ammunition very early in the campaign. He may be interested that there is an east-west balance—which I believe is good—in the Administration as a whole. He will note that around 25 per cent of the ministerial team are women, and that a third of the team come from outwith the central belt. I am glad about the fact that there is a minister from every one of the eight list regions on which the electoral system was based. There is a genuine spread.

**Phil Gallie (South of Scotland) (Con):** Is it not the case that the First Minister could hardly miss with respect to selecting members from every region, given that one in six MSPs will become a Government minister?

**The First Minister:** Phil Gallie is a great expert in missing. His point gives me a terrible and horrible feeling of déjà vu—I suppose that I will overcome that in time. As far as I am concerned, the figures speak for themselves. It is a fair and good spread. The people in my team were picked on merit—I ought to make that very clear. It is not a pedantic matter of geographical balance, but the outcome is a happy one.

In this afternoon's debate, we will no doubt return to the size of the junior ministerial team. We have been accused of extravagance and of the

constitutional equivalent of loose living. It is the first time in a long time that I have been accused of loose living and I am quite flattered. I have to disown the compliment.

I also like the fact that *The Scotsman* yesterday accused us of having put in place a series of faction captains. I do not know who I would put in that category. Rather quaintly, it went on to say that too much attention had been paid to the

“dishonourable tradition of rewarding loyalty”.

That is an interesting insight into how the editor of *The Scotsman* picks his team. I can think of a few people in that team whose presence is explained by that, but I should not pursue that line too far, or I will make enemies where, of course, I have friends.

The outstanding feature of the Administration is that it is a partnership Administration and a coalition Administration. That fact has produced heavy attacks from some predictable quarters. The huddle of amendments that we are discussing today is the end product of those attacks.

There has been an attack on the basis of the coalition and on the circumstances of the case, but—perhaps more surprisingly and more fundamentally—there has been root-and-branch opposition to the principle of coalition.

Inevitably, I have to take the arguments in a short space of time. I will deal with the basis of the coalition and with the circumstances of the case. A great deal of the fire has been directed at the question of tuition fees. The issue is surrounded by controversy, and I concede that there is considerable opposition to the current policy. My colleagues in the Liberal Democrat party have made it very clear that they stand where they did, but we have all agreed that there ought to be a proper inquiry before there is action, and that there ought to be a proper investigation of all aspects of higher and further education funding in Scotland. That seems to be a matter almost of common sense. It is known by the Parliament that we have had a massive range of representations from higher education, saying that we should not snatch at the matter and that we should not just rush to abolish tuition fees, but that we should try to get right something that is a very complicated issue.

That view has been put to us by the Association of University Teachers (Scotland), by the Committee of Scottish Higher Education Principals and by the National Union of Students. I ought to say that the NUS has made it clear that it wants the abolition of tuition fees, but it still argues that there should be a full inquiry first so that we get it right.

**Mr John Swinney (North Tayside) (SNP)**  
rose—

**The First Minister:** I will finish this passage before I give way.

All those organisations argue that case because they fear that if we snatch at the decision, if we rush to judgment, we may attack the wrong target and end up with the wrong result. We must define our objectives. John Swinney—to whom I will give way in a minute—will surely agree that we must consider access, the number of places and the most effective way of broadening the student base of higher education and that we must deal with the future financial consequences of any changes that we introduce. Given that, it is perfectly honourable, good practice and good sense for the Parliament to say that we will consider these things properly and that we will get impartial advice before we take that decision. I will be interested to hear the attack that I presume is about to come because I would have thought that a cautious man such as Mr Swinney would take the view that that was proper preparation for decision making.

**Mr Swinney:** It has certainly taken a long time to get to the end of that passage—it seemed to be the longest on earth. I accept the points the First Minister is making in relation to the commentary by the AUT and the Committee of Scottish Higher Education Principals and other organisations, but there was one important group of people that he missed out of his explanation of the body of opinion, and that is the electorate. By voting for the Conservative party, the Scottish National party, the Liberal Democrats and the three independent members, the electorate said quite clearly that it did not want tuition fees. Where is the electorate in this cosy coalition between the Labour party and the Liberal Democrats?

**The First Minister:** I think that the electorate takes the view that good decision making should be the mark of a mature Parliament. I am interested to hear that it was a single-issue election. Most of the nationalists I talked to made claims about certain other issues being the determining factor, and said that those issues were what took people into the SNP and that lobby, if I can put it that way, and made them put crosses against SNP candidates.

Information is constantly shifting on tuition fees. I had some figures just the other day that may be of interest—I use them only as a symbol of the need for full information. The assessments by the Students Awards Agency for Scotland this year show that 54 per cent of students will pay no tuition fees, 23 per cent will be on the taper and 23 per cent will pay full fees. That is a very significant shift on the figures that I was using only a few months ago. I very, very clearly take the position that we want to get this right. This Parliament is supposed to be about talking—certainly—but also about listening and about learning. There has

been a great deal of talk about proper scrutiny before we reach decisions and, if we take that seriously, it seems to me fair that we should start now as we intend to continue.

**Mr Alex Salmond (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)** rose—

**The First Minister:** I am genuinely conscious of the time. One of the problems—

**Mr Salmond:** That would be a bad practice.

**The First Minister:** All right, I will let him in—very quickly.

**Mr Salmond:** Does the First Minister acknowledge that the majority of the Scottish electorate voted against tuition fees? Do Liberal members of the Parliament, as far as he is aware, have a free vote after the commission of inquiry has reported?

**The First Minister:** I recognise that a majority of votes were cast for parties that had that as one issue in their manifesto. That is very different from saying that it was a one-issue election or that such a simple connection can be made. I know that Mr Salmond is good at making oversimple connections, but I think that that is a dangerous one for him to make. What we must do is see the outcome of the inquiry, assuming the Parliament agrees to set it up, and make proper judgments on that basis.

The second point I want to address about the coalition is whether coalition is in itself in some way inherently unfair and wicked—

**Mr Salmond:** And a free vote?

**The First Minister:** I have just said that we will have to wait and see the results. We will then try to reach—Mr Salmond laughs, but it would be the height of ridiculousness even in his strange political world to appoint a committee of inquiry and then say that we will pay no attention to what it says. That would be a total illogicality.

**Mr Salmond** rose—

**The First Minister:** I am not going to let Mr Salmond in again. What we intend is that the Executive will consider the results of the inquiry, as will everyone else. My intention, my expectation and my hope is that a collective decision will emerge from doing that, but we will all have to wait and see. Let me move on.

**Mr Salmond:** Is there a free vote?

**The First Minister:** I have just answered. We expect to reach a collective decision and we will move forward from that point.

The other point is that there is an attack on coalitions as such. I find that very odd, because the Scottish National party has a record of



coalitions, as every member will know. One such coalition existed between 1994 and 1996 in an important unit of government, the Grampian Region. The SNP was in coalition—I almost hesitate to mention—with the Liberal Democrats, heaven forbid. I presume that that coalition was established because the SNP wanted an administration that could deliver a policy that would give a sense of direction and which would work in a constructive and proper way. At the time, those were very good reasons for entering into that coalition, and those same arguments apply now. I hope that people will accept and understand that.

I am always surprised by the attitudes of the SNP. Sometimes I am astonished by them, Sir David, but let us leave that for another occasion. I remind SNP members that they have advocated proportional representation for as many years as I can remember, yet they are totally unwilling to live with the consequences of the policy that they advocated. That was pointed out to them, repeatedly and tirelessly, by the press and others during the election campaign. It is absolutely right that we should try to give a sense of purpose to this Parliament and to working in partnership.

**Mr Kenneth Gibson (Glasgow) (SNP):** Is it not the case that policies should be based on principles other than the speaker's—

**The First Minister:** I am not giving way. I trust that people will not rise in their place and shout at members—not even nationalists.

**The Presiding Officer:** If a member wants to make an intervention, he must rise in his place and call on the minister to give way. He must not then continue to speak unless the minister has given way.

**The First Minister:** I apologise to Mr Gibson, but I am conscious of the time. I am not going to give way to him, because I must sit down in two or three minutes if I am to hold to my side of the bargain with those who are trying to take part in this debate.

I finish by stating that this is a partnership coalition, and that we want to make that partnership work. We are determined to make it work, and to give it every chance, because we genuinely believe that it is right for the country and not simply for sectional interests. I agree that those who are not in the coalition may be disappointed by the fact that they are not included. *[Laughter.]* The derisive laughter of SNP members suggests that we have been very wise in the arrangements that we have made. It points also to the fact that, if we cannot command a reasonable working arrangement in this chamber, the Parliament will get into great difficulties in deciding anything and will end up in some degree of

confusion and chaos. The interesting—and, I suspect, instinctive—response to my remark underlines that point.

Our aim is a partnership that is determined to raise educational standards, to give patient-centred health care, to create employment opportunities in Scotland, and to look to the social justice agenda. We aim to redress the balance, by placing the emphasis on helping those in almost all of our communities whose prospects are damaged by cruel circumstances over which they have no control. I would like to think that members from all parts of the chamber would be prepared to help with that agenda. I also believe that the Administration must be committed to it, and that that Administration is the one that I commend to the chamber now. It is a ministerial team that is ready for action, that is committed to delivery, and which has considerable talent and energy. I very much hope that it will get what it needs: the support of those who sit in our Parliament.

I am honoured and delighted to move the motion. I move,

That this Parliament agrees that  
James Wallace,  
Sam Galbraith,  
Henry McLeish,  
Jack McConnell,  
Susan Deacon,  
Tom McCabe,  
Ross Finnie,  
Wendy Alexander,  
Sarah Boyack  
be appointed as Ministers.

**The Presiding Officer:** It might help members if I make it clear that the time limits that I am suggesting for speeches will not mean, as in the House of Commons, cutting people off mid-sentence at the end of the allotted time. I will be flexible, and will take account of interventions that a member has taken during a speech. Flexibility is limited, but it is there.

I would like members formally to move amendment S1M-4.1 in Mr McLetchie's name, and amendment S1M-4.3 in Mr Swinney's name, so that we can have a wide debate.

*Amendments moved:* S1M-4.1, to leave out "James Wallace" and "Ross Finnie".—*[Lord James Douglas-Hamilton.]*

S1M-4.3, to leave out "Henry McLeish".—*[Michael Russell.]*

**The Presiding Officer:** Both amendments are open to debate. I shall call Mr McLetchie first, with a time limit of six minutes, followed by Mr Swinney, with a time limit of six minutes. I shall then open the debate with time limits of four minutes for each member. At the end, I shall invite someone who supported each of the amendments to respond for two minutes. The debate will be

wound up by Mr Jim Wallace, speaking in favour of the motion, with a limit of six minutes.

10:20

**David McLetchie (Lothians) (Con):** The Scottish Conservatives oppose the appointment of Mr Jim Wallace and Mr Ross Finnie as Scottish ministers because they are here under false pretences.

They were elected on a manifesto that committed them to abolish tuition fees, end charges for eye and dental checks, lift the beef-on-the-bone ban, scrap tolls on the Skye bridge and stop the use of the private finance initiative in funding public projects.

None of those commitments appears in the coalition agreement, which is surprising when one considers that Mr Wallace has said of himself:

"In negotiating with anyone, I have a pretty strong resolve to get what I want."

Oh, really? Well, he could have fooled me. As we all know, promises made by Mr Wallace are just election rhetoric. It is a great pity that he did not tell that to the electorate, or to some of his hoodwinked back benchers, before 6 May.

Some Liberal Democrat back benchers seem to think that if one puts a policy before the electorate in one's party manifesto, and claims on national television two days before voting that it is non-negotiable, one should not ditch that policy after the election for the sake of a vestige of power. Those back benchers are right. They are the honourable members in the Liberal Democrat party. It is a pity that they belong to a dishonourable party.

The Liberal Democrats have been exposed for what they are: totally unprincipled and happy to whelp as Labour's lapdogs. Jim Wallace may have claimed during the election campaign that he would not trade principles for a ministerial Mondeo, but an Omega and a deputy's badge have obviously done the trick.

The Liberal Democrats seem to think that they will get a free vote on tuition fees after the independent commission has reported. The fact of the matter is, as we all know, that they will be bound and whipped by the final decision of the Cabinet, which has a majority of Labour members who are wholly opposed to abolition.

The Liberal Democrats have been taken for a ride by Labour. Either one accepts the principle of free higher education for students and young people or one does not. There is no need for an independent commission to adjudicate on that, so it is a pointless exercise.

**The First Minister:** I am interested in the

absolutism of Mr McLetchie's argument, the implication of which seems to be that he is in favour of free higher education. Why then did the Conservatives introduce loans, and why does he not advocate their abolition?

**David McLetchie:** There is a distinction between tuition fees and maintenance for students while they are studying. There is free school education—nursery, primary and secondary—but nobody is suggesting that the Government should pay maintenance awards to parents for looking after their children.

It is not as though this Government could not afford to lose a couple of ministers. Losing Jim Wallace and Ross Finnie would help to shrink a top-heavy Administration.

Let us consider the numbers. There is the new Secretary of State for Scotland—and it would be churlish not to congratulate Dr Reid on his appointment to that distinguished office—and his two junior ministers. There is the new post of Advocate General, and we congratulate Lynda Clark on her appointment to that post. Then there is the First Minister and his team. Altogether, some 24 ministers are carrying out the work that, before the general election, was done by just five ministers. There are now nearly five times as many ministers as there were.

Frankly, that is an outrage. It is an explosion of bureaucracy and red tape, all of which must be paid for by the taxpayer. Does anybody seriously think that the money to pay for all those ministers and their entourage of special advisers, spin doctors, secretaries, chauffeurs and so on, could not have been better spent on the education of our young people? Some of that money could have been put towards funding the abolition of tuition fees for higher education.

I propose that we strike a blow for smaller, smarter government in Scotland by putting this bloated Administration on a diet. That means cutting out Jim Wallace and Ross Finnie. They are too rich, indigestible and unpalatable. They deserve no less, for they are guilty of perpetrating a massive fraud on the people of Scotland at the election. Their masters will no doubt save them today, but the people will judge them later.

10:25

**Mr John Swinney (North Tayside) (SNP):** Yesterday, I raised a point with you, Sir David, about the "Partnership for Scotland" document that has been put before Parliament by the coalition Administration. That is where I want to start, because it is at the root of the discussion that we are having today.

The Parliament has got off to a very good start.

It began its business with the dignified elections of the Presiding Officer and the First Minister, and the meetings were convened in a dignified way. However, I do not think that the Executive can be said to have got off to a particularly good start. It is important to remember the contents of "Partnership for Scotland: An Agreement for the First Scottish Parliament", which state what this Administration will put to the Parliament. The document covers a number of areas where the hopes that we had for this Parliament to be the start of a new politics in Scotland have been thwarted by the actions of the coalition Administration.

Mr McLeish is a key minister in that Administration and is responsible for one of the most sensitive policy areas. His foreword to the consultative steering group report on the Scottish Parliament raised a great deal of hope in Scotland. He wrote:

"In all our deliberations we have been struck by the degree of consensus that exists. In particular, that the establishment of the Scottish Parliament offers the opportunity to put in place a new sort of democracy in Scotland, closer to the Scottish people and more in tune with Scottish needs. People in Scotland have high hopes for their Parliament, and in developing our proposals we have been keen to ensure that these hopes will be met. In particular, our recommendations envisage an open, accessible Parliament; a Parliament where power is shared with the people".

Where, in this "Partnership for Scotland" agreement, are the people who voted decisively for the abolition of tuition fees in the election on 6 May? They have been forgotten in the negotiations for the coalition Administration.

We have before us a proposal on tuition fees that nobody had heard about and that nobody was offered on 6 May. It has been cobbled together so that this Administration could be formed and it excludes the clear and express opinion of people in Scotland that tuition fees should be abolished. The overwhelming majority of the members of this Parliament were elected to deliver on that opinion.

**Hugh Henry (Paisley South) (Lab):** Mr Swinney says that the people of Scotland voted overwhelmingly for the abolition of tuition fees and that that was what they were voting for when they voted for the SNP. Will he now accept that, in voting for the SNP, people were voting only for the abolition of tuition fees and not for independence?

**Mr Swinney:** I think that the SNP's performance and achievement is clear from the outcome of the election. This Parliament, which remains within the United Kingdom constitution, is an acknowledgement of the support given to the political parties. Equally, this Parliament was elected to deliver to the people of Scotland the abolition of tuition fees, but the actions of some members since 6 May have not contributed to the

delivery of that policy commitment. That is the key point that emerges from this debate.

Mr McLeish is to be supported in his work by Nicol Stephen, who is the Deputy Minister for Enterprise and Lifelong Learning. Over the past 24 hours, a number of remarks have been made that show the difficulties that this coalition Administration will have to overcome if they are to deliver on the partnership document, irrespective of whether that document reflects any of the aspirations of the people of Scotland.

The coalition agreement has failed to recognise what the Liberal Democrat manifesto said about beef on the bone. It has failed to deliver any real change to the privatisation of public services and it has failed to abolish tolls on the Skye bridge. The coalition Administration has cast aside all those things.

We must focus the debate on tuition fees—that is the fundamental point about the way in which this coalition has been constructed. On Sunday, Mr Ross Finnie said that we would be able to vote freely according to our views on the report. The next day, it was reported that Mr McLeish had said that, from the point at which the report was presented,

"collective cabinet responsibility holds and we would anticipate that both parliamentary groups would support the set of recommendations that we would put to the parliament."

Unless I am mistaken, there is a contradiction between those two arguments. My colleague Mr Salmond asked the First Minister whether there would be a free vote when the report was produced. I do not want to be uncharitable to the First Minister—I am never uncharitable to him—but it was quite clear from his answer that he had dodged Mr Salmond's question. There is no free vote. Mr McLeish makes the position absolutely clear: when the independent commission reports on tuition fees, the Executive will come to a conclusion about that report and the two coalition partners will adhere to that conclusion.

Somewhere along the line there is a fundamental division of opinion at the heart of the coalition agreement. Will Liberal Democrat members be able to apply independent discretion when the report is produced? It sounds as though they will not.

On Radio Scotland this morning, we heard that, in the foreword to the partnership document, the First Minister and Mr Wallace had talked about the ability to deliver stable government. At the heart of this coalition agreement is an issue on which the Scottish election turned and a fundamental disagreement about the rights of the coalition partners in the Administration.

The Administration is not stable. It cannot deliver

what the Scottish people voted for on 6 May. On 17 May, *The Scotsman* reported that Mr McLeish had said:

"At this stage there are no cracks in the coalition."

Today's debate might turn on this question: when is a crack not a crack? A crack is not a crack when it is a yawning chasm between the positions of the two ministers who are to be appointed.

We need to know today what this coalition Administration will actually deliver in relation to tuition fees, because clarity on that issue was sadly lacking in what was said over the weekend. The "Partnership for Scotland" document leads the Scottish people to a conclusion for which they did not vote on 6 May. The appointment of Mr McLeish should not be approved.

10:33

**George Lyon (Argyll and Bute) (LD):** During the election campaign, we heard much about the new style of politics that would pervade our new Parliament. We heard mention of greater consensus or even compromise—that dirty word of politics. We heard that there would be more consultation with the people before decisions were taken. Above all, the pledge that was given to the people of Scotland was that this Parliament would be different from Westminster.

The perception so far may be that this Parliament is no different from Westminster, but the reality is that it is quite different. We have proportional representation, which delivered 129 of us into this chamber. PR has made a difference. It has meant that, instead of another humiliating defeat for our friends in Mr McLetchie's party, that party has 18 MSPs. The reality of PR means that, instead of seven first-past-the-post members for Mr Salmond's party, the SNP has the moderate success of some 35 members.

The biggest difference has been that PR has meant that, unlike Westminster, there is no winner takes all—no party was given a mandate to deliver the whole of its manifesto. That means that every party in this chamber is a minority. To deliver stable government for Scotland, compromises had to be made between two parties. I am not ashamed of the word compromise; it means that two parties have come together to deliver the partnership document for the Scottish people.

We have heard much about the important issue of tuition fees. Liberal Democrats believe that the right way in which to proceed is for us to go out to consultation and for the committee of inquiry to take the views of everyone involved. All the lobbying that I have had on the issue shows that that is what most of the major institutions involved want. When the time comes and the inquiry

reports, our position—that tuition fees should be abandoned—will have been made clear.

**Mr Duncan Hamilton (Highlands and Islands) (SNP):** Did not Mr Lyon give an unalterable commitment—during the campaign in Argyll and Bute, which he and I shared so comfortably—to the abolition of tuition fees? That commitment now seems to be on the back burner, with the result that we must wait and see what happens. If he gave such a commitment, would not his election to that constituency be a mandate to stay true to his principles rather than to sell out in this way?

**George Lyon:** There is no sell-out. During the campaign, I stated that we were opposed to tuition fees; we will testify to the inquiry on that basis. I take it that the SNP and the Tory party will do the same. We hope that the inquiry will return a verdict that will support our position. I will listen to that verdict before we vote on the subject. That is what is stated in the partnership document and we agree with it.

**Mr Salmond:** Once he has done all that, and once he has considered the matter, will he have a free vote on the outcome of the inquiry?

**George Lyon:** As I stated clearly, I will make up my mind and take into consideration what is said in the inquiry before we vote on the subject. Our position is very clear; we are still opposed to tuition fees and we will be able to make up our own minds when the day comes. *[Interruption.]*

**The Presiding Officer:** Order. Mr Lyon, as you are near the end of your four minutes, please come to a conclusion.

**George Lyon:** To sum up, the "Partnership for Scotland" document delivers. It delivers £51 million extra on education and £29 million extra to help the poorest students. It delivers by creating a new Minister for Rural Affairs, who will deliver for rural Scotland. It delivers for much of the agricultural community by setting up an independent arbitration system to ensure that farmers are treated fairly in EU decisions. It delivers by setting up a new body to promote Scottish food; we supported that very clearly. It delivers on beef on the bone—*[Laughter.]* The commitment is in black and white; what Government would override scientific advice? Science has to be taken into account; if science says no, we have to wait, but the commitment on beef on the bone exists.

I support the partnership document. I believe that it will give Scotland a stable Government and that the situation with tuition fees will be resolved through the committee of inquiry. It is only right that we consult all interested parties on the subject.

10:39

**Roseanna Cunningham (Perth) (SNP):** I object specifically to the inclusion of Jim Wallace's name in the list of ministers as Minister for Justice, but I cannot help but comment on the farrago of nonsense that we have just heard from one of the Liberal Democrat members. Mr Lyon showed in his speech that the Liberal Democrat manifesto contained virtually nothing that we can take as a promise.

Being the first Minister for Justice in our nation is a hugely responsible task. I must ask whether Jim Wallace has shown any real responsibility in recent weeks. I, too, have read the consultative steering group report; it makes somewhat nostalgic reading already. Jim Wallace was an assiduous member of that group. Its report talked in terms of open, accessible and participative government, yet he has connived at creating a situation where this debate is the only forum in which we can raise issues about the so-called partnership agreement between the Liberal Democrats and new Labour—so much for the new politics.

Members have, in effect, been presented with a fait accompli. On a number of matters—tuition fees is perhaps the most contentious, but it is not the only one, as we have heard—the majority in Parliament will be overridden or side-stepped. That is not democracy and it is not what the people expected. It is neither open nor just. We are in danger of engendering disappointment and alienation among voters.

We are being asked to approve someone who claimed that a key manifesto promise was nothing more than election rhetoric. I wonder just what the word promise means in these circumstances. Perhaps Jim Wallace will take the opportunity later today to outline how much of the Liberal Democrat manifesto was nothing more than election rhetoric.

Many Liberal Democrat members—including some who are in the chamber today—and a vast number of their voters must be considering the nature of trust. Liberal Democrats made promises that were not going to be kept. Mr Wallace has shown that he and his party are not to be trusted. Either he conducted the campaign in bad faith or he is now open to the accusation that he is a naive dupe. Either way, it does not look good on his CV.

Jim Wallace claims to be a Liberal Democrat. I see little liberalism or democracy in his behaviour, and precious little justice, so I support the amendment to have his name struck from the list of ministers.

10:43

**Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab):** Three criticisms have been made of

the selection of ministers. They concern the number of ministers, their quality and matters relating to the coalition.

Mr McLetchie objected to the number of ministers. He would admit that the way in which for 100 years the Scottish Office has been run by five ministers has hardly been a model of good government. I have a limited personal experience of that; I assure members that covering the number of portfolios that Scottish Office ministers used to cover in the bad old days is not a recipe for good government. I commend the First Minister for addressing that problem and ensuring that government in Scotland can be conducted much more efficiently than it has been in the past.

The problem of quality on the Government benches has been the embarrassment of riches among the new members. I have found this Parliament a more competitive environment than Westminster when it comes to appointments, but that is a good sign. It indicates the very high quality of Labour members, who are the only ones for whom I will speak.

Another noted achievement, which should be celebrated today and on many other days, is that 50 per cent of our members are women. As far as I know, we are the only substantial group in any parliament in the world of which that is so. We should continually receive praise from the people of Scotland for that achievement, which I hope all the other parties will emulate.

That achievement has resulted in the appointment to the Cabinet of three remarkable women. As two of them are my neighbouring MSPs, members will forgive me for mentioning them. Sarah Boyack was born to be Minister for Transport and the Environment. Combining those two portfolios for the first time represents an imaginative realignment in the Scottish Office.

Susan Deacon has a key appointment as Minister for Health and Community Care. Since the Government was elected in 1997, it has taken a broad view of health policy, which will lead to an attack on health inequality in particular. Susan is clearly the ideal person to drive health policy forward.

Lest I forget, the third woman is Wendy Alexander, who worked with me on the matters that she covers in the Scottish Office. I can vouch for her great expertise in those areas.

I perhaps gave those three women the political kiss of death when I said in the *Edinburgh Evening News* that one of them would be the next First Minister, but no doubt we will see in time.

The third criticism of the selection of ministers relates to the coalition. What we are trying to achieve in this Parliament is a different way of

doing things—those of us who have come from Westminster will be aware of that. We should ask ourselves at all times whether we are doing things differently.

The fact that parties will have different relationships to one another is a key plank of the new politics. Given that we had a voting system that was unlikely to deliver an overall majority, I fail to see how anyone can complain about the fact that two parties are working together in a new way.

That does not mean that the Labour party will not work differently with other parties as well. I hope that Labour will have a new working relationship with the Tories and with the SNP, although, because of past enmities, that will be difficult to achieve. There will always be a fundamental divide between Labour and the SNP on the constitutional question, but I hope that, in substantive policy areas such as health and housing, we can work in a way that is unlike the Westminster style.

Parties working differently together is not the only point of the new politics. I have two other points to make.

**The Presiding Officer:** Would you draw your comments to a close? You have had your time.

**Malcolm Chisholm:** I am sorry; I was not aware of the time factor.

Committees will be fundamental to the Parliament, as will be the involvement of the wider public. Not having time to go into those points in more detail, I will just say that the way in which we are approaching tuition fees seems to be a good example of the new politics working. We will involve people from outside and we will have a comprehensive debate in the chamber. That is a more sophisticated view of politics than the simplistic approach of individual party manifestos.

**The Presiding Officer:** I would like to explain to members that the bureau has ordered digital clocks to be installed around the hall so that I do not have to interrupt people when their time is up. In the meantime, there is no alternative.

10:47

**Mr Brian Monteith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con):** I would like to explain why we are proposing that the names of James Wallace and Ross Finnie be deleted and not those of, for instance, Henry McLeish or Susan Deacon. It is simple. Our amendment is about the conduct of the election campaign, before and after the vote.

When we launched our policy on tuition fees, proposing to introduce a scheme that would, effectively, abolish them, it was clear that other

parties had similar policies. The nationalists and the Liberal Democrats launched their policies; it was clear to those who now sit here and the electorate that those parties were committed to the effective abolition of tuition fees. That was until Mr Wallace's wobbly weekend, when, during an interview, the fact that negotiations on tuition fees might be a part of coalition discussions became a possibility. It was then incumbent on those taking part in the campaign to pin Mr Wallace down. There followed a week of campaigning in which parties sought to ascertain what he meant. I attended a number of meetings and participated in programmes, and I well remember the Liberal Democrat spokesman intervening while Nicola Sturgeon was speaking, to assure us that there was no way that tuition fees would be negotiated on.

I remind Mr Wallace of his words:

"I'm not going to trade principles for a ministerial Mondeo. I'm not to be bought at any price."

It could not be clearer than that. He also said:

"Tuition fees are dead as of next Friday. The people of Scotland have made it non-negotiable."

He was talking about the Friday after the election. Those were the words that Mr Wallace used to clarify the situation, just in case there was a scintilla of doubt about what he had said in that interview.

Nicol Stephen came to Mr Wallace's rescue. He had said previously that tuition fees would go, and he is on record as saying:

"If Scotland gets the opportunity to blaze a trail for the rest of the UK by abolishing tuition fees, we should grab it."

We waited in expectation, knowing that on that Friday tuition fees would go if the Liberal Democrats joined the nationalists and the Tories, but the Liberal Democrats decided that they could have an inquiry, buy time and possibly ensure that they could take part in a coalition deal, even though in previous election material they said:

"We now have clear and indisputable evidence of the damage that Labour's tuition fees have done to Scottish education . . . Abolishing tuition fees would instantly transform the situation."

They had no doubts; they had already made up their mind. Nevertheless, when it came to the aftermath of the election it was time to negotiate, to put tuition fees on the table and to talk about having a committee of inquiry that could give them the opportunity to ditch their promises later.

**Mr Mike Rumbles (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD):** Mr Monteith has obviously not read the document. I want to make one point quite clear and, for his education, I will read it for him:

"The Liberal Democrats stood on a manifesto commitment to abolish tuition fees. The Liberal Democrats

have maintained their position on it. The partnership agreement does not mean abandonment of that position."

**Mr Monteith:** Can the gentleman tell me how he will vote when the inquiry is published and it recommends that tuition fees should stay in place? Can the gentleman tell me how all the other members of the Liberal Democrat party will vote? No? There we are. The point that is clear is that the Liberal Democrats went into the election with a clear commitment. They have brought shame not just to themselves, but to the whole idea of what the Parliament could do. The people who will be most hurt by that are those who voted for the Liberal Democrats, many of whom left the Labour party in order to do so. Those people put their trust in the Liberal Democrats and they will feel let down.

Some people may think that we need to abolish tuition fees and that I should be happy to see the Liberal Democrat party in difficulty over the issue. That is not the point. It is clear to me that the Liberal Democrat party has brought a greater cynicism towards all politicians, not just to itself. It has brought shame to all members of the Parliament and that is why it is important that we vote for the removal of James Wallace and Ross Finnie from the list of ministers. They do not stand for the things that they said that they would stand for, but are working against them. The Scottish people need to see that the Scottish Parliament takes notice of that and will remove them from the list of ministers. We should support the amendment.

10:53

**Mike Watson (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab):** I am staggered by those remarks and by the fact that David McLetchie has lodged the amendment. Such comments come ill from Conservatives. Let us be absolutely clear on the matter. The Conservatives absolutely refuse to recognise the new political climate in Scotland. However, if it were not for that new political climate, those seats would all be empty—that is not strictly true; the seats would be filled, but not by Conservatives. There has to be a new understanding of the position that we are in.

I also address my remarks to Roseanna Cunningham, although I see that she has not stayed for the rest of the debate. None the less, the question is—as Malcolm Chisholm has already mentioned—what the realistic expectation was when the election took place on 6 May. Was the expectation that one party would have a majority? I do not think so. The negotiations that were undertaken in the immediate post-election period were utterly understandable and reasonable. Those negotiations have produced what we hope will be a stable Government. What was the

alternative to that? It was a political coconut-shy, based on a party that had 39 per cent of the vote.

**Brian Adam (North-East Scotland) (SNP):** In light of the new coalition arrangement, will Mr Watson tell us precisely what the Labour party has given up from its manifesto in order to accommodate the Liberal Democrat party? We are well aware of what the Liberal Democrat party has given up to accommodate the Labour party, but what has the Labour party given up?

**Mike Watson:** It is not the purpose of the debate that I should answer such questions. The purpose of the debate is to put forward and ratify the Cabinet that has emerged from the discussions. As far as I am concerned, both political parties are satisfied with the outcome, and that is what this form of Parliament was always going to be about. It was absolutely predictable.

One of the basic mistakes made by those who fail to grasp the new political situation is that they suggest that the Labour party should have gone into government on its own, and should have walked that perpetual tightrope on every political issue. I suppose that we should be flattered by that. However, such a Government would always have been in danger of being knocked off at any point, perhaps without notice, and I do not think that that is what the people of Scotland voted for on 6 May. They voted for a system which meant that, if a party did not get an overall majority, it had to enter into some form of agreement. Nor do I think that the manifesto commitments of all the parties were held to be indivisible, as there is no way that political parties, having stood against one another during an election, could enter into any form of coalition without each side giving something away in negotiations, and that is clearly the case for this coalition.

**Phil Gallie:** Mr Watson talks about the new political climate. I put it to him that perhaps the electorate of Scotland made their judgment on the basis that there would be no overall majority party, and that the Parliament would take each issue on its merits. That is what the people of Scotland wanted and, by entering into a shady deal, the Labour party and the Liberal Democrats have cheated the people of Scotland.

**Mike Watson:** That is nonsense—it might not come as a surprise that I have said that to Mr Gallie before.

The people of Scotland, who are watching both this debate and the way in which the Parliament develops, want stable government for Scotland. They do not want the political knockabout of a student debating society, which, day on day, week on week, would be balanced on a knife edge. That might make good television and good reporting for our colleagues in the press gallery, but it is not

what the people of Scotland voted for.

The negotiations that have produced the Cabinet whose members are here today is liable to produce stable government for Scotland. That does not mean that it will last for four years. I hope personally that it will, but it might not. The issue of tuition fees has been raised to a ridiculous level of importance and, although I accept that it is an important issue, it is not the most important issue to Scotland as a whole. Tuition fees do not mean much to young, unemployed people, or to a single parent living in a damp house. If agreement is reached today to endorse this Cabinet, as I am sure it will, those issues can be dealt with and resolved. We can bring a Government to Scotland that is much more responsive than has been the case in the past.

That is what the Labour-Liberal Democrat agreement is about, and this is the Cabinet that it has produced. I invite members to endorse the Cabinet.

10:57

**Richard Lochhead (North-East Scotland) (SNP):** Thank you, Mr Presiding Officer—  
[*Interruption.*]

**The Presiding Officer:** I am sorry, but your microphone is not working. Did you fail to press the button?

**Richard Lochhead:** No, the button is pressed.

In opposing the appointment of Ross Finnie, I wish to refer to recent developments in the fishing industry that have implications for the rural affairs portfolio.

After 18 long years of Tory sell-outs in Westminster, Scotland's fishing industry has been keenly looking forward to the establishment of the Scottish Parliament, so that it has a forum where its voice is heard, and where the industry is not used merely as a bargaining chip. However, I fear that the appointment of Ross Finnie will do little to improve the fortunes of the fishing industry.

The industry continues to suffer from backroom deals, whether those deals are made 500 miles away in London or around the corner from this chamber. New Labour has picked up where the Tories left off. A few days ago, it was revealed that Westminster had moved the English boundary 60 miles into Scottish waters, and, by the passing of an order in London, 6,000 square miles of Scottish waters had been stolen. The fishing industry now faces the prospect of the English-Scottish boundary being just east of Carnoustie. Even Ross Finnie, with his skills in accountancy, will be unable to make sense of that ridiculous situation.

**Euan Robson (Roxburgh and Berwickshire)**

**(LD) rose—**

**The Presiding Officer:** Mr Robson, press your button only once. If you press it twice, you have had it.

**Euan Robson:** I hope that Mr Lochhead will concede that the English-Scottish boundary is not the responsibility of the partnership agreement.

It is clear that we need an early debate on that subject. It is also clear that the fishermen's associations were not consulted in any way, shape or form. Indeed, delegations are coming today to Parliament to talk about the subject. However, I hope that Mr Lochhead will accept that it is false and unacceptable to infer that that was some deal cooked up in the partnership programme for government. To illustrate the point, fishery protection officers in Eyemouth in my constituency—

**The Presiding Officer:** Mr Robson, interventions have to be short.

**Richard Lochhead:** That was a speech, not an intervention. If Mr Robson listens to the rest of my speech, he will find out exactly why the fishing industry is concerned about the agreement between the Liberal Democrats and the Labour party. That industry is up in arms. It was not consulted by any of the authorities. The Parliament in Scotland was not consulted. Indeed, no courtesy was shown to the industry—it found out about this theft only from someone who was at an oil industry liaison meeting, when it crept up in conversation.

Another backroom deal was struck around the corner, and we find yet again that the fishing industry is the victim of a backroom deal. Thanks to this coalition, the importance of the fishing industry has been reduced to 16 words out of a 24-page manifesto. That is why the fishing industry is concerned about the coalition deal and why it wants more attention to be shown.

Fishing industry leaders are visiting Parliament today, and I ask all members of all parties to support the fishermen's cause without being distracted by or tied to any backroom deal. That is why I oppose Ross Finnie's appointment.

11:02

**Trish Godman (West Renfrewshire) (Lab):** I shall speak against the amendment moved by David McLetchie.

The people of Scotland elected this Parliament less than two weeks ago. On Thursday, we voted with an overall majority to appoint Donald Dewar as the First Minister. Now the parties that lost the election and which lost the vote for First Minister are showing that they are not prepared to accept



the democratic verdict of the people of Scotland and of this Parliament. That gives the lie once and for all to the parties' protestations that they would make the Parliament work.

As a team, the first Scottish Executive will lead the new Scotland into a new century, and we should be determined to make the new Scotland a showpiece of social justice and economic success. When Keir Hardie founded the Labour party 100 years ago and stated the case for a Scottish Parliament, he set in train the events that led to this Parliament. The Liberal Democrats also have a long and proud commitment to home rule.

Because of that shared history, both parties co-operated to win the Parliament through the constitutional convention, the referendum campaign, the Scotland Act 1998 and the consultative steering group. This week, we delivered on our long-standing and principled commitments to make this Parliament work. Those principles towered above our party political differences. However, those differences should not be underestimated. The two parties have separate identities and different cultures and constituencies and fought tooth and nail for votes in the election, but they have been able to put those differences aside in service to the people of Scotland.

The partnership into which we have entered ensures that the Parliament has the stability necessary to work for all the people of Scotland.

**Brian Adam:** Will Trish Godman give way?

**Trish Godman:** I have no desire to give way. The wrecking tactics that we have seen today reinforce the need for stability. Mr McLetchie's amendment seeks to isolate one part of the partnership, but that will not work. The partnership agreement was signed in service to the people of Scotland, and it should not be broken in the name of narrow political advantage.

Jim Wallace will bring forward freedom of information legislation to entrench the new Scottish Parliament as being open and democratic. Those who complain of so-called deals done behind closed doors—when in fact "Partnership for Scotland" has been published and is the subject of debate today—should perhaps reflect that as a result of such work, Jim Wallace will lead the introduction of freedom of information legislation in this new Parliament.

The people of Scotland want a Parliament that can deliver on the issues that each and every one of us took around the doors for the four or five weeks of the election campaign: better schools, colleges and universities, a national health service that delivers for patients, safer communities and warm and decent homes.

This week's "Partnership for Scotland" agreement

provides the stability necessary to achieve those aims. We should not let political opportunists damage the new politics before they take root. Our aim through the partnership is to improve the quality of life for Scottish people and to achieve nothing less than equality and justice for every man, woman and child in Scotland.

11:05

**Mary Scanlon (Highlands and Islands) (Con):**

I question Ross Finnie's commitment to, and empathy for, rural affairs, given his support for increasing the fuel escalator above the level imposed by his new party leader. Higher fuel costs are having a serious effect on the transportation of goods, which affects businesses, tourists and people who live and work in the Highlands and Islands. If the Administration's view is that rural affairs should be viewed solely as an accounting exercise, it is sadly out of touch with the needs and concerns of Scotland's rural communities.

Why was the well-respected highlander, John Farquhar Munro, who has many years' experience on Highland Council and as chairman of its roads and transport committee, not considered for the post of Minister for Rural Affairs?

Having been a lecturer in further and higher education for the past 25 years, I am well aware of the demands that are made on our students and of the highly damaging effect of the imposition of tuition fees. I say to Mike Watson that the students of Scotland need no lessons on who is affected by tuition fees; single parents and the young unemployed are the ones who would benefit most from their abolition.

**Dr Richard Simpson (Ochil) (Lab):** Mary Scanlon cannot have been listening to the First Minister's speech. He mentioned a most interesting statistic that may help to raise the debate from its juvenile level, at which I am appalled. Given that 53 per cent of the population had no tuition fees to pay, can Mary Scanlon mention a single parent or any unemployed person who has had to pay tuition fees?

**Mary Scanlon:** I will respond to the First Minister's comment about the percentage of people not paying tuition fees. Those who are eligible to pay tuition fees are exactly the people who are choosing not to enter further and higher education. As a student adviser at the University of the Highlands and Islands until one month ago, I had personal experience not only of students deciding not to enter further and higher education but of many who had to drop out.

When Jim Wallace works out how to spend his additional £33,000 salary and Mr Finnie his additional £17,500, will they spare a thought for the thousands of students in Scotland who will pay

a heavy price for Lib-Lab collective Cabinet responsibility? Students who are planning to start a course this autumn do not know whether they will have to pay fees this year, next year or in the future. Will Jim Wallace and Ross Finnie consider the hardship of students in the Highlands and other rural areas—where wages and salaries are below the national average—who require a longer pay-back period? Will they give some thought to the high proportion of students who work long hours to pay tuition fees and to pay for their keep and the effect that that has on their health, studies, future qualifications and life choices?

**Dr Sylvia Jackson (Stirling) (Lab):** Will Mary Scanlon give way?

**Mary Scanlon:** No, I have almost finished. Will the Liberal Democrats apologise to the voters in Scotland for promises made before 6 May being promises betrayed on 14 May?

11:10

**Euan Robson (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD):** I support the motion. I have been especially interested in the debate on tuition fees and in Mary Scanlon's assumption about the outcome of the report into tuition fees and the debate that will follow it.

My belief is that the partnership Government will offer stability, coherence and a sense of direction for the first four years of the Parliament. Such a climate is especially important for commerce and industry—I have had some comments from my constituency to that effect. The programme for the Government is sound, but it is clearly a starting point for the future. The programme will develop. It is too early to make a judgment on it—it should be judged at the end of four years. Despite that, there is a presumption among Opposition members that they know the outcome of the debate and the vote on tuition fees.

**Christine Grahame (South of Scotland) (SNP):** I am very interested in what Mr Robson has to say. He is now a Borders MSP, as is Mr Jenkins. Does Mr Robson think that the Liberal Democrats have a mandate to go into a coalition with the Labour party when in Roxburghshire the Labour party came fourth, and in Tweeddale it came third? I do not think that the Liberal Democrats have the authority of the people in the Borders for such a coalition.

**Euan Robson:** As we have won the seats, I think we have a mandate.

Earlier, I tried to make a point about the fishing dispute. That matter arose before the formation of the partnership Government. It is of considerable importance, and I hope that we can have an early debate on it. What happened impinges on the

rights of this Parliament—it should not have been dealt with as it was. The consultation on the issue was lamentable.

**Richard Lochhead:** Will the member give way?

**Euan Robson:** I have finished.

11:12

**Mr Duncan Hamilton (Highlands and Islands) (SNP):** I support the amendment that opposes the appointment of Mr Jim Wallace. I do so with some regret: such opposition was not my understanding of the new style of politics, but neither was it my understanding of the new politics that coalition meant takeover. Sadly, that is where we are at.

The First Minister started this debate by talking about how the Scottish National party was against the whole concept and principle of coalition government. Nothing could be further from the truth. What we are against is the misuse of coalition by the Labour party, which simply assumes that its manifesto can be imposed on the Parliament, on the country, and certainly on the minority party in the arrangement. Let us separate the principle of coalition government from the rather tawdry practice of it that we are seeing here today.

I cannot be the only member who spent the election campaign listening to a Liberal Democrat opponent—in my case the aptly named Mr Lyon—who told everyone about his party's immutable and unalterable commitment to the principle of free education. That principle was important for people in rural areas, where we had to give people access to education to give them a chance to improve their lives. It was a principle that would garner support across the Parliament. Then, all of a sudden, the principle changed. It did not change for any rational reason, and it did not change after an inquiry; it changed purely because a few members of the Liberal party fancied getting themselves into the Cabinet. George now says that, after an inquiry, he will give us an answer as to whether he will have a free vote or opinion. George did not need an inquiry before 6 May. I am not sure what has changed. Perhaps he can tell me.

**George Lyon:** Does that mean that if the inquiry does not recommend the abolition of tuition fees Duncan will vote against its findings?

**Mr Hamilton:** The Scottish National party is absolutely full square against tuition fees, and I would certainly vote against such a finding. What this discussion highlights is the difference between a party of principle and a party of opportunism, which is what it seems George represents.

It was also fascinating to listen to George's arguments about beef on the bone. He is the

recently retired president of the National Farmers Union. I wonder what the farmers have to say about his prevarication over lifting the beef-on-the-bone ban and about how the commitment to lifting the ban immediately seems, as a result of another of his opportunistic guises, to have mutated. I wonder what his previous employers will have to say.

This is not just about policy; it is also about integrity. Many of the points that have been raised with me in reaction to the coalition are about the death of a Liberal party in Scotland. No one can deny that there is a long and proud tradition of liberal democracy in Scotland, but we are seeing a massive sell-out. We are seeing the death of a distinct political party, and its amalgamation into a larger Labour party. That is a very bad thing for Scottish democracy.

The point of proportional representation is to encourage minority parties and the fractionising of the political process to ensure that there is wider, more mature and more adult debate. Rather than more parties and more opinions, what seems to be coming through in the guise of coalition government is fewer parties and one opinion. I suggest that that is a regressive step. As the leader in the negotiations, Mr Wallace should take the responsibility for that. In opposing his appointment, we must ask ourselves how a man who clearly cannot command the support of his own party can seriously expect to command the support of this Parliament.

11:15

**Mr Kenneth Macintosh (Eastwood) (Lab):** I support the election of the Executive that has been proposed by the First Minister because I want stability in the Government. That is a view that I think is shared by the Scottish people. At the start of this new Parliament, the best way to ensure stability and consistency in government is to look at what unites the parties in this chamber, not at what divides them.

Scottish Labour and the Liberal Democrats have many common aims. Both want more investment in schools and hospitals. We want to see that political power is exercised as closely as possible to the Scottish people and we want to ensure that Scotland remains a full and equal partner in a stable United Kingdom.

We should not, therefore, be surprised that the new politics in Scotland has led to partnership. Governing Scotland as a partnership from the start reflects the will of the electorate. This is the fulfilment of the Labour party's desire for a new, inclusive and consensual politics. Inclusion and consensus are key words in Scottish politics at the moment. They are the heart and soul of

partnership. This is all about finding a way to accommodate our differences, working hard to realise our common aims and forging policies that will contribute to the common good.

The proposed Executive is part of a partnership that comprises a majority of the Parliament. When the public watches this debate it will be disappointed that certain members tried to break the consensus so soon by attempting to stop the Executive carrying out its vital work for Scotland.

As well as stability in government, the Scottish people—and Scottish business in particular—want stability in national finances and prudence in their use. We already—as part of the wider British partnership—benefit from a stable foundation. The Minister for Finance in this Parliament must ensure that we build on that stability to give us a dynamic and enterprising economy.

We must have a minister who understands that prudence in the use of our finances means recognising that there is a public desire for increased investment in schools and hospitals. That increased investment should be delivered because it is right to do so, but it must be delivered without our blindly running into increased income tax. Increased investment must be accompanied by a determination to ensure dynamism and enterprise without the damaging effect of unnecessary tax rises.

The Labour party has already shown that it is possible to win the trust of the Scottish people by promising and delivering no rise in income tax. The Executive of this new Parliament will be able to do likewise. I want an Executive that the Scottish people can trust to deliver their priorities. A Minister for Finance whom the people can trust always to have their priorities at heart must be central to that.

I, for one, recognise the talent and determination that Jack McConnell would bring to the post. He would think of nothing but Scotland's best interests. Those who seek to oppose this Executive should start to do likewise.

11:18

**Tommy Sheridan (Glasgow) (SSP):** I suppose that time will show that none of us has a monopoly on wisdom and, therefore, that those of us who believe that what has been cobbled together between Labour and the Liberals is a very shabby deal must wait to see the result in the future opinions of ordinary people in Scotland.

It is obvious that members in the Labour and Liberal coalition believe that they have put together a stable Government that will deliver what they promised. The difficulty for the Liberal Democrats is that what they promised to deliver

has been deleted within a week of discussion of the deal.

**Mr Rumbles** rose—

**Tommy Sheridan:** I will not give way yet. My remarks are in many respects directed towards Mr McLetchie's amendment.

In many ways, Labour has what it wanted—it has subsumed the Liberals in this pact. I do not often refer to editorials in the *Sunday Mail*, but I think that that paper got it just about right last Sunday: "Liberal Democrats RIP." They have let down their electorate and the people of Scotland.

Many members, including Mr Dewar, said that this was not a one-issue election. There were, however, some issues that dominated the campaign, one of which was student funding and, in particular, tuition fees. During the hustings, I took part in many a debate with new Labour members—I will not embarrass any of them by referring to them by name—and I found it very difficult to get them to defend tuition fees. Many of them said that the situation would have to be reviewed after the election, which I think managed to hold off some of the revolt among the students at the debates.

The difficulty is that more than 60 per cent of the people of Scotland voted for political parties that said quite clearly that they wanted tuition fees to be abolished. I agree with Mr Watson's point that tuition fees should not become a *bête noire*. Frankly, for the lone parents and unemployed people he mentioned, tuition fees are not the main issue; the main issue is student maintenance.

The other problem for new Labour is that it has gone even further than the Tories. It is rather sad that we can listen to representatives of the Tory party talking today about student maintenance and support when that party's record of underfunding of education and, in particular, attacks on students is nothing short of a disgrace. The difficulty is that new Labour's performance is allowing the Tories to behave like the students' friends, because new Labour has gone further than the Tory party.

Many new Labour members, many of whom I recognise in the chamber—I see Mr McConnell here, although I would not want to embarrass anyone—benefited from the same educational opportunity as I did. In 1981, under a Tory Government, I was able to attend Stirling university, to receive a full maintenance grant and to claim housing benefit between terms, free of the idea of tuition fees—although my parents' income at the time would have meant that fees would not have been a factor. New Labour has removed access to education for working-class children from the housing schemes of Scotland because it has removed access to student maintenance. That is why the deal that has been entered into with the

Liberals is so shabby.

**Dr Simpson:** Will the member give way?

**Tommy Sheridan:** I may give way later.

**The Presiding Officer:** You will not be able to give way later, as you have had nearly four minutes.

**Tommy Sheridan:** I have nearly finished. That is why I am not letting him in.

If the Liberals had stuck to their guns on the tuition fee argument, the issue of student funding would have been raised very early on in the session. That is what we wanted, what the National Union of Students wanted and, frankly, in the opinion of my party, what the electorate of Scotland wanted. It is from that point of view that I support Mr McLetchie's amendment. If people want new politics, there it is; on this occasion the Scottish Socialist party is willing to support his amendment.

I know that many members of new Labour are sitting uncomfortably on the idea that new Labour is a party that has gone further than the Tories in underfunding student support. Perhaps Mr Dewar, if he were here, would confess that his concern about having a free vote after an inquiry is not about the Liberals, but about members of his party voting against fees.

11:24

**Des McNulty (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab):** During the past two weeks, I have been struck, as I am sure have many other members, by the extent to which people of all shades of political opinion in Scotland are enthused about the prospect of the new Parliament and the opportunities it creates for better government of Scotland. Almost everybody to whom one speaks wants this Parliament to succeed. It is for that reason most of all, that I support the partnership agreement—it provides a framework for meeting the aspirations of the Scottish people.

Whichever aspect of policy people are concerned with, the agreement delivers a secure and stable Government. I believe that the Government will operate in a new, different and more integrated way. It will seek solutions through extensive consultation and discussion—processes we are all committed to—that will transcend departmental and organisational boundaries. It will deliver, I hope, better co-ordinated and more effective action. Goodness knows, people have elected a Parliament for a purpose, not because it is a beautiful idea in principle. They want to change things and see effective action taken. That is what we are here for. This is about delivering for people.

Effective action is vital across a range of policies, but I want to address the issue of public health and social work. The health inequalities in Scotland are an affront to our society and we must do something about them. I believe that all parties in the Parliament have an obligation to deal with the severe health inequalities that currently exist.

On a number of occasions, as Minister for Health and the Arts, Sam Galbraith has highlighted the gulf in health between different parts of Scotland. The example commonly used is that of Bearsden and, just over the constituency boundary, Drumchapel. My constituency is a microcosm of the health inequalities in Scotland: in Clydebank there is poor health equivalent to that found in many parts of north and east Glasgow; at the other end of my constituency there are leafy suburbs, including not just Milngavie but a substantial part of Bearsden, where the health status of the population is much better. We have to deal with those health inequalities, which are to be found in areas that are so close to each other, in an integrated way. Under this Government, I am confident that one of the key priorities will be a general improvement in health and the tackling of health inequalities.

A great deal has been done since 1997. I do not want to embarrass Sam Galbraith. He has ended the flawed internal market, poured substantial resources into front-line services in health and effectively promulgated the ethos of putting patients first. His biggest achievement was to reject decisively the blame culture established under the Conservative Government which, in effect, held poor people responsible for having worse health because of their poverty. That was unacceptable.

We have to address the fact that poverty induces ill health. Social disadvantage, whether it is caused by poverty or by personal circumstances—which may affect individuals in any part of society—generates ill health. Ill health reduces people's opportunities and disfigures their lives.

**The Presiding Officer:** I am sorry to interrupt, but time is running out.

**Des McNulty:** I will just wind up. This affliction needs to be tackled in three ways: first, by taking specific measures—and I am confident that the new team will pursue such measures; secondly, by establishing clear targets that show how we are going to change things and allow people to measure our achievements; thirdly, by having a health impact assessment of all our policies so that they are properly integrated. If we can take that step and deliver measurable achievements in health, it will be a sign of what can be achieved through the Government's partnership agreement.

11:29

**Michael Matheson (Central Scotland) (SNP):** The people of Scotland elected the Scottish Parliament to reflect their needs and aspirations. As the elected members of this Parliament, we have the responsibility of ensuring that we have a Parliament that is open, accountable and, above all, democratic in its decision making.

During the early days of this Parliament, and from the publication of the partnership document by Labour and the Liberal Democrats, it was clear that a sell-out was taking place for the sake of ministerial office rather than of reflecting the needs of the people of Scotland. A majority of members were elected on the basis of manifestos that committed them to abolishing student tuition fees and lifting the beef-on-the-bone ban.

In February 1998, Charles Kennedy—that well-known Liberal Democrat face and the man who is now one of the front runners for the leadership of that party—led the Opposition debate in the House of Commons. He led the debate against the Government and its ban on beef on the bone. Now what do we see? We see Mr Finnie and his leadership colleagues doing a U-turn on the issue. They now tell us that they will wait until they receive the right medical evidence before making such a decision. Why did they not take the same medical evidence before they made it their party's policy to lift the ban? The words “envelope” and “the back of it” with regard to policy making come to mind. The Liberal Democrats have clearly failed to think through this process and have concerned themselves more with ministerial office.

It is all very well for people such as Mr Finnie to sell out on their party policy, but selling out on the farmers who voted for the Liberal Democrats and on the people who live in rural communities that depend on farming is not just selling out on their party policy, it is a betrayal of the supporters who elected them to this chamber.

**Dr Simpson:** What astonishes me about the points being made by Michael Matheson and the parties who wish to lift the beef-on-the-bone ban is that they are determined to go against the medical advice that is being offered. Does he think that any member does not want the ban on beef on the bone lifted as quickly as possible? The ban cannot be lifted until the appropriate medical advice has been received.

**Michael Matheson:** I must point out to Dr Simpson that the majority of members were elected on a commitment to get the ban lifted. Mr Lyon—who has disappeared and has not remained for the debate—was one of the leading members of the National Farmers Union who campaigned against the Government's imposition of the ban.

Let us consider how Mr Finnie, the new Minister for Rural Affairs, will operate and the areas that he will be responsible for. Issues relating to rural transport and the environment will be the responsibility of the Minister for Transport and the Environment, not Mr Finnie. The issues of Highlands and Islands Enterprise and Gaelic will be the responsibility of the Minister for Enterprise and Lifelong Learning, not Mr Finnie. Mr Finnie will be left with agriculture, and we have already seen that he sold out on the farmers in regard to the beef-on-the-bone ban.

**The Presiding Officer:** Mr Matheson, your time is up.

**Michael Matheson:** I am winding up.

We have also seen recently how Westminster has ignored this chamber.

Mr Finnie will be left with forestry. I am sure that that is high on the agenda of the people of Inverclyde, but it is hardly justification for the creation of such a senior ministerial portfolio—it smacks more of creating a portfolio to keep the Liberal Democrats on side. I have two key reasons for opposing Mr Finnie's appointment—

**The Presiding Officer:** I am sorry, your time is up.

11:34

**Hugh Henry (Paisley South) (Lab):** We were told when this new Parliament was created that it would be an opportunity to do things differently, and that it would be a forum for positive debate to represent civic Scotland in a change for the better. However, in a sense, at the first test we have failed, because the first major debate of this Parliament is not about policies that will improve the lot of ordinary people in Scotland; it is an attack on a number of individuals in this Parliament and on the roles which they are hoping to play. We should be debating social inclusion and the damage that has been done in Scotland during 18 years of Tory neglect. Those are the things that matter to the people of Scotland. We have an opportunity in this Parliament to rebuild our civic society.

**Richard Lochhead:** If Mr Henry wants us to do things differently, perhaps the parties should fulfil their manifesto commitments for once.

**Hugh Henry:** When I look at the agreement, I see an opportunity for the Labour party not only to fulfil its manifesto commitments, but to take account of some of the positive things that people from other parties in this Parliament bring to the debate. Yes, we have been elected on a strong manifesto, but we have also been elected on a commitment to listen to other people in this Parliament and to listen to people throughout

Scotland. That is how we should proceed.

We should be examining ways in which to involve those who have been socially excluded—those who have been neglected and do not have the opportunity to play their full part in our society. We were told by our opponents that they would make this Parliament work, but all we get is a mean-spirited attack on, for example, Henry McLeish, a man who spent countless hours helping to drive through the legislation that created this Parliament, which is attempting to represent civic Scotland. We do not get a debate on the positive virtues of this Parliament, but an attack on Henry McLeish and other individuals. Clearly, there are those who would rather be negative, destructive and spiteful.

**Colin Campbell (West of Scotland) (SNP)** rose—

**Mr Duncan Hamilton (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)** rose—

**Mrs Lyndsay McIntosh (Central Scotland) (Con)** rose—

**Hugh Henry:** We should be looking to debate a more positive way forward in a new Parliament. *[Interruption.]*

**The Presiding Officer:** If the gentleman does not want to give way, members must resume their seats.

**Hugh Henry:** For too long we have neglected many in our society who have not had the opportunity to fulfil their true potential. This debate should be about giving those people that opportunity, creating a new Scotland, creating new debate and creating new policies.

11:37

**Dennis Canavan (Falkirk West):** I lodged an amendment similar to that of Mr Swinney to exclude Henry McLeish from the list of ministerial appointments. I want to make it clear at the outset that I bear no personal animosity towards Henry; in fact, I hold him in high personal regard. However, I feel very strongly that the minister responsible for higher education ought to be more in line with Scottish public opinion on that important subject.

It is a fact that the majority of members of this Parliament were elected on commitments to abolish tuition fees. It is another fact that the Labour party was the only party that contested that election without a commitment to abolish tuition fees. I find it rather ironic that the party of free education has become the party of fee-paying education. That may be part of the reason for the Labour party's failure to win a majority of seats in this Parliament. Nevertheless, Labour has an

obligation to respect the views of the Scottish people, including their views on the important matter of higher education.

I want to say something about this Lib-Lab pact, or partnership, or whatever it is called. I am not opposed in principle to a coalition, but this seems to be a rather shabby deal to cheat the people by depriving them of what they voted for. All that we have on tuition fees is the promise of some kind of inquiry or review. Anybody with any experience of politics in another place knows that the term review is just Westminster-speak for a fudge. Besides, we have just had a national review of tuition fees—it was called an election. During the election the subject was aired very adequately, not just in my constituency but in virtually every constituency in the country.

The people of Scotland want us to introduce early legislation to abolish tuition fees. The abolition of tuition fees, although necessary, is not sufficient, because it must be accompanied by the restoration of student grants, particularly for students from low-income families. Virtually all the designated members of the new Scottish Executive had the same advantage that I had: going to university with the assistance of a student grant. Many of us would never have had that opportunity if we had not had student grants.

I remember visiting the campus of the University of Stirling, which was then in my constituency, as a young Labour MP, many years ago. A young revolutionary, complete with long hair and leather jacket, started haranguing Harold Wilson, the Prime Minister at that time, who was perceived by that student revolutionary, who was then a member of the Communist party, as the great bogeyman. The student revolutionary complained that Harold Wilson was not doing enough to help students because he was not meeting the full demands of the National Union of Students for an increase in grants.

Times change. Earlier this week, that erstwhile student revolutionary became the new Secretary of State for Scotland, and therefore a member of a Cabinet which, frankly, has kicked away the ladder of opportunity from many students, including future generations of students.

We should not repeat the same mistake in this place. We, collectively, as members of this Parliament—not just the members of the Scottish Executive—have a great responsibility to try to ensure that young people in particular have maximum educational opportunity, including those from low-income families.

In a sense, education is the key to the future of our country, and we should not sell our young people short.

11:43

**Lewis Macdonald (Aberdeen Central) (Lab):** I welcome the nomination of an Executive to represent the whole of Scotland and to highlight the priorities for Government.

In my constituency of Aberdeen Central, there are areas of severe urban deprivation. There will be a warm welcome there for the creation of a ministry for social inclusion.

Aberdeen is also at the heart of a wide rural hinterland; there will also be a warm welcome for the creation of a specific ministry for rural affairs. Important city-based industries such as paper and food look to the country areas as a source of supply; people from country areas come into town for their health services, higher education and much else. So central is Aberdeen to the rural north-east that Aberdeenshire Council, as well as the city council, is headquartered in my constituency.

Beside all those things and beside all the economic links, there are family ties; today, most relevantly, there are shared values. I am confident that in both town and country in the north-east, there will be broad support for the principles which underlie the partnership agreement that has been presented today: principles of working together on a co-operative basis and of seeking to make this Parliament work not as a Westminster in miniature and not as a stepping-stone to independence, but as an open, accessible and new Parliament in its own right.

**Brian Adam:** Mr Macdonald referred to the partnership agreement and to its principles. It is fairly obvious which particular principles the Liberal Democrats have given up to reach that partnership. For the benefit of the rest of us, would Lewis Macdonald care to elucidate which principles the Labour party is giving up to enter the agreement?

**Lewis Macdonald:** I appreciate Mr Adam's persistence in asking that question a second time. He misses the point of the partnership, which is to bring together the positive aspects of the two manifestos. That is what the partnership agreement—very notably—achieves.

There will be a particular welcome in the north-east for the strategic approach that the Minister for Rural Affairs permits on rural issues. The new ministry will have a straightforward but very wide remit, although it was criticised by a member of the SNP. In fact the ministry will be responsible for co-ordinating the delivery of services across a wide range. It will work with the transport ministry on integrated rural transport policy and it will work with the justice department on promoting and implementing land reform. These are positive and welcome developments.

**The Presiding Officer:** Will you finish, please.

**Lewis Macdonald:** The ministry for rural affairs will also develop policy and by its very existence send out the right signals about the priority that this Parliament gives to rural areas. I am disappointed that some of the parties here choose, as their first reaction to the proposal to create a ministry for rural affairs, to seek to delay the appointment of a minister. On the contrary, we should endorse the appointment of Ross Finnie and give rural issues the priority that they deserve.

**The Presiding Officer:** Ten members still wish to speak. If they notify the chamber office during the lunch break that they wish to be added to the list for the afternoon, we will try to include them then.

11.46

**Mr Swinney:** Mr Macdonald was just as embarrassed as Mr Watson was by the question from my colleague Mr Adam about what the Labour party had given up to ensure the partnership agreement. With a number of others who are here I was in London on Monday evening for the incapacity benefit vote. There was no embarrassment displayed then by Labour MPs who were, frankly, doing cartwheels along the lobbies of the House of Commons because of what had been achieved by the Labour party at the expense of the Liberal Democrats.

Mr Adam's question was a key moment in the debate. The other key moment in the debate was Mr Lyon's contribution, and I am glad to see that he has come back into the chamber. He told us that the Liberal Democrats will be making up their own minds about tuition fees in due course. I am sorry, but I still cannot reconcile that statement with remarks on the record by Mr McLeish that quite clearly say that the two parties will come to an agreement within the coalition Executive on what the line is on tuition fees and that both parliamentary parties will be bound by it. Those two points of view are not compatible.

**Mr Keith Raffan (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD):** Will Mr Swinney give way?

**Mr Swinney:** Please excuse me—I would normally give way, but I have only two minutes. I worked in the business world before I became a full-time parliamentarian and when two companies came together there was always a debate on whether it was a merger or a takeover. I think all of us in the Parliament know that the coalition agreement was not a merger but a takeover: the Liberal Democrats were the wee party and the Labour party was the big party.

11:48

**David McLetchie:** It has been a fascinating discussion so far. I was intrigued by the contribution from Mr Sheridan, whose support I welcome. [Laughter.] I was also intrigued by the contribution from Patricia Godman, who referred to Keir Hardie. I have to tell her that she will never get off the back benches by invoking the name of a socialist in the chamber. I was very intrigued by the lack of answers to the question posed by the persistent Mr Adam and I congratulate him on his persistence. The truth that his unanswered question elucidates is that the coalition is a result of a partnership of give and take—the Liberal Democrats giving and the Labour party taking. That is the foundation on which it is based.

I am intrigued by the faith that is being placed in the proposed committee of inquiry. Mr Canavan said that we have already had a national review in the general election. He is right, but preceding that there was a review in the Dearing and Garrick reports of the whole issue of funding of higher education, which came to a particular conclusion on fees. All the political parties had an opportunity to consider those reports and to come to their own conclusions on tuition fees. My party did so, as did the Scottish National party and the Liberal Democrats.

We have had all the inquiries, reports and reviews that we need to take a decision. We took a decision in our parties and the people took a decision on 6 May. The committee of inquiry, as Dennis Canavan rightly said, is a complete and utter fudge—it is a fig leaf and a delaying tactic to allow time for arm-twisting, or perhaps for gentle persuasion by Mr McLeish, in order to get a particular outcome.

We have been bombarded with letters from people in higher education requesting a wider review, because those people rightly feel that the Government will not make up the difference by providing the additional funding that those institutions need. That would be the real solution. Our solution is for Mr McConnell, as the new Minister for Finance, to sharpen his pencil, reduce the bloated administration, and redeploy some of the funds into the people's priorities—the abolition of tuition fees.

11:50

**Mr Jim Wallace (Orkney) (LD):** Those who are here—or people who watched the earlier meetings of the new Parliament—who thought that this was a completely new style of politics, and that the politics of the bitter battles of Westminster were dead and gone, will now have to revise their views. Today's debate has been typical of Westminster, down to the incisive interventions of Phil Gallie and the ever-charming speeches of



Roseanna Cunningham. However, this is an era of new politics, and by progressing in a partnership agreement we have shown that such politics are possible. When I hear criticisms, it is with a sense of *déjà vu*. I remember criticisms from the same coalition of the SNP and Tories when the Liberal Democrats went into the constitutional convention with a broad range of Scottish civic opinion. We were told that, as Liberal Democrats, we would be eaten up, and that by selling out our principles we would not get anywhere. Yet the blueprint that was forged by that constitutional convention—including proportional representation—led to the very Parliament in which we are sitting today.

**Ms Sandra White (Glasgow) (SNP):** Will Mr Wallace give way?

**Mr Wallace:** Our commitment to making this Parliament work can never have been in any doubt.

**Ms White:** Will Mr Wallace give way?

**Mr Wallace:** As a reputed minister for justice, I feel that when someone is in the dock they should be given the chance to answer the charges against them.

In the new politics, in which the voting system was always likely to make all parties minorities, we said all along that we would be willing to talk to the party with the largest number of seats, to consider whether a partnership agreement for a stable and effective Government could be achieved. By their votes, it was the people of Scotland who shaped the composition of this Parliament. It is up to us, the elected members of the Scottish Parliament, to make the effort to secure fair, stable and effective government, recognising that no single party has been given unlimited power by the people of Scotland. We talked for four days to achieve our negotiated partnership. It is a partnership that will last for four years. As Trish Godman said, our partnership agreement is open and it is on the record. We will be accountable according to that partnership agreement. The alternative would be four years of a hamstrung minority Government, with deals being cobbled together on the back stairs night after night. There would be no accountability and no notion of what was being traded for what.

**Mr Salmond:** We are not disputing the Liberal Democrats going into those partnership talks; it is what they came out with that we are disputing. When we were on election programmes together, Mr Wallace said that the issue of tuition fees was non-negotiable. Did he then mean to negotiate after the election?

**Mr Wallace:** I shall come to the issue of tuition fees. Mr Salmond also mentioned what resulted from the talks. I believe that we have achieved an agreement that addresses the needs of the people

of Scotland as well as meeting our opportunities and challenges.

I appreciate that the culture of coalition government is not one with which we are very familiar in this country. Through either naivety or mischief, people think that the smaller party in a coalition can still achieve its whole manifesto. It is worth remembering what we have achieved: the investment of new real resources in our schools; additional teachers; more investment in books and equipment; immediate measures to tackle student hardship and to improve access to education; building on the health opportunities fund to promote public health; a healthy homes initiative to tackle dampness; a freedom of information regime; progress towards reform of the electoral system for local government; and a ministry for rural affairs, with specific measures to help farmers who are dogged by form filling and to promote quality Scottish meat produce. Our manifesto is committed to providing opportunities for new types of public and private partnerships. I do not think that Mr McLetchie ever read our manifesto. That commitment will allow assets—where appropriate—to revert to public ownership. We are also committed to freezing the tolls on the Skye bridge for the rest of the contract period. All those commitments are more than was ever on offer before and we have managed to negotiate them.

Liberal Democrats remain committed to the abolition of tuition fees, as my colleague Mike Rumbles indicated. A crucial element that is spelt out in the agreement is that we remain free to support that view and argue the case for it. We are the only party in this Parliament that has so far taken an initiative on tuition fees, with the exception of an amendment lodged by Mr Canavan. In spite of all the rhetoric, neither Mr Salmond's party nor Mr McLetchie's party has spelt out how they would fulfil and finance their commitment to Scotland's students.

We have secured, as a matter of urgency, the establishment of a committee of inquiry, whose membership, time scale and terms of reference will be approved by this Parliament. That committee will address not only tuition fees, but financial support for those participating part time and full time in further and higher education. I share Mr Canavan's concern about hardship among students. That was also mentioned by Mary Scanlon, although I do not think that the Tory party is in any position to lecture on student hardship.

The increase in access funds, in line with our manifesto commitment, to £14 million a year is a measure that will address student hardship. The pilot scheme to help young kids, who in the past felt that they had to leave school rather than take

the opportunities that higher education could offer them, is a real step forward. Additional help for part-time and mature students is also a worthwhile effort that will encourage students who are trying to improve their qualifications.

**The Presiding Officer:** You have one minute left.

**Mr Wallace:** The committee of inquiry is supported not only by the Committee of Scottish Higher Education Principals and by the Association of University Teachers, but by the National Union of Students (Scotland) which, like us, oppose tuition fees. I wonder whether the Conservative party and the SNP will present evidence to the committee, as the Liberal Democrats will.

Much has been said about principles. A belief in the basic worth, merit and integrity of every individual is what drives me as a liberal and as a Liberal Democrat. I believe in freedom from ignorance, and our policies are to improve access to and to invest in education. I believe in freedom from disease, and our policies will bring about a patient-centred health service, tackling bad health and promoting good health. I believe in freedom for each individual to fulfil his or her potential, and that is why we want to tap the reservoir of enterprise and to tackle the vicious circle of deprivation and underachievement. Those are fundamental principles to me and to my party. They are such important principles that I do not want just to talk about them; I want to do something about them. That is why we are prepared to go into government and put those principles into practice.

**The Presiding Officer:** I remind members of the voting procedure. When I put the question and ask, "Are we all agreed?", anyone who wishes to vote against or to register an abstention must shout no at that point. That triggers an electronic vote.

We come first to the amendment in the name of Mr David McLetchie:

S1M-4.1, to leave out "James Wallace" and "Ross Finnie".

The question is, that the amendment be agreed to. Are we all agreed?

**Members:** No.

**The Presiding Officer:** In that case, there will be a division.

Members should vote yes to agree to the amendment, no to disagree with the amendment, or abstain to record an abstention. Members have 30 seconds in which to vote.

## FOR

Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
Elder, Dorothy-Grace (Glasgow) (SNP)  
Ewing, Dr Winnie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
Goldie, Miss Annabel (West of Scotland) (Con)  
Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)  
Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)  
Ingram, Mr Adam (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
McGrigor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
Paterson, Mr Gil (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
Sheridan, Tommy (Glasgow) (SSP)  
Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
Ullrich, Kay (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

## AGAINST

Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)  
Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
Ferguson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)

Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Henry, Hugh (Paisley South) (Lab)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Margaret (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 Macdonald, Lewis (Aberdeen Central) (Lab)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 Mackay, Angus (Edinburgh South) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)  
 McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)  
 McConnell, Mr Jack (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)  
 Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mulligan, Mrs Mary (Linlithgow) (Lab)  
 Munro, Mr John (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Radcliffe, Nora (Gordon) (LD)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland) (LD)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Ochil) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Ian (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is as follows: For 51, Against 70, Abstentions 0.

*Amendment disagreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** We come next to the amendment in the name of Mr Swinney:

S1M-4.3, to leave out "Henry McLeish".

The question is, that the amendment be agreed to. Are we all agreed?

**Members:** No.

**The Presiding Officer:** In that case, we move to a division.

Those who support the amendment should vote yes, those who oppose it should vote no, and those who want to abstain should press their abstain button now.

#### FOR

Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
 Elder, Dorothy-Grace (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Ewing, Dr Winnie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Ingram, Mr Adam (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Mr Gil (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
 Ullrich, Kay (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
 White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

#### AGAINST

Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
 Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
 Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
 Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
 Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
 Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
 Ferguson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
 Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
 Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
 Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Henry, Hugh (Paisley South) (Lab)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)

Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Margaret (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 Macdonald, Lewis (Aberdeen Central) (Lab)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 Mackay, Angus (Edinburgh South) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)  
 McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)  
 McConnell, Mr Jack (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)  
 Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mulligan, Mrs Mary (Linlithgow) (Lab)  
 Munro, Mr John (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Radcliffe, Nora (Gordon) (LD)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland) (LD)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Ochil) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Ian (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)

#### ABSTENTIONS

Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
 Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Goldie, Miss Annabel (West of Scotland) (Con)  
 Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 McGrigor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Sheridan, Tommy (Glasgow) (SSP)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is as follows: For 33, Against 70, Abstentions 18.

*Amendment disagreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** We come now to the motion in the name of the First Minister:

That this Parliament agrees that  
 James Wallace,  
 Sam Galbraith,  
 Henry McLeish,  
 Jack McConnell,  
 Susan Deacon,  
 Tom McCabe,  
 Ross Finnie,  
 Wendy Alexander,  
 Sarah Boyack  
 be appointed as Ministers.

The question is, that the motion be agreed to.  
 Are we all agreed?

**Members:** No.

**The Presiding Officer:** In that case, there will be a division.

#### FOR

Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
 Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
 Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
 Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
 Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
 Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
 Ferguson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
 Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
 Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
 Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Henry, Hugh (Paisley South) (Lab)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Margaret (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 Macdonald, Lewis (Aberdeen Central) (Lab)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 Mackay, Angus (Edinburgh South) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)  
 McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)  
 McConnell, Mr Jack (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)

McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)  
 Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mulligan, Mrs Mary (Linlithgow) (Lab)  
 Munro, Mr John (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Radcliffe, Nora (Gordon) (LD)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland) (LD)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Ochil) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Ian (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)

#### AGAINST

Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
 Elder, Dorothy-Grace (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Ewing, Dr Winnie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Ingram, Mr Adam (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Mr Gil (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
 Sheridan, Tommy (Glasgow) (SSP)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
 White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

#### ABSTENTIONS

Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Goldie, Miss Annabel (West of Scotland) (Con)  
 Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 McGregor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is as follows: For 70, Against 38, Abstentions 11.

*Motion agreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the vote is valid, and I therefore declare that the Parliament has agreed to the First Minister's recommendations and that he may now recommend to Her Majesty that she appoint James Wallace, Sam Galbraith, Henry McLeish, Jack McConnell, Susan Deacon, Tom McCabe, Ross Finnie, Wendy Alexander and Sarah Boyack as ministers.

*Question, That the meeting be now adjourned until 2.30 pm today, put and agreed to.—[Mr Reid.]*

*Meeting adjourned at 12:03.*

14:29

*On resuming—*

## Junior Ministers

**The Presiding Officer (Sir David Steel):** The next business is a debate on a motion from the First Minister, which seeks the agreement of the Parliament to the appointment of the junior Scottish ministers. I will put the question on the motion and on the amendment no later than one hour after the First Minister has opened the debate. I intend to select amendment S1M-5.1, as printed in the business bulletin.

14:30

**The First Minister (Donald Dewar):** I will be brief. We are debating the list of ministers outwith the Cabinet. Of course, I have no difficulty in commending the names on that list to members. I know that there has been some criticism of the size of the list. Mr David McLetchie made reference to that in this morning's debate. He used the phrase

"an explosion of bureaucracy and red tape".

He said that he was looking for a "smaller, smarter" Administration that was not "bloated"—to use his happy word. I do not know whether my colleagues qualify as being bloated but the only explosion was probably of rhetoric.

I submit to the Parliament that there is a need for proper supervision of the Administration and for adequate scrutiny. As many people have said today, anyone who has served in the Scottish Office or who has a knowledge of the stress, strain and difficulty of stretching political scrutiny across the vast range of responsibilities previously held by the Scottish Office and now passed to this Parliament will understand why I believe that there must be an adequate group of ministers, each specialising in a particular area.

I want to make a small prediction. I may be wrong, but I predict that over the next week or two there will be criticism that we do not have an individual minister for such-and-such an area. If members look through the party manifestos—I would not necessarily recommend anyone to do so—they will see that those documents are sprinkled with demands for not just ministers, but separate ministries for a number of areas. I noticed in the press today that there was criticism of the fact that we do not have a separate ministry for tourism, as distinct from a minister responsible for tourism. The pressure may be to increase ministerial coverage, not to restrict it.

On the Cabinet side, we have a good basis. This is an occasion on which, surprisingly, I am totally

at one with the Scottish National party. I took the trouble to look at its manifesto, which, at the back, describes the nine key posts that the SNP believes should make up the Cabinet. If one adds a business manager and the Lord Advocate, who everyone would expect to be included, we arrive at exactly the same number of ministers, with a large overlap of responsibility and definition. I suspect that it will become clear that our choices for the junior posts are wise and well defined.

**Mr Alex Salmond (Banff and Buchan) (SNP):**

The SNP has criticised the choice rather than the number of ministers. What policy will a junior minister with specific responsibility for fisheries pursue on the transfer of 6,000 square miles of fishing waters to English jurisdiction? How did that transfer, which is causing such anxiety within the Scottish fishing industry, happen?

**The First Minister:** The junior minister, like the senior minister, would be expected to follow the collective policy of the Administration. He would not be allowed to go off on a fishing trip of his own, if I may put it that way. He would have to follow.

I am sure that we will return to the question of fishing. However, as Alex Salmond will know, the order was made in early March, and was explained in a Scottish Office press release at the time. The order went through the House of Commons on 23 March. If the SNP missed it—I can understand how such things happen—it, too, may have some explaining to do.

I believe that this group of junior ministers has talent and considerable relevant experience. I look forward to working with a very able group of ministers who will be of enormous support to the principal ministers in their departments. The junior ministers will be part of a corporate team; that is an important point.

We have heard a lot about tuition fees and this and that; we have also had some wonderful mixed metaphors. I particularly enjoyed David McLetchie's remark that the committee of inquiry was both a fudge and a fig leaf. I would have thought it would be either one or the other. If I could mix metaphors even more, he probably thinks that we are using belt and braces. In any event, it was a cheery debate.

In his speech, Jim Wallace referred to three substantial concessions that have been overlooked. Those substantial concessions are for those from poorer backgrounds who stay on at school to get university qualifications and who require financial support. There will also be support for part-time mature students. Moreover, the access fund has been increased to £14 million. Those concessions are worth underlining because they provide practical help and broaden the base of entry to higher education. Perhaps that—I put

this forward as a point of debate—is a more practical and obvious course to take than to remove a charge that is paid only by those whose families are better off.

**Andrew Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP):** Will the First Minister give way?

**The First Minister:** I give way for the last time.

**Andrew Wilson:** Will the First Minister please outline how the concessions that he referred to will be paid for? We have heard a lot about spending but not a lot about what will be cut.

**The First Minister:** I know that Andrew Wilson was one of the chief architects of the SNP manifesto. As the SNP was attempting to buy the sun, the moon and the stars—and various other things—on the basis of savings within the Scottish Office block budget, it is a little odd that he should question me on spending.

**Mr John Swinney (North Tayside) (SNP)** rose—

**The First Minister:** Just let me finish. We have taken steps to ensure that there is a debate on these matters; no doubt such points can be addressed then.

Today, we are putting forward a team which I believe stands for partnership and progress. This is not a matter of scoring and totalling up points. Obviously, the partnership agreement is not an exhaustive list—it was never meant to be—but a way of establishing and proving that there is an identity of interest and a common approach over a wide spread of policy areas, which we believe will be the basis for the effective operation of government.

What I am interested in above all, and what I think people in Scotland are interested in, is in ensuring that the operation of government is effective and that the Government delivers on the key areas of the social justice agenda—education and health—in the way that was promised in the partnership document and in our respective Liberal Democrat and Labour manifestos. We have the people to do that; what we need now is the support of this chamber so that they can take up their ministerial posts and get on with the work.

I move,

That this Parliament agrees that  
Angus Mackay,  
Peter Peacock,  
Rhona Brankin,  
Nicol Stephen,  
Alasdair Morrison,  
Iain Gray,  
Iain Smith,  
John Home Robertson,  
Frank McAveety,  
Jackie Baillie,  
be appointed as junior Scottish Ministers.

14:38

**Phil Gallie (South of Scotland) (Con):** I move amendment S1M-5.1, to leave out "Nicol Stephen" and "Iain Smith".

I start by expressing the apologies of Annabel Goldie, who intended to move the amendment but was called away for a funeral.

If the First Minister does not recognise the difference between a fudge and a fig leaf, he does not inspire me with confidence. This morning, he referred to the misses that I made. I missed winning Ayr by 25 votes, reducing the Labour majority by some 6,500. I do not intend to miss it next time round.

This morning, there was a lot of hot air and indignation against those of us who dared to question the make-up of the First Minister's lists. The First Minister was dismissive about our amendment, which the Presiding Officer accepted for debate. He referred to a little huddle of amendments, which perhaps sets the tone for future Government-led debates.

Labour members express dismay at the loss of consensus in the new style of politics. In every respect, their way is the Blairite way: "Do not question, just accept and do what I say." That may be good enough for Labour and Liberal members, but it is certainly not good enough for Conservative members or for Dennis Canavan, as the points that he made this morning show.

New politics? The Scottish electorate would settle for honest politics. They would like to believe that politicians mean what they say, which is precisely what this amendment is about.

I have no beef with the Labour party other than over the number of ministerial positions created. Hugh Henry gave the game away to the Liberals this morning when he said that the partnership was about delivering on Labour's manifesto commitments. For the Labour party it may be partnership; for the Liberals it is absorption.

A comparison between the document "Partnership for Scotland" and the Liberals' election pledges emphasises the scale of the sell-out. That is why I ask members to support the amendment. I bear no personal animosity towards Nicol Stephen or Iain Smith. Like, I suspect, most of us in the chamber, I know little of them, but I know that they supported their leader when he said two days before the election that tuition fees would be dead on the following Friday.

Nicol Stephen boasted that the Liberals had done more than any other party to campaign against Labour's tuition fees, but he now condones them. How can he condone—how can we condone—the appointment of Nicol Stephen and Iain Smith as Government ministers when we

want honesty to be restored to the political scene?

This morning, Conservatives were criticised for not having prepared the way for the abolition of tuition fees, but that comment showed a lack of knowledge. We tabled a bill in the House of Lords. Our measures were costed and could have been covered within the Scottish block grant.

The Liberals' motion on tuition fees is a smokescreen. I suspect that they were put up to it by their Labour masters, who—as Dennis Canavan said this morning—are well experienced in that.

**Iain Smith (North-East Fife) (LD)** *rose—*

**Phil Gallie:** I will take challenges from anyone, but if they, like Mr Smith, are not prepared for activities in this Parliament and cannot work their microphones, that is their tough luck. Other members want to speak. We must recognise that time is limited.

We also heard about reviews yesterday, when Mr McCabe and Mr Dewar attempted to put the issue of prayers on the back burner. That is typical of Labour. We need to examine what Labour has done recently. The Scottish air traffic control centre at Prestwick has been on the back burner for the past two years.

**The First Minister:** What is he talking about?

**Phil Gallie:** If Donald does not know what I am talking about, I suggest that he gets to grips with these issues, because they are important to Scotland.

Like defence cuts, the A77 upgrade has been put on the back burner in order to waste time and to lay off implementing those aims that Labour has but that it has not declared since it was elected. I suspect that more issues will be put on the back burner following the difficulties that Labour is having at Westminster over social security reform.

Let us not get fixated on tuition fees. What about the Liberals' pledge to end the beef-on-the-bone ban? People spoke about the medical risk, but the chance was 1 billion to one. None of us would even consider such a risk when travelling to this place. What about the abolition of eye-test and dental charges and the Liberals' stand against the private finance initiative? All those ideals seem to have gone down the tubes.

To some extent, I feel sorry for Liberal voters. They put their faith in the Liberal Democrats and they have been let down badly. But never mind the Liberals—what about the size of this team?

**The Presiding Officer:** Could you wind up?

**Phil Gallie:** All right. Today, we are asked to confirm 22 ministers. Added to that are another five Scottish ministers at Westminster, giving 27 in

all. David McLetchie talked this morning of an explosion in the ministerial team. If an increase from seven ministers to 27 is not an explosion, I do not know what is.

**The Presiding Officer:** Mr Gallie, I take it that you were moving the amendment to leave out Nicol Stephen and Iain Smith from the list of appointments.

**Phil Gallie:** I thought that I had done that at the beginning when I referred to Annabel Goldie's intention. That was my intention at that time.

**The Presiding Officer:** I know that that was your intention and that was why I was clarifying it. The amendment before Parliament is to

"leave out 'Nicol Stephen' and 'Iain Smith'."

The time limit for speeches will be the same as it was this morning—four minutes—but if everybody takes the full four minutes we will not get through the list of those who have requested to speak. If members speak for less than four minutes, everybody will get a chance to speak.

14:45

**Mr Kenny MacAskill (Lothians) (SNP):** On behalf of the Scottish National party, I support the amendment to leave out Mr Nicol Stephen. Like others, I do so on the basis not of personality, but of policies. Accountability, accessibility and transparency were principles that underpinned the consultative steering group report. The document arose out of and reflected the application of those principles. Many meetings were held, and they were open and accountable. Public views were canvassed, public views were sought and welcomed, and public views were reflected and echoed in the document.

What has happened in the past few days? First, our Parliament, adjourned for nigh on 300 years, has reconvened and been opened to public view. A great deal of public warmth and sympathy has been extended. Secondly, and sadly, a deal has been brokered behind closed doors—behind the back of the electorate and behind the back of Liberal Democrat members and voters. As Mr Canavan said earlier, the electorate spoke on 6 May, in clear public view.

I regret that the electorate in Aberdeen South did not choose my party. That is their democratic right and entitlement. They selected Mr Stephen and supported the policies and platform on which he stood. His victory was acknowledged by my party with all the dignity and decorum that went with the occasion. However, the electorate did not select or vote for the Labour party candidate, so Mr Stephen has no democratic right whatever to sell out his principles or the policies and platform on which he stood and sought election.



As my colleague Mr Hamilton said earlier, this is not a partnership but a takeover—a lock, stock and barrel takeover of the soul of liberal democracy. That is clearly shown in the document “Partnership for Scotland”—otherwise known, as far as I can see, as the unconditional surrender of liberal democracy in Scotland. Never in the recent history of Scottish politics has so much been ceded by so many for so very little.

The document refers to the settled will of the Scottish people. On 11 September 1997 and again on 6 May 1999, the people of Scotland expressed their settled will. That is fine. I believe that their settled will was that tuition fees should be dead in the water. We have found that that promise has been reneged on. It was not, as far as I can tell, election rhetoric. It was not even empty rhetoric. It was, as I remind Mr Wallace, a simple statement of fact that tuition fees would be dead if all those parties that pledged their opposition to them remained firm and true to the pledges that they gave to the electorate and upon which they sought to be returned.

I paraphrase our national bard: Mr Stephen and his party have been bought and sold for ministerial gold—such a parcel of rogues in a party.

14:48

**Mr Keith Raffan (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD):** I support the First Minister's motion on junior ministers. It is with particular pleasure that I support the two nominees whom I know well as friends and colleagues: Nicol Stephen and Iain Smith. I respect their ability, experience and integrity. I also wish the other nominees for junior minister well.

I take this opportunity to wish the First Minister well. I did not vote for him last week, but there was nothing personal in that. I did not feel that it was right to hold the vote on the First Minister before the composition of his Administration was clear, as it now is. I have a high regard for the First Minister. We go back a long way—back to 1966, when I unsuccessfully tried to prevent him from becoming the member of Parliament for Aberdeen South. I wish him and his Administration every success for the country's sake.

I did not vote for the partnership agreement. That was a very difficult decision for me to take as our negotiators achieved far more than I expected. As a result, there is a lot of good in the agreement. Negotiation is difficult, as the SNP should realise. After all, it has been in coalition in a number of local authorities.

**Robin Harper (Lothians) (Green)** rose—

**Mr Raffan:** I will not give way yet. [MEMBERS: "Ah."] I will do so shortly. I want to finish my point

about the SNP. It has been in coalition before at a local authority level. I hear that the two SNP councillors approached their Tory counterparts in Stirling offering a coalition. That clearly comes as a revelation to many members.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer (Ms Patricia Ferguson):** Mr Harper, please sit down. Mr Raffan is not going to give way.

**Mr Raffan:** To be fair to the Conservatives—I am always fair to them—they turned the offer down. It is interesting that the SNP actually approached the Conservatives, perhaps foreshadowing the strange alliance between the two parties that we see in this Parliament today.

I am now happy to give way to Mr Harper.

**Robin Harper:** I want to say—[*Interruption.*]

**Mr Raffan:** Is this eating into my four minutes?

**Robin Harper:** Does Mr Raffan agree that, despite what he has said, it is a matter of considerable regret that the Liberal party has abandoned its commitment to ban the further planting of genetically modified crops in Scotland? The Liberals have a commitment in their manifesto that there should be no commercial planting of GM crops. I know that it has not yet started, but the pressures for commercial planting will now be excessive.

**Mr Raffan:** On a point of order, Deputy Presiding Officer. This is a speech.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** It was an intervention as well.

**Robin Harper:** Is it a matter of regret to Mr Raffan that, in the partnership agreement, the Liberal party appears to have dropped its commitment—

**Mr Raffan:** I have got the point. I am worried about my four minutes—Mr Harper seems to have taken half of them.

I am against the commercial planting of GM foods, although that is not relevant to the points that I am trying to make at the moment. Furthermore, I do not believe that my party has abandoned its commitment.

There are a lot of good things in the agreement, including the £29 million to increase access to further and higher education for people on low incomes, which we might not have secured without the agreement. We might not have got much of the £600 million to catch up with the school building maintenance backlog, which exists thanks to the Tories. We might not have secured the 500 extra teachers without the agreement or the extra £21 million for books, which the SNP called for during the election campaign. There is a lot that the whole Parliament—not just the Liberal

Democrats and Labour—can support.

I am saddened by the tone of this morning's debate, particularly by the personal attacks, which demean this place and those who make them; they make little impact on their victims. Mr McLetchie's remarks were unfortunate. There is a good old phrase used in the House of Commons about members misjudging the mood of the House. I think that Mr McLetchie seriously misjudged the mood of the Parliament today when he went completely over the top in his remarks.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Could you wind up please, Mr Raffan?

**Mr Raffan:** The real reason for the Conservatives' bitter hostility to the agreement is their envy of the coalition being achieved between two mature parties. After all, they cannot even reach consensus among themselves with the Michael Howard faction versus the William Hague faction.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Could you sit down, please?

**Mr Raffan:** Indeed, hardly a week goes by without Lady Thatcher going ballistic because of the way in which she believes her policies have been sold out by William Hague.

I will have more to say later.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** At the beginning of this afternoon's proceedings, Sir David said that, if members used all their time, not all those who wanted to speak would be able to. If people exceed their time, the difficulty becomes even worse.

**Mr Raffan:** On a point of order. Was Mr Harper's intervention taken out of my time or did I have four minutes?

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** It is taken out of your time—it is part of the allotted time for the individual's speech.

14:54

**Mr Andy Kerr (East Kilbride) (Lab):** There has been a lot of talk today of settled wills. There were continuous references to tuition fees this morning, but I thought that the settled will of the Scottish people was this: 71 per cent of them voted against independence. The SNP tried to hide independence at number 10 on its list of pledges, which was interesting.

As to the new politics, are we supposed to take Phil Gallie's word before that of the chief scientific officers? I would err on the side of caution and certainly not take Phil Gallie's word about beef on the bone.

We should be discussing some of the issues

that are at stake in terms of the ministries. Ministries exist to do a job. Last Thursday, we elected the First Minister with a clear majority; the other three candidates somewhat disappeared.

When the two parties sat down and discussed the "Partnership for Scotland" agreement, things were taken from both manifestos. The agreement was brought to the Parliament; people have had a chance to look at it and it has been agreed by the majority of members.

Labour and the Liberal Democrats have come together and agreed to create a ministry for enterprise and lifelong learning to deliver a sustainable economy for Scotland. That gives focus to the delivery in Scotland of Labour's pledge to young people—the new deal—and to the 20,000 modern apprenticeships that were promised and will be delivered by the Labour party.

As someone who represents East Kilbride, which is well known for innovation, economic development and employment in a new town, I believe that that ministry has a great role to play. I ask the minister, after he has taken office on 1 July, to visit East Kilbride to see some of the good examples that we have set.

We want to increase the number of business start-ups. The role of one of the ministries is to develop 100,000 new businesses in Scotland in order to increase and stabilise employment. We must ensure a balance of responsibilities between home and working life to enable people to educate themselves—that is part of lifelong learning and also a role for one of the ministries.

Yes, a debate over tuition fees will occur, but not as people have said. This is the Scottish Parliament, not Westminster, where things are put to committee and then disappear. The committee of inquiry will be run in the interests of members and it will report back with recommendations.

Putting tuition fees aside, because we have an agreed position on them, we can perhaps discuss maturely the real business for today. We should agree the appointment of ministers, not endlessly discuss tuition fees. The reality is that 54 per cent of students do not pay tuition fees, 23 per cent pay partial fees and 23 per cent pay the full fees. Members should also remember the 42,000 extra places for students in Scotland—equivalent to the number of students at Edinburgh and Glasgow universities put together. Those are the real issues for today, which I hope the Opposition parties will debate.

14:58

**Nicola Sturgeon (Glasgow) (SNP):** I am sure that Mr Kerr would love to put tuition fees to one

side, but I suspect that the Scottish people may have other ideas. We heard a great deal earlier today about cracks, or, in Mr Swinney's more colourful term, yawning chasms in the coalition between Labour and the Liberal Democrats. Keith Raffan has just fallen headlong into the yawning chasm.

What we seem to have in the proposed appointment of Nicol Stephen as the Deputy Minister for Enterprise and Lifelong Learning—perhaps that should be lifelong debt for Scotland's students—is an attempt to find some glue to hold the whole thing together. At least, that is the charitable view. The less charitable but I suspect more accurate view is that Nicol Stephen is being stitched up by his so-called new friends on the Labour benches, tied in to supporting a policy that he campaigned against in the election, and when the time comes, to supporting his boss over his own party colleagues. In supporting this amendment I urge Nicol Stephen to give serious consideration to voting for it because I suspect that in the months and years ahead he will look back and realise that it is in his own political interests to do so.

I took part in a couple of debates with Nicol in Aberdeen during the election campaign. I heard him promise his constituents that he would abolish tuition fees. I believed him. I think his constituents believed him as well. So I urge him today to follow his conscience and not to follow the Labour party in imposing tuition fees on students in Scotland.

It is not the interests of Nicol Stephen that are important in this Parliament, however; it is the interests of the Scottish people. In the foreword to the CSG report Henry McLeish said that the people in Scotland have high hopes for their Parliament. That is something we are all acutely aware of in the early days of the Parliament. We know that the decision that we take now will shape the Parliament for many years.

That is why we, as members of the first Scottish Parliament, must be guided by the principles that guided the consultative steering group. That group envisaged an open, accessible Parliament in which power would be shared between the Parliament, the Executive and the Scottish people, with an Executive that would be accountable to the Parliament and a Parliament that would be accountable to the Scottish people. However, the first act of the present Executive was to go behind closed doors and cut a secret deal—a deal that seems to have been motivated more by the pursuit of power than by the priorities of the Scottish people.

Many members this morning lamented the fact that we were challenging individual ministers rather than debating real issues. To those members I say that if this Parliament had been

given the opportunity to debate, in detail, the contents of the partnership agreement, we could have had that constructive debate. We could have subjected its contents to scrutiny and assessed how it compared to the manifestos of the parties, or how it differed from the Liberal Democrat manifesto. We could have discussed how it attempts to frustrate the will of this Parliament, and by extension the will of the people of Scotland, on the subject of tuition fees.

A two-thirds majority of this Parliament was elected on a promise to abolish tuition fees. The fact that Jim Wallace, who before the election declared the abolition of tuition fees to be non-negotiable, is now prepared to barter that majority for a position of power—although if we are to believe Labour sources he has been duped as far as power is concerned—and the fact that Nicol Stephen is lining up behind Mr McLeish as deputy minister for tuition fees, should be unacceptable to this Parliament. I think that it will be unacceptable to the people of Scotland.

If we are to build a Parliament that can fulfil the hopes of the Scottish people, we cannot have in the Executive people who have shown themselves so willing to play fast and loose with the democratically expressed wishes of the Scottish people. That is why I support the amendment.

15:02

**Bill Aitken (Glasgow) (Con):** This afternoon, several people have asked what the real issue of this debate is. The real issue is that a major Scottish political party has reneged clearly and categorically on promises that it made to the electorate. That is a disgraceful and shameful situation. Let us consider what has been cobbled together. The Liberals say that they have achieved 48 of their aims—of course they have. The only reason that they have achieved those aims is that they were in the Labour manifesto as well. Many of those issues were also dealt with by the SNP and the Conservatives—so that is what the Liberal Democrats have got: absolutely nothing. And what have they lost? They have lost political credibility and respect. As I listened to the sanctimonious diatribe from Keith Raffan, it occurred to me that this may indeed be the end of the Scottish Liberal Democrat party. How long will it be before it is totally subsumed by the Labour party?

The one person for whom I feel sorry this afternoon is Iain Smith, whom I have not yet had the pleasure of meeting. He is going to be the deputy whip to Tom McCabe. Tom McCabe lives in the real world; he is from the west of Scotland. He knows how the Labour party is run. As someone from the west of Scotland myself, I can tell Mr Smith that he is going to learn a very hard lesson. It will be interesting indeed to discover how

he will approach Mr Gorrie and, possibly, Mr Raffan, when the deal is put down and when he is told that those members must produce their votes. What powers of persuasion will he use on that delicate occasion? Both Mr Gorrie and Mr Raffan are, I suspect, men of principle who will tell him frankly where to get off. How will Mr Smith explain that to his boss, Mr McCabe?

The other issue to emerge from today's debate is, as David McLetchie said, the size of the Administration. That will no doubt be costed in due course. It will be interesting when the cost of ministerial salaries is weighed against what that Administration can produce. "Education, education, education" may have been the mantra of 1997, but how much of the Parliament's money that is about to be spent on a bloated and oversized Administration could be used for the benefit of education? How much of it could be used to provide additional school books and additional classroom assistants?

The issue of tuition fees, however, is one that cannot be sidetracked, because its effect on the Scottish people is manifest. The system has caused a dramatic fall in applications, it has affected middle-income families, and is generally unfair. It is a chicken that will, in due course, come very firmly home to roost. Although I do not want to anticipate the result of the inquiries that will be carried out, it will be very interesting indeed to see how our Liberal Democrat friends cope if the result goes the wrong way.

In the spirit of good will that has existed since this Parliament began, I ought to express my best wishes to those who are to attain ministerial office this afternoon. However, in view of the reek of hypocrisy that is coming across from the Liberal Democrat benches, I hope that members will understand if I cannot extend that good will to Mr Stephen and to Mr Smith.

15:06

**Johann Lamont (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab):** Taing dhuibh airson cothrom a bhi bruidhinn. Tha mi ga chunntais mar urram a bhi an seo an diugh a seasamh airson muinntir Phollok.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am proud to be here to represent the people of Pollok and, in supporting the nominations for junior ministers, I am proud to speak my first words in this new Parliament in the language of my parents and forebears. *[Applause.]*

If I may speak about rhetoric, SNP members should remember that, although they claim, as they did last night, that the SNP is Scotland's party, no one has a monopoly on being Scottish. We are all Scotland's parties and our job is to ensure that all Scotland's voices are heard.

I am sure that members who are native Gaelic speakers will have winced at my halting Gaelic. At one time, Gaelic marked people out as being different and, in many cases, Gaels did not use their own language. Now, fortunately, things are different. However, there are still many people in our communities who are marked out as different, who are visible, and who feel under threat. I am proud to be part of a Labour team that seeks to celebrate and embrace difference, but which will challenge the underlying and damaging inequalities than can emerge from those differences.

I am pleased to support the nominations of Frank McAveety and Jackie Baillie, who, with Wendy Alexander, will be responsible for leading the fight for social inclusion and justice. There are many causes of exclusion, whether of the carer looking after a dementia sufferer, the woman victim of male violence, the young black person suffering a racist attack, or the child whose life chances are already significantly determined by the time he or she goes to school. It is fitting that Scotland's first Administration in Scotland's first democratic Parliament should have social inclusion as a central aim.

A crucial area of inequality that must be addressed is the experience of women. I am proud of Labour's record on equal representation. It was done not by proportional representation nor by accident, but as the result of the determination of women in the Labour movement, and outside it, to ensure that, from the beginning, this Parliament would be different.

I welcome the fact that Labour's team for tackling social exclusion contains two strong women, giving practical meaning to all our aspirations for the women of Scotland. Our challenge will be not only to work for the women of Scotland, but to work with them, to bring about real change.

Perhaps people are wondering what the difference might be. I am the first woman ever to represent the people of Pollok—records go back to 1761—and that is a responsibility that I take seriously. I hope that we will now have the opportunity to create a politics that seeks practical outcomes, empowers those who need changes, and ends the world of gesture politics that is, regrettably, so beloved of many people in this chamber, who, soundly beaten in the election, want to use this Parliament to go on performing.

Wendy Alexander and her team seek not gesture but action. We should welcome a strategy for social inclusion that emphasises the crucial and critical role of communities in determining priorities for themselves. We welcome action on housing and action to tackle child poverty.

**Bruce Crawford (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)** *rose*—

**Johann Lamont:** I have just stopped after twenty years spent working with young people and their families who faced more challenges in their everyday lives than we shall ever know. Our children's voices must be heard and their stories must inform and drive our priorities in power. They can tell us the cost of poverty. They can tell us what happens to their educational opportunities. Given what the Tories have done to create social disaffection during the past 20 years, I for one would have pause for thought to wonder whether my priorities are the same as those of the Tories on the question of tuition fees.

Those young people know the impact of poverty on their health and emotional well-being. We should be outraged at the affront that the statistics of poverty give to our idea of a new Scotland. I commend Labour's team to members, and I urge support for a team and a strategy that must address inequality and that will embrace the power of co-operation. I am supported by the Co-operative party and by the Co-operative movement. We have nothing to fear from co-operation. We must celebrate community and give power to communities in order that the Scottish Parliament can take on the responsibility of tackling the deep-rooted injustice that is faced by too many young Scots.

15:11

**Fiona Hyslop (Lothians) (SNP):** I got the impression from this morning's debate that some members of the Labour party were questioning the right to challenge the list, and that this debate should somehow be a formality. The demand for Nicol Stephen's removal from the list presented to us today is certainly not made in a mean-spirited manner. In this new democracy we have a duty and a responsibility to challenge anything that calls into question the democratic will of the Scottish people who, quite clearly, are against tuition fees.

This debate is about the content of the "Partnership for Scotland" document. Rather than being for Scotland, it is a partnership for two political parties that are hungry for power. It is a partnership against students and free education and for Labour's privatisation agenda, and which has cost implications that must be challenged in debate. We need more resources for education, but since the Liberal Democrats abandoned the notion of tax-varying powers in their deal, they had better ensure that education spending is not paid for by health and housing cuts and the things that the previous speaker mentioned.

Yesterday, there was a request for proportional

prayers—a concept which I think is inappropriate, but of which I could see the logic. There is, however, something that you cannot have proportionally, and that is principle. Principle is measured in absolute terms, and on tuition fees, the Liberal Democrats do not have it.

The issue of tuition fees was a touchstone in the Scottish elections because education matters to the people of Scotland. Anyone who has studied the evolution of education in Scotland will know that it is the principle of free education that we uphold. That is why, although the Tories have seen sense on this issue, their attack is blunted. They started the cuts in grants and maintenance that are continued under new Labour. It is important that we remember that free education is not just about tuition fees; it is also about grants and about maintenance. Up to 12 per cent fewer mature students are applying for university places—that is not a very good advert for lifelong learning, Mr Stephen.

This Parliament should be about building trust, so that our young people believe that the democratic process can work for them. Mr Stephen's appointment is an action that would destroy that trust. How can we persuade young people to engage in the political process and to come out and vote when, the Scottish people having given the Parliament a clear mandate to scrap tuition fees, as soon as it sits, it turns its back on them? If we want young people to engage in political and democratic processes, they must be treated with respect.

I warn Jim Wallace not to hide behind the coat tails of the National Union of Students. Its president may not be completely impartial, having campaigned less than a fortnight ago for a minister who was approved today—Sarah Boyack. As a student leader she led me and many others at the University of Glasgow in campaigns against cuts in student grants. The Labour front bench is awash with former student leaders, who should know about student poverty, including Jack McConnell and Susan Deacon. I understand that Susan used to campaign for fair grants and against any loan schemes. It is interesting how times change.

If a week is a long time in politics, we have seen a century and a chasm in thinking from Labour since it became new and high office prevailed.

A final criticism is that the architecture of these appointments is more reflective of selfish party power dealings than the interests of democracy. The Scottish people had hoped for the creative use of Government departments and that joined-up thinking would be reflected in department structures. The split of higher education from the education brief is not to serve innovative Government, it is to serve and accommodate

power-broking deals.

Yesterday we saw a portent of things to come when Labour tried to bury the prayers debate in a review by a sub-committee. How much more will Labour try to bury away? Labour wants to bury debate and decision making in this Parliament and the Liberal Democrats have given them the shovel.

15:16

**Mr Kenneth Gibson (Glasgow) (SNP):** Johann Lamont hit the nail squarely on the head when she talked about the ministerial team as being Labour's team, not a Labour-Liberal Democrat team. Over the next weeks and months we will hear more and more about Labour's team and Labour's policies, and less and less about the Liberal Democrats in that partnership.

The saddest comment this morning came from Lord Watson, who told this chamber that the issue of tuition fees has now assumed a ridiculous level of importance. I have no doubt that those insensitive remarks will reverberate around the campuses of Scotland. This chamber must oppose any policy that prohibits the participation of individuals in higher education for purely financial reasons. Among the implications of such a policy that we have already seen are that applications to institutions of higher education are down 6 per cent this year, while one fifth of Scottish students now go without a meal every day because of financial hardship. Students forced to pay tuition fees without grants often have to take two or three part-time jobs, thereby displacing the less academically qualified from the job market and entrenching social exclusion.

As we know, the Liberal Democrats are committed to abolishing tuition fees; unfortunately, not this millennium. I oppose the appointment of Mr Smith to the ministerial team. His constituency includes the University of St Andrews. I am sure that students of that worthy institution and others would like to know the answer to the following question: if the committee of inquiry opposes abolition, as we expect it will do, will Mr Smith, as deputy whip, act as enforcer and compel Liberal Democrat members to vote against their consciences, their manifestos, their activists and electors, in order to ensure the retention of tuition fees? I am willing to stand aside for Mr Smith to give a yes or no answer to that question.

**Iain Smith (North-East Fife) (LD):** Which words of the agreement do you not understand? The two parties will each consider the evidence and conclusions of the committee of inquiry.

**Mr Gibson:** I asked for a yes or no answer, Mr Smith. Please give that answer.

**Mr Smith:** I will decide what to say in an intervention. The parties are not bound in advance. Which words do you not understand? It is clear that the Liberal Democrats will make up their minds, and I as a whip will deliver what they want to vote, not what other parties want to vote.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Are you finished, Mr Gibson?

**Mr Gibson:** Yes, I am. I ended by asking the question to which I did not receive an answer.

15:18

**Dr Richard Simpson (Ochil) (Lab):** I had a fixed speech with which to address this chamber. However, as a new member of this parliament—as we all are—I find it difficult that we are repeating a debate on all the issues with which we dealt this morning, on which there was a vote and on which the SNP and the Conservatives were roundly defeated. What we are going through is a complete waste of time. I do not deny the right of members to speak on the matter, but if this chamber is going to constantly reiterate the same arguments, we will be faced with a situation similar to that of the Houses of Parliament, where the seats are empty. I for one am not going to sit here and listen to repeated arguments the whole time.

**Andrew Wilson:** Will Dr Simpson give way?

**Dr Simpson:** No, I will not give way. I welcome this morning's appointment of Susan Deacon as the first ever woman health minister in Scotland, and now speak to the nomination of Iain Gray, who has specific responsibility for community care. Health is an important issue, and the appointment of this team should be welcomed by the whole chamber.

As a doctor, I welcome the commitment to a patient-centred health service contained within "Partnership for Scotland". There has been a protracted period of structural change in the national health service in Scotland. Although those changes are designed specifically and uniquely to meet the needs of the Scottish community, in partnership with all health workers we must turn our attention to making those improved structures work for the people who matter most: patients.

Our patient-centred health programme will include one-stop clinics to provide same-day tests and diagnosis, and a new NHS helpline, NHS Direct, which will ensure that health advice is immediately available around the clock, every day of the year, to everyone in Scotland.

The programme will also include the use of the best technology to link every doctor's surgery in Scotland to the NHS, thus providing an immediate connection among surgeries, pharmacies and hospitals. Under the previous leadership of Sam

Galbraith, who introduced the programme, Scotland already leads Britain in this area. We have just begun to tap into the improvements in the care process that the new information technology will create. Unlike the sterile debating process in which we are engaged today, these are real issues that real people are facing.

We will establish walk-in walk-out centres that will offer same-day treatment by specialist staff.

**Michael Matheson (Central Scotland) (SNP):** Will Dr Simpson give way?

**Dr Simpson:** No. Perhaps the appointment of Iain Gray as a junior minister, with a specific remit for care in the community, will begin to break down the Berlin walls that have grown up between health and social work since 1969. That is another real issue facing real patients in hospitals today.

**Michael Matheson:** Will Dr Simpson give way?

**Dr Simpson:** No. Our patients need a seamless care service and everything that the new department does will be focused on patients. The partnership's renewed and binding commitment to patient-centred care will allow the Government to commit to the biggest ever hospital building programme in Scotland's history. It is a commitment not only to shorten waiting lists but to speed up treatment and shorten waiting times, to increase the number of doctors and to increase NHS spending in real terms over the coming years.

I am particularly pleased that "Partnership for Scotland" commits the Government to seek the guidance of the parliamentary health committee. The real debates, as opposed to today's sterile debate, will take place in the committees. We need to debate the complex issue of tuition fees, but the soundbite approach that has been adopted by certain members today is utterly appalling.

It gives me great pleasure to speak to the nomination of Iain Gray. The Parliament should support his nomination.

15:22

**Alex Neil (Central Scotland) (SNP):** Labour members' rhetoric about social inclusion would sound a lot less hollow if their colleagues in the House of Commons were not planning, simultaneously, to impose a savage cut in incapacity benefit.

I will address most of my remarks to the Scottish Liberal party. I remember when that party had a proud tradition; I remember the legacy of people such as John Bannerman and Jo Grimond. It was a radical party and a party of principle. With this new partnership agreement, we are witnessing the strange death of the Liberal tradition in Scotland. I

could never imagine people such as Jo Grimond adopting the marshmallow antics of today's Liberal Democrats in their dealings with the Labour party. I could never imagine the earlier generation of Scottish Liberals selling out on a basic principle of free education.

What did the Liberal Democrats get, apart from their ministerial positions? They got a committee of inquiry, but we do not know whether it will have the power, the remit or the composition to deal effectively with tuition fees. Who will nominate the committee members—the eight Labour members of the Scottish Cabinet or the two Liberal members? If the eight Labour members nominate Labour cronies who they know will come up with the answer they are looking for, will the two Liberal members have the right of veto over the nominations?

What will the committee's remit be? Will it look at the issue of student poverty? [MEMBERS: "Yes."] Will it be able to address the reintroduction of student grants and the issue of student loans? [MEMBERS: "Yes."] Will it meet, and take evidence, in public? [MEMBERS: "Yes."] If the committee recommends the abolition of tuition fees, do we have a commitment from the benches opposite that the recommendation will be accepted?

**Mr Swinney:** Amid the tremendously new-politics behaviour of Labour members, did Mr Neil notice that, when he asked whether Labour members could give a cast-iron guarantee to support the abolition of tuition fees if the report recommended it, there was silence?

**Alex Neil:** I did notice the silence, but I thank Mr Swinney for the intervention.

The actions of the Liberal Democrats reminds me that Winston Churchill used to say—it is not often that a nationalist quotes Winston Churchill—that the Liberals sat on the fence so much that they could be called mugwumps; they sat on the fence with their mugs on one side and their wumps on the other.

Last week the wumps wanted the abolition of tuition fees; this week the mugs have sold out on that issue. Last week they were going to demand radical changes in the private finance initiative; this week they have sold out on the private finance initiative. Last week they were going to start to use the tax-raising power for investment in education; this week they have ruled that out for four years.

**The Presiding Officer:** Please start to wind up your speech, Mr Neil.

**Alex Neil:** I submit that this is the biggest betrayal of the Scottish people since the previous Lib-Lab pact, 22 years ago.

15:26

**Phil Gallie:** I would have liked to put this question to the First Minister, but he is not now here, so perhaps one of his colleagues can answer: has anybody done any costing on this exercise? Has anybody considered the cost of the additional member and all the trappings that go with ministerial positions? If so, could they put a price on it?

I would hazard a guess that the cost would be about the same as the take from 1p on income tax, but I stand to be corrected on that. [*Laughter.*] Before Dr Simpson laughs, he, or a Labour minister, should come up with the figures. Dr Simpson suggested that members were wrong to question the honesty of other members. This debate is all about honesty. It is about pledges that were given to the electorate. If Dr Simpson thinks that it is right to tell the electorate one thing but do another he is in the wrong place.

I would like to pick out one or two members, such as Bill Aitken, who did make useful comments. Bill, who has long experience in the west of Scotland, made a very useful contribution. He pointed out that the Liberals had, once again, got nothing for their manifesto commitments.

Keith Raffan asked whether the Tories will support the partnership. Our line is as we stated before the election: we will support policies in the partnership document that will benefit Scotland, but we will stand against any bad policies.

**Mr Raffan:** Will Phil Gallie give way?

**Phil Gallie:** I do not have time. Keith Raffan will not have the choice that we will have, because he is tied into the agreement. We will live up to our manifesto, which is more than he will do.

**The Presiding Officer:** Please wind up now, Mr Gallie.

**Phil Gallie:** Fiona Hyslop demonstrated the hypocrisy of Labour ministers on tuition fees. In doing that, she did this chamber a service. [*Interruption.*]

**The Presiding Officer:** Order. I now call Ross Finnie to wind up for the Executive.

15:29

**Ross Finnie (West of Scotland) (LD):** It is fair to say that this debate has generated more heat than light. It has also revealed a strange tendency among SNP and Conservative members to believe everything they read in the press. They do not allow for the fact that most articles are written without letting truth interfere with a good story.

There have also been few examples of willingness to listen or understand. Mr Gallie got

off to a particularly bad start. The First Minister made clear the difference between fudge and fig leaf. It was intriguing that, after hearing that perfect explanation, Mr Gallie should plough on—obviously he did not believe that there was any difference at all.

My leader, James Wallace, made it clear this morning that we have not changed our position on tuition fees. That will be perfectly clear to anyone who reads the partnership document.

It is a pity that Mr Neil has not read the document, which makes clear that the terms of reference, the time scale and the membership of the committee of inquiry should be submitted for the approval of Parliament.

**Andrew Wilson:** Can Ross Finnie tell me why three of his party's members voted against the document because of the policy on tuition fees? I walked past Mr Raffan as he was addressing a camera in a somewhat animated manner; he was saying that he would not vote for the document for that reason. Do those members misunderstand the policy?

**Ross Finnie:** I regret to say that Andrew Wilson is wrong. Those three members did not all vote against the document because of tuition fees. There were other matters on which they expressed—[*Interruption.*] The point, as Mr Raffan made clear, is that they now accept the opinion of the majority of members and they retain—

**Mr Salmond:** Will the member give way?

**Ross Finnie:** No, I have very little time left and I want to make two points.

I would not have recommended the agreement to my colleagues if it had involved a matter of principle. I want to make that absolutely clear. Anyone who reads the document will understand that there is substantial give and take on both sides. Labour did not get a majority and neither did the Liberal Democrats; that is why the document reflects substantial changes in both form and substance to the parties' positions.

On the appointments of junior ministers, let us be clear that what is being formed is a Government, not an extension of a department of the Scottish Office. The numbers that were suggested by Mr McLetchie are absurd and would have made it almost impossible for ministers to attend committees. The committees will be powerful and ministers will have to attend them to ensure proper scrutiny.

The ministers form the basis of a perfectly stable Government and I commend the document to the chamber.

**The Presiding Officer:** An amendment in the name of Miss Annabel Goldie has been moved:



S1M-5.1, to leave out "Nicol Stephen" and "Iain Smith".

The question is, that the amendment be agreed to. Are we all agreed?

**Members:** No.

**The Presiding Officer:** In that case, there will be a division. Members should vote yes to agree to the amendment, no to disagree with the amendment, or abstain to record an abstention. Please vote now.

#### FOR

Adam, Brian (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
 Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
 Elder, Dorothy-Grace (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Ingram, Mr Adam (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 McGrigor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Mr Gil (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Ullrich, Kay (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
 White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

#### AGAINST

Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)

Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
 Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
 Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
 Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
 Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
 Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
 Ferguson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
 Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
 Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
 Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Henry, Hugh (Paisley South) (Lab)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Margaret (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 Mackay, Angus (Edinburgh South) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)  
 McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)  
 McConnell, Mr Jack (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow Kelvin) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)  
 Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mulligan, Mrs Mary (Linlithgow) (Lab)  
 Munro, Mr John (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Radcliffe, Nora (Gordon) (LD)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Ochil) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Iain (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)

**ABSTENTION**

Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is as follows: For 48, Against 69, Abstention 1.

*Amendment disagreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** A motion in the name of the First Minister has been moved:

That this Parliament agrees that  
 Angus Mackay,  
 Peter Peacock,  
 Rhona Brankin,  
 Nicol Stephen,  
 Alasdair Morrison,  
 Iain Gray,  
 Iain Smith,  
 John Home Robertson,  
 Frank McAveety,  
 Jackie Baillie,  
 be appointed as junior Scottish Ministers.

The question is, that the motion be agreed to.  
 Are we all agreed?

**Members:** No.

**The Presiding Officer:** In that case, there will be a division. Please vote now.

**FOR**

Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
 Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
 Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
 Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
 Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
 Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
 Ferguson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
 Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
 Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
 Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Henry, Hugh (Paisley South) (Lab)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Margaret (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 Mackay, Angus (Edinburgh South) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)

Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)  
 McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)  
 McConnell, Mr Jack (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow Kelvin) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)  
 Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mulligan, Mrs Mary (Linlithgow) (Lab)  
 Munro, Mr John (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Radcliffe, Nora (Gordon) (LD)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Ochil) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Ian (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)

**AGAINST**

Adam, Brian (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
 Elder, Dorothy-Grace (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Ingram, Mr Adam (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Mr Gil (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)

Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Ullrich, Kay (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
 White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

#### ABSTENTIONS

Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
 Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 McGrigor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is as follows: For 70, Against 41, Abstentions 7.

*Motion agreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** In accordance with section 49 of the Scotland Act 1998, the First Minister may, with the approval of Her Majesty, appoint junior Scottish ministers. Before doing so, he must have the agreement of Parliament. The Parliament has agreed with the First Minister's recommendations to appoint the following members as junior Scottish ministers: Angus Mackay, Peter Peacock, Rhona Brankin, Nicol Stephen, Alasdair Morrison, Iain Gray, Iain Smith, John Home Robertson, Frank Macavity—[*Laughter*—]and Jackie Baillie.

I apologise, Mr McAveety.

**Mr Frank McAveety (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab):** That is quite all right, Mr Stole.

**Fergus Ewing (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP):** On a point of order. Now that the ministerial team has been appointed, it would be churlish of us not to congratulate the ministers on their appointments and hope for the best in the future. I want to draw to the attention of the minister who has responsibility for fisheries, the welcome presence of—

**The Presiding Officer:** No, I am sorry. I have already made it clear that I will be very severe on bogus points of order. That is not a point of order for the chair, nor is it in order to refer to other people who may be attending the meeting in the galleries.

**Andrew Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP):** On a point of order, Sir David.

**The Presiding Officer:** I hope that this is a genuine point of order.

**Andrew Wilson:** Now that the Government team, including Mr Macavity, is in place, can I

draw your attention to the fact that it is now 19 May and, from consultations with the chamber office, I understand that parliamentary questions will not be received for answer before 2 July, after which time the Parliament will go into recess? Therefore, we will not receive an answer to any deliberative parliamentary question until August. I think that that is simply unacceptable. Given the fact that the Government's spending plans published by the Labour Government eight weeks ago in "Serving Scotland's Needs" have been rendered entirely useless by 25 words written in the coalition document, surely, as the democratic legislature, the Parliament has the right to ask questions and to get answers.

**The Presiding Officer:** Mr Wilson, that point will be entirely relevant in a moment when we come to the business motion. You might want to make it then.

**Andrew Wilson:** It is not being heard then.

**The Presiding Officer:** You can put the point to the Business Manager in the next item of business. We will discuss that matter in a moment, once we have finished dealing with the election to the corporate body. The business motion is before us and your point will be very relevant then.

**Andrew Wilson:** We were told this morning that the business motion was not going to be debated today.

**The Presiding Officer:** An amended business motion will be taken after the elections to the corporate body. Your point will be relevant then.

## Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body

**The Presiding Officer (Sir David Steel):** We now move to the election of members of the parliamentary corporation. We have received four nominations. In alphabetical order they are:

Robert Brown  
Des McNulty  
Andrew Welsh  
John Young

I would like to be able to say, "Are we all agreed?" and then to move on, but the standing orders will not allow me to do that; we have to go through the four separate voting procedures, as we did for the First Minister. I hope that the Procedures Committee will consider that issue very early on, but I am afraid that I am bound by the standing orders just as everyone else is.

I will put each election to the Parliament. In the first, there will be four candidates. I trust that one will then be elected. There will follow a second election, with three candidates. I trust that one will be elected. There will then be a third election, with two candidates and one will be elected. Finally, there will be a fourth election, with one candidate. To establish the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, it is necessary to have a quorum of voters in each election. I hope that that is quite clear.

We shall now proceed to the first election. Members who want to vote for Robert Brown should press the yes button now. Those who do not want to vote for him can press the abstain button. Is that quite clear?

**Members:** No.

**Bruce Crawford (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP):** On a point of order. There is obviously some confusion about this afternoon's process. There is general agreement about what the process should be, but to ensure that everyone understands the voting process, it would be useful to have a short adjournment, if that is possible.

**The Presiding Officer:** We cannot have an adjournment, but I am very willing to go through the procedure more slowly.

Let me be blunt about the procedure. It might not have happened that each party made one nomination, but, as that is what has happened, there is agreement on who should constitute the corporate body. All that I have to do is to ensure that the procedure is followed in accordance with the standing orders.

**Ms Margaret Curran (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab):** I am sorry, Mr Presiding Officer, but members in this area still cannot hear you properly. *[Interruption.]*

**The Presiding Officer:** Is that any better?

**Ms Curran:** It is slightly better.

**The Presiding Officer:** I will speak up.

**Mr Tom McCabe (Hamilton South) (Lab):** I wish to raise a point of order similar to that raised by Mr Crawford. I think that a brief adjournment of no more than two minutes would be helpful in order to avoid any confusion during the vote.

**The Presiding Officer:** Mr McCabe, are you moving a motion to adjourn for two minutes?

**Mr McCabe:** I am.

**Bruce Crawford:** I second the motion.

**The Presiding Officer:** I accept the motion. We will adjourn for about two minutes. Will the four business managers meet in the well of the chamber.

*Meeting adjourned at 15:41.*

15:44

*On resuming—*

**The Presiding Officer:** I trust that four successful tutorials have been held on this subject. We will try the procedure again.

There are four nominations for the parliamentary corporate body, and there will be four separate elections. In the first, there are four candidates.

15:45

Members who wish to vote for Robert Brown should do so by pressing the yes button now.

*Members voted.*

15:46

**The Presiding Officer:** The voting time is up. Members who wish to vote for Des McNulty should vote yes now.

*Members voted.*

15:47

**The Presiding Officer:** Voting time is closed. Members who wish to vote for Mr Andrew Welsh should do so now.

*Members voted.*

**The Presiding Officer:** I am going to reduce the voting time to 20 seconds, otherwise we are wasting time. Members who wish to vote for Des McNulty should press the yes button now.

I beg your pardon. We have not voted for Mr Andrew Welsh yet. Those who wish to vote for Mr Andrew Welsh should press the yes button now.

Sorry—we have done that. We are now on the fourth election.

15:48

Members who wish to vote for Mr John Young should do so now by pressing the yes button.

*Members voted.*

15:49

**The Presiding Officer:** Voting time is up. Anyone wishing to record an abstention should press the abstention button now.

15:49

The time for voting is up. I declare the results as follows:

Robert Brown	108
Des McNulty	9
Andrew Welsh	1
John Young	0
Abstentions	0

#### VOTES FOR ROBERT BROWN

Adam, Brian (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
 Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
 Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
 Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
 Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
 Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
 Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
 Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Fergusson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
 Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
 Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)  
 Henry, Hugh (Paisley South) (Lab)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)

Ingram, Mr Adam (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)  
 McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)  
 McGrigor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)  
 McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow Kelvin) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)  
 Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Ian (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
 White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

**VOTES FOR DES McNULTY**

Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)

**VOTE FOR MR ANDREW WELSH**

McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow Kelvin) (Lab)

**The Presiding Officer:** I declare that Robert Brown is elected.

We now move into the second election, in which there are three candidates. They are: Des McNulty, Mr Andrew Welsh and John Young. There must be an easier way of doing this. Those who wish to vote for Des McNulty should press the yes button now.

*Members voted.*

15:50

**The Presiding Officer:** The time for voting is up. Those who wish to vote for Mr Andrew Welsh should press the yes button now.

*Members voted.*

15:51

**The Presiding Officer:** The time for voting is up. Those who wish to vote for John Young should press the yes button now.

*Members voted.*

15:51

**The Presiding Officer:** The time for voting is up. Anyone who wishes to abstain should press the abstain button now.

15:52

The time for voting is up. The results in this round are as follows:

Des McNulty	115
Andrew Welsh	0
John Young	0
Abstentions	0

**VOTES FOR DES McNULTY**

Adam, Brian (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)

Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
 Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
 Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
 Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
 Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
 Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
 Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
 Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
 Elder, Dorothy-Grace (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Ferguson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
 Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
 Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Margaret (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 Mackay, Angus (Edinburgh South) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)  
 McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)  
 McConnell, Mr Jack (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 McGrigor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)  
 McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow Kelvin) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)

Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mulligan, Mrs Mary (Linlithgow) (Lab)  
 Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Munro, Mr John (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Paterson, Mr Gil (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Radcliffe, Nora (Gordon) (LD)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Ochil) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Ian (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
 White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

**The Presiding Officer:** I declare that Des McNulty is elected.

We now move on to the third election. There are two candidates—Mr Andrew Welsh and John Young. Those who wish to vote for Mr Andrew Welsh please press the yes button now.

*Members voted.*

15:53

**The Presiding Officer:** The time for voting is up. Those who wish to vote for Mr John Young should press the yes button now.

*Members voted.*

15:53

**The Presiding Officer:** The time for voting is up. Those who wish to abstain on that vote should press the abstain button now.

15:54

The result of that election is as follows:

Andrew Welsh	115
John Young	0
Abstentions	0

#### VOTES FOR MR ANDREW WELSH

Adam, Brian (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
 Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
 Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
 Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
 Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
 Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
 Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
 Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
 Elder, Dorothy-Grace (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Ferguson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
 Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
 Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Margaret (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 Mackay, Angus (Edinburgh South) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)

McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)  
 McConnell, Mr Jack (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 McGrigor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)  
 McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow Kelvin) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)  
 Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mulligan, Mrs Mary (Linlithgow) (Lab)  
 Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Munro, Mr John (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Paterson, Mr Gil (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Radcliffe, Nora (Gordon) (LD)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Ochil) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Ian (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
 White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

**The Presiding Officer:** I declare that Andrew Welsh is elected.

We now come to the last election. There is one nomination, John Young. Vote yes, no or abstain. Those who wish to vote for John Young or otherwise should vote now.

*Members voted.*

15:54

**The Presiding Officer:** The voting has ended.

The result is as follows:

John Young	115
Against	0
Abstentions	0

#### VOTES FOR JOHN YOUNG

Adam, Brian (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Aitken, Bill (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Alexander, Ms Wendy (Paisley North) (Lab)  
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Barrie, Scott (Dunfermline West) (Lab)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Edinburgh Central) (Lab)  
 Brankin, Rhona (Midlothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Robert (Glasgow) (LD)  
 Campbell, Colin (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Canavan, Dennis (Falkirk West)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh North and Leith) (Lab)  
 Craigie, Cathie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (Lab)  
 Crawford, Bruce (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perth) (SNP)  
 Curran, Ms Margaret (Glasgow Baillieston) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Mr David (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Deacon, Susan (Edinburgh East and Musselburgh) (Lab)  
 Dewar, Donald (Glasgow Anniesland) (Lab)  
 Douglas-Hamilton, Lord James (Lothians) (Con)  
 Eadie, Helen (Dunfermline East) (Lab)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Ferguson, Ms Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill) (Lab)  
 Fergusson, Alex (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Finnie, Ross (West of Scotland) (LD)  
 Galbraith, Mr Sam (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (Lab)  
 Gallie, Phil (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Gibson, Mr Kenneth (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Gillon, Karen (Clydesdale) (Lab)  
 Godman, Trish (West Renfrewshire) (Lab)  
 Gorrie, Donald (Central Scotland) (LD)  
 Grahame, Christine (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Gray, Iain (Edinburgh Pentlands) (Lab)  
 Hamilton, Mr Duncan (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Harding, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Harper, Robin (Lothians) (Green)  
 Henry, Hugh (Paisley South) (Lab)  
 Home Robertson, Mr John (East Lothian) (Lab)  
 Hughes, Janis (Glasgow Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Jackson, Dr Sylvia (Stirling) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Cathy (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (Lab)  
 Jamieson, Margaret (Kilmarnock and Loudoun) (Lab)  
 Jenkins, Ian (Tweeddale, Ettrick and Lauderdale) (LD)  
 Johnston, Mr Nick (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Kerr, Mr Andy (East Kilbride) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 Livingstone, Marilyn (Kirkcaldy) (Lab)  
 Lochhead, Richard (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Lyon, George (Argyll and Bute) (LD)  
 MacAskill, Mr Kenny (Lothians) (SNP)  
 Macintosh, Mr Kenneth (Eastwood) (Lab)  
 Mackay, Angus (Edinburgh South) (Lab)  
 MacLean, Kate (Dundee West) (Lab)  
 Macmillan, Maureen (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Springburn) (Lab)  
 Marwick, Tricia (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAllion, Mr John (Dundee East) (Lab)  
 McAveety, Mr Frank (Glasgow Shettleston) (Lab)  
 McCabe, Mr Tom (Hamilton South) (Lab)



McConnell, Mr Jack (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)  
 McGrigor, Mr Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 McGugan, Irene (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McIntosh, Mrs Lyndsay (Central Scotland) (Con)  
 McLeish, Henry (Central Fife) (Lab)  
 McLeod, Fiona (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothians) (Con)  
 McMahon, Mr Michael (Hamilton North and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Mr Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow Kelvin) (Lab)  
 McNulty, Des (Clydebank and Milngavie) (Lab)  
 Monteith, Mr Brian (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Morrison, Mr Alasdair (Western Isles) (Lab)  
 Muldoon, Bristow (Livingston) (Lab)  
 Mulligan, Mrs Mary (Linlithgow) (Lab)  
 Mundell, David (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Munro, Mr John (Ross, Skye and Inverness West) (LD)  
 Murray, Dr Elaine (Dumfries) (Lab)  
 Neil, Alex (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Oldfather, Ms Irene (Cunninghame South) (Lab)  
 Paterson, Mr Gil (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Peacock, Peter (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)  
 Peattie, Cathy (Falkirk East) (Lab)  
 Quinan, Mr Lloyd (West of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Radcliffe, Nora (Gordon) (LD)  
 Raffan, Mr Keith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Reid, Mr George (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)  
 Robison, Shona (North-East Scotland) (SNP)  
 Robson, Euan (Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (LD)  
 Rumbles, Mr Mike (West Aberdeenshire and Kincardine) (LD)  
 Russell, Michael (South of Scotland) (SNP)  
 Salmond, Mr Alex (Banff and Buchan) (SNP)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Ochil) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Iain (North-East Fife) (LD)  
 Smith, Mrs Margaret (Edinburgh West) (LD)  
 Stephen, Nicol (Aberdeen South) (LD)  
 Stone, Mr Jamie (Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross) (LD)  
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Swinney, Mr John (North Tayside) (SNP)  
 Thomson, Elaine (Aberdeen North) (Lab)  
 Tosh, Mr Murray (South of Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Ben (North-East Scotland) (Con)  
 Wallace, Mr Jim (Orkney) (LD)  
 Watson, Mike (Glasgow Cathcart) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Ian (Ayr) (Lab)  
 Welsh, Mr Andrew (Angus) (SNP)  
 White, Ms Sandra (Glasgow) (SNP)  
 Whitefield, Karen (Airdrie and Shotts) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Allan (Cunninghame North) (Lab)  
 Wilson, Andrew (Central Scotland) (SNP)

**The Presiding Officer:** I declare that John Young is elected. We now have a parliamentary corporate body.

## Sitting Days

**The Presiding Officer (Sir David Steel):** The next scheduled business of the day is a debate on a Parliamentary Bureau motion.

15:55

**Mr Tom McCabe (Hamilton South) (Lab):** Under rule 8.2.6 of the standing orders, I move without notice that the motion, That this Parliament agrees that the office of the Clerk should be open on each of the following days: Monday 24 to Thursday 27 May, Tuesday 1 to Friday 4 June, Monday 7 to Friday 11 June and Monday 14 to Friday 18 June, should be taken now.

**The Presiding Officer:** I agree that this motion without notice should be taken. The question is, That the motion in the name of Mr Tom McCabe should be taken now. Are we all agreed?

*Question agreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** I call Mr Tom McCabe. The debate will last no more than 30 minutes.

**Mr McCabe:** Rule 2.1.3 requires that the days on which the office of the clerk is to be open shall be agreed by the Parliament on a motion of the Parliamentary Bureau and that until the Parliament has so decided, the Presiding Officer should appoint those days. The Presiding Officer has announced, through the business bulletin, that Wednesday 12 May to Friday 14 May, and Monday 17 May to Friday 21 May should be days on which the office of the clerk is open. This motion seeks the Parliament's agreement to the days until mid-June on which the office of the clerk should be open. I should make it clear that I am speaking on behalf of the Parliamentary Bureau.

It may be helpful if I explain briefly the significance of the office of the clerk being open. The Parliament normally meets only on sitting days. The standing orders define sitting days by reference to the days on which the office of the clerk is open. That is why weekends are not included in the motion. The omission from this motion of 28 May and 31 May means that the office of the clerk will be closed on those public holidays and that those days are not sitting days.

The Parliamentary Bureau will continue to consider the timing of the parliamentary recess as required under rule 2.3 of the standing orders, and a motion will be brought to the Parliament in due course. In the meantime, I hope that this motion clarifies the situation until mid-June.

I move,

That the office of the Clerk should be open on each of the following days: Monday 24 to Thursday 27 May, Tuesday 1 to Friday 4 June, Monday 7 to Friday 11 June

and Monday 14 to Friday 18 June.

15:56

**Andrew Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP):** I would like to repeat the point that I made earlier on a point of order, and I hope that the Government's Business Manager will respond.

My understanding from the chamber office is that parliamentary questions will not be taken or read until 2 July, after which we go into recess. That means that legitimate questions will not be answered until September. Earlier I said August, but a quick calculation shows that they will not be answered until September. I do not think that that is acceptable, given that the Government is now in place, its members are performing their duties, and each minister has a role to fulfil.

In the coalition agreement—a piece of research, although to be polite I should perhaps call it a document—we have had substantial changes to the Government's expenditure plans. Those plans were, as I said, previously given in "Serving Scotland's Needs", which was published at some expense and was rather nicely done. Earlier today, when I asked the First Minister about those substantial changes, he was—despite a glib attack on my position—unable to answer the question.

Surely we in a Parliament that is supposed to be a legislator should have the right to an answer to this very legitimate question: if the Government is making public spending announcements—as it has done—why are we not being told, in a zero sum budget, where the money is coming from? There must be an unanswerable case for parliamentary questions to be lodged at this stage and to be answered within a fortnight.

Furthermore, rule 5.8.1 of the standing orders provides:

"In proposing the business programme, the Parliamentary Bureau shall ensure that sufficient time is set aside—

- (a) between the beginning of May and the end of June each year for the consideration of financial proposals".

What plans does Mr McCabe have to fulfil that provision in 1999?

15:58

**Mr Keith Raffan (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD):** I share Mr Wilson's concern about questions and the fact that we will probably not be able to get even written answers until the early autumn. If the Parliament rises on 2 July, that will certainly be the case and it will slow up proceedings a great deal. I would be grateful for guidance on when we will be able to lodge both written and oral questions.

I would also like some further information. How far in advance does the Business Manager intend to let us know the Parliament's business?

The earlier the better would be helpful. I do not know whether there is a plan to have a business question time such as that in the House of Commons—which I know is sometimes abused when members ask spurious questions—but it would be useful to have the kind of question time in which we would be able to put points regarding the business of the following week to the Business Manager, and for individual members to raise the concerns they feel should be debated.

Could Mr McCabe also let us know the current situation with committees and the prospect of their being set up in the near future? Can he give us any guidance on what is happening regarding both statutory committees as set out in the consultative steering group report and subject committees? The subject committees can now be set up because we know who the ministers are and what they are responsible for.

16:00

**Fergus Ewing (Inverness East, Nairn and Lochaber) (SNP):** I welcome the fact that the days of opening of the office of the clerk have been published. What opportunity will there be—for all opposition parties and not just the Scottish Nationalists as the main opposition—to have substantive issues debated, such as the removal from Scottish jurisdiction of 6,000 square miles of fishing waters? This appears to have been carried out by stealth by Order in Council shortly before the election in which we were all engaged.

The First Minister remarked that during the election campaign the SNP promised the sun, the moon and the stars. I would challenge that, but what is undoubtedly clear is that while we were all fighting an election campaign, London Labour was stealing Scotland's sea without any consultation with even members of the Scottish Fishermen's Federation—who are present here today and met with us at lunch time. They are anxious to meet with every other party in Scotland.

There is a real sense of concern throughout Scotland that there should be a very early opportunity for every party to raise issues of substantive concern, such as the plight of Scottish fishermen and the serious implications that that order passed by stealth at Westminster will have in relation to prosecution under the English jurisdiction of Scottish fishermen, such as the impact of regulation of the fisheries industry and such as the fact that none of the bodies concerned appears to have been consulted.

I would, finally, ask Mr McCabe to express concern about the fact that this Parliament, whose

essence was to be consultation, should find itself in this situation where no consultation about such an important matter has taken place with any of the relevant bodies. Westminster passed that under a cloud of darkness and during an election campaign.

16:03

**Dorothy-Grace Elder (Glasgow) (SNP):** It is absolutely ridiculous that this Parliament should be inaugurated and that we should then simply cut and run into what looks to me like a ridiculously long Westminster-style recess. Some of us will refuse to have more holidays than does an average member of the Scottish public. There is a lot of work to be got on with.

As Mr Ewing said, what we have seen here in this Parliament is a dodgy deal that has been steamrollered through in England. Mr Blair has contrived what is virtually a one-party state. We will not permit that in Scotland. We have seen in the alliance between Labour and the Liberal Democrats what Roy Hattersley has described as an alliance between a Venus flytrap and a bluebottle. The SNP is not prepared to cut and run and leave major business unfinished, including the discussion of student fees. This Parliament should stay here to do the duty that it was put in place by the public to do.

16:04

**Dennis Canavan (Falkirk West):** Would Mr McCabe be good enough to explain in his summing up the implications of his motion for our ability to put questions to the newly appointed members of the Scottish Executive?

I understand from some unconfirmed media reports that, supposedly, as this Parliament does not as yet have legislative competence, we should not have the opportunity to ask questions of the Executive until such time as we officially have legislative competence. However, I would draw a distinction between the role of this Parliament as a legislature—making laws—and its role in bringing the Scottish Executive to account. It is important that the Executive is accountable to the people of Scotland through us, their elected representatives, right from its creation.

Today, the members of the Scottish Executive have been approved by the Parliament. I understand that the Queen, as head of state, has also already signified her approval of the First Minister, so the Executive exists, whether or not we, as a Parliament, have legislative competence. We ought, therefore, from an early date to have maximum opportunity to put questions to the Executive. We may have to postpone deliberations on legislative measures, but I hope that we will be

able to have debates and ministerial statements as well as the opportunity to put important questions on behalf of our constituents and the people of Scotland.

Perhaps Mr McCabe will be good enough to address those points as well as the serious point raised by Dorothy-Grace Elder. Here we are, a newly formed Parliament, and we seem to be cutting and running already by going into a recess. I believe that the people out there would prefer to see us getting our sleeves rolled up, getting some work done and bringing the newly appointed Executive to account, which is the important and immediate role that we have to play.

**The Presiding Officer:** Before I call the next speaker, I should make it clear that we are not discussing the original motion lodged by Mr McCabe, but the revised motion, which does not deal with the summer recess. We have not got to that yet.

16:07

**Johann Lamont (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab):** It is for this body to decide how best to scrutinise ministers, when we meet and so on, but I would like to make a point about where the work is being done. I do not know what Dorothy-Grace Elder thinks she will be doing when she is not here. If I am not here, I fully intend to work on behalf of my constituents, the people whom I represent in Glasgow Pollok. With respect, it is old politics to think that sitting in this chamber talking to one another makes change. What will make change for Scotland is us working in our constituencies, representing the people there and, above all, listening to what they have to say about what we should be doing.

We must get away from the idea that to prove that we are working hard for our constituents, we must sit in this chamber. That is part of our role, and holding people to account for what they do is an important part of the democratic process. However, it is as important to ensure that the people of Scotland can participate actively in that democratic process through the people whom they chose to elect to this body.

16:08

**Mr Alex Salmond (Banff and Buchan) (SNP):** That is true, but one of the duties of members of this Parliament is to hold the Executive to account and to ask questions of the relevant ministers. That is only part of a member's duties, but it is every bit as important as being in the constituency and carrying out constituency work.

Members will find that their constituents will expect many of the things that come up in the constituency to be pursued with ministers and with

the relevant responsible bodies. There are members of the Scottish Fishermen's Federation in the gallery today—[*Interruption.*]. It is perfectly in order to mention them. They are here because they expect this Parliament to have something to say about their immediate concern, to which Fergus Ewing referred. Not just Opposition members, but every member of this Parliament who is not a member of the Executive has a responsibility to hold the Executive to account. I welcome the redrafted motion, because it does not preclude the possibility of us having the opportunity, before the summer recess, to question the ministers who have been approved today. That is part of our democratic responsibility.

Whether it be ministerial Mondeos or not, there are perks that come with ministerial office, and rightly so. The First Minister has been sworn in and he is entitled to the perks that allow him to pursue that office. One of the responsibilities of ministerial office is to be accountable to Parliament. It would not be correct for this Parliament not to have the opportunity to question the ministers who have been elected today and the First Minister before the summer recess. There is an obvious choice: either we find a method of having substantive questions before 1 July 1999 or, alternatively, we delay the recess until we have had at least one opportunity to question each minister who has been trusted by this legislature today. That is not just a point for the Opposition parties, but one for every member of this Chamber.

16:10

**Robin Harper (Lothians) (Green):** There was an earlier reference to the fact that the previous debate was mainly about tuition fees. If I had not been pulled from the list of speakers in that debate, I would certainly have opened up the debate on the environment. I certainly would like the opportunity to question ministers on the issue of the environment before the summer recess. There are many questions. I accept that ministers may not be able to clarify many of the policies immediately, but it is only fair for us and the people of Scotland that we should be able to find out as much as possible before the summer recess.

**The Presiding Officer:** No other members have asked to speak, so I give the floor to Tom McCabe to reply to the debate.

16:11

**Mr McCabe:** On the first question, on a factual point, powers do not pass to ministers until 1 July 1999. Today, we have endorsed the ministers, but legal powers do not pass to them until 1 July 1999.

I fully support and sympathise with many of the points made about the opportunity to ask substantive questions. So far, the legal advice that has been given to the Parliamentary Bureau is that that will not be possible until 1 July 1999. At that date, people can lodge questions and then there is a further requirement for those questions to lie on the table for eight days before the ministers answer them.

I do not think that that advice has satisfied any representatives on the Parliamentary Bureau from any party, and the representatives will be interested in finding ways in which substantive discussions can take place in the weeks ahead and certainly prior to 1 July. I would stress, however, that the decision is not a whim of either the Executive or any other party within the Parliament. If the legal advice is that questions are not competent until such a date, I think it would be prudent, to say the least, to pay attention to that advice.

With regard to the arrangements for finance in this year, the quotation from the standing orders is correct. However, in the first year of the Parliament special arrangements are in place and therefore there is no requirement in the time scale stated to deal with that issue at this time.

With regard to the business motion and how far in advance Parliament will know exactly what is to be debated, the intention is that there will be a business motion presented each week—from memory it will be on a Wednesday—and, in a similar way to today, 30 minutes will be available to discuss that motion.

With regard to committees, again, discussion is on-going in the Parliamentary Bureau. Systems of allocation are under discussion and the bureau will meet again tomorrow. We would hope, as early as possible, to be able to come forward to the Parliament and advance the question of committees both mandatory and subject.

With regard to the comments relating to the summer recess, I well understand that there may be some confusion, given that the earlier motion was lodged not on behalf of any party but mistakenly, I think, by the office. Today the motion deals only with our business until mid-June. There has been no decision as yet on the starting date of the summer recess.

There may be an opportunity to discuss environmental issues between now and July. Of course, that depends upon how that discussion is framed, and advice will be taken on that. On behalf of the Executive, I would stress that there is no desire to stifle debate within the Parliament.

**Andrew Wilson:** I would like to clarify two issues that are at stake. The first is debates before the Parliament that Mr Salmond, and others,

raised, and the second is the putting down of questions for written answer. The practice in the House of Commons is that written answers can be tabled and will be replied to in the form of letters to the members concerned. As I understand it, answers are placed in the House of Commons library over the summer recess. That does not seem to be the case for this chamber. Is there a facility whereby we can lodge questions on 1 July or 2 July and they will be answered immediately, even though the Parliament is in recess?

**Mr McCabe:** I made it clear that there is no will on behalf of the Executive to stifle debate, and if a mechanism can be found that is legal and complies with the requirements of the Scotland Act 1998, we will investigate it and try our best to put it in place. I stress again that there is no desire to stifle debate, but the advice that has been given is not helpful at the moment. We will do our best to correct that advice.

**Dennis Canavan:** Is Mr McCabe saying that the legal advice is that it would be illegal for members of the Executive to answer members' questions in this Parliament? Is the legal advice that that practice would be illegal until such time as the Executive gets legal competence?

**Mr McCabe:** The advice is that it would not be competent for that to be done until such time as the powers pass to the ministers. As I have already said, the advice is that once those powers pass, eight days must be allowed for questions to lie on the table before answers can be given. I have already stressed that no party on the Parliamentary Bureau is happy with that situation and we are investigating ways by which it can be corrected.

**Mr Keith Raffan (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD):** If powers are not transferring to the new ministers until 1 July, presumably if we have casework or questions that we wish to raise we raise them with the existing Scottish Office ministers?

**Mr McCabe:** I understand that that is the case.

**The Presiding Officer:** One of my responsibilities is to chair the Parliamentary Bureau. As Mr McCabe said, we are meeting tomorrow morning and we will have a second round of discussions on some of the issues that have been raised. We have had one meeting already, we will have another tomorrow, and we are looking as sympathetically as we can, given the advice that we are constrained by, at those points.

However, it may be helpful if I tell the Parliament that we have already decided that whatever meetings there may be in the next couple of weeks, there will definitely be a full meeting of the Parliament on Tuesday 8 June. The reason for that is that we are bound, under the standing

orders, to have elected the three mandatory committees within 21 days of our coming into being. That is how we know that there will definitely be a meeting on Tuesday 8 June. There may be other meetings before that, but that will be determined tomorrow. I hope that that is helpful and clear.

It may also be helpful if I tell members that since I know that there is a meeting that day, I have decided that that should be the day when, as Presiding Officer, I invite you all to a reception in the evening in the Old Parliament Hall. It would be helpful if members put that in their diaries before they receive the invitations.

**Michael Russell (South of Scotland) (SNP):** On a point of order, Mr Presiding Officer. It is my recollection that there was a discussion that the bureau had accepted that under rule 5.6(c) of the standing orders, members' business might be taken after decision time. I think that I am right in saying that that was discussed; therefore, there is a procedure by which motions can be lodged and discussed, because rule 5.6(c) allows a half-hour discussion every day. In my view, that is an inadequate step forward, but it is a step forward.

**The Presiding Officer:** You are correct. Members can lodge questions for members' time, which is the half-hour after the end of the official business. What I cannot tell you—because we have not decided it yet—is when the next meetings will be, but there will be a half-hour debate on, for example, 8 June. That is a helpful point.

We have now to put the question on the motion in the name of Mr Tom McCabe:

That the office of the Clerk should be open on each of the following days: Monday 24 to Thursday 27 May, Tuesday 1 to Friday 4 June, Monday 7 to Friday 11 June and Monday 14 to Friday 18 June.

Are we all agreed?

*Motion agreed to.*

*Meeting closed at 16:20.*

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

Members who would like a copy of the bound volume should also give notice at the Document Supply Centre.

No proofs of the *Official Report* can be supplied. Members who want to suggest corrections for the bound volume should mark them clearly in the daily edition, and send it to the Official Report, Parliamentary Headquarters, George IV Bridge, Edinburgh EH99 1SP. Suggested corrections in any other form cannot be accepted.

The deadline for corrections to this edition is:

**Wednesday 26 May 1999**

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*

*Annual subscriptions: £640*

BOUND VOLUMES OF DEBATES are issued periodically during the session.

*Single copies: £70*

Standing orders will be accepted at the Document Supply Centre.

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: £2.50*

*Special issue price: £5*

*Annual subscriptions: £82.50*

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS weekly compilation

*Single copies: £2.50*

*Annual subscriptions: £80*

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 0171 242 6393 Fax 0171 242 6394  
68-69 Bull Street, Birmingham 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 01232 238451 Fax 01232 235401  
The Stationery Office Oriol Bookshop,  
18-19 High Street, Cardiff CF12BZ  
Tel 01222 395548 Fax 01222 384347

**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](mailto:sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk)

[www.scottish.parliament.uk](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk)

**Accredited Agents**  
(see Yellow Pages)

and through good booksellers