



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

Official Report

MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT

Tuesday 3 December 2013

Session 4

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body

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

Tuesday 3 December 2013

CONTENTS

	Col.
TIME FOR REFLECTION	25131
BUSINESS MOTION	25133
<i>Motion moved—[Joe FitzPatrick]—and agreed to.</i>	
HELICOPTER TRAGEDY IN GLASGOW	25134
<i>Statement—[First Minister].</i>	
The First Minister (Alex Salmond)	25134
Johann Lamont (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)	25137
Ruth Davidson (Glasgow) (Con).....	25138
Alison McInnes (North East Scotland) (LD).....	25139
Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green)	25140
Sandra White (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP).....	25141
The First Minister	25141
WOMEN AND WORK	25142
<i>Motion moved—[Angela Constance].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Kezia Dugdale].</i>	
The Minister for Youth Employment (Angela Constance)	25142
Kezia Dugdale (Lothian) (Lab).....	25146
Mary Scanlon (Highlands and Islands) (Con).....	25149
Christine Grahame (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)	25151
Siobhan McMahon (Central Scotland) (Lab)	25152
Dennis Robertson (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP)	25154
Jayne Baxter (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)	25156
John Mason (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP).....	25157
Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD).....	25159
Jamie Hepburn (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP).....	25161
Margaret McCulloch (Central Scotland) (Lab)	25163
Mary Scanlon	25164
Jenny Marra (North East Scotland) (Lab)	25166
The Minister for Commonwealth Games and Sport (Shona Robison)	25168
SCOTLAND'S CENSUS	25172
<i>Motion moved—[Fiona Hyslop].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Patricia Ferguson].</i>	
The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop).....	25172
Patricia Ferguson (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (Lab)	25176
Cameron Buchanan (Lothian) (Con)	25179
Roderick Campbell (North East Fife) (SNP)	25181
Hanzala Malik (Glasgow) (Lab)	25183
Marco Biagi (Edinburgh Central) (SNP)	25184
Christian Allard (North East Scotland) (SNP)	25185
Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)	25187
Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)	25188
Cameron Buchanan	25190
Lewis Macdonald (North East Scotland) (Lab)	25191
Fiona Hyslop	25194
PUBLIC BODIES (JOINT WORKING) (SCOTLAND) BILL: FINANCIAL RESOLUTION	25198
<i>Motion moved—[John Swinney].</i>	
DECISION TIME	25199
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT TRUSTS AND COMMUNITY INITIATIVES	25208
<i>Motion debated—[Christine Grahame].</i>	
Christine Grahame (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)	25208
Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)	25211
John Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP)	25212
Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab)	25213
Annabelle Ewing (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP).....	25215

Mike MacKenzie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)	25216
The Minister for Local Government and Planning (Derek Mackay)	25218

Scottish Parliament

Tuesday 3 December 2013

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

Time for Reflection

The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick): Good afternoon. The first item of business this afternoon is time for reflection. Our time for reflection leader is Pastor Geoff Austin of the Church of the Nazarene in Ardrossan.

Pastor Geoff Austin (Church of the Nazarene, Ardrossan): Presiding Officer and members of the Scottish Parliament, thank you for the invitation to be with you today. As you have heard, I serve as pastor to the Church of the Nazarene in Ardrossan in North Ayrshire.

Occasionally, I look through old sermons and wonder, "Why did I ever preach that?" A few weeks ago, I found a section in an old sermon entitled "Time for reflection", so I thought that I had better look and see what it said. The thought was that it was time to reflect on what had happened in previous years, to see whether the things that the church had said it had a vision for had been accomplished or whether ideas had just been good ideas and were now forgotten.

A good idea becomes a vision if you continue to have a deep desire for that thing to happen. Our vision as a church was and is to meet the spiritual and practical needs of our community, and to follow the example of Jesus, who often met physical needs before he met spiritual needs.

Over the past five years, a group of creative and gifted laymen have started a cafe in which anyone can eat for a donation, or for nothing if they do not have any money. A supply of quality second-hand clothing is also on hand. North Ayrshire food bank is based at the church. It distributes 200 parcels each month. Nearly 3,000 people have been fed there in the past 12 months. A by-product of the food bank was making a meal of it, which was featured on the STV appeal in 2013. It is a school holiday feeding programme for children who usually get free school meals. A grow your own garden project teaches people how to grow healthy food and provides some fresh produce for the cafe.

The cafe, food bank and garden are all run by volunteers, including several who have a variety of health issues. It gives them a sense of usefulness and self-worth. Next week, a new programme to help ex-offenders will begin. A community craft shop displaying crafts created by local crafters was recently started and is proving to be a huge

success. The Deputy First Minister's mother, our local provost, is volunteering there today.

As Christians, we also have a vision to see the church grow. As we have sought to serve the community in a practical way, God has blessed every aspect of the church's ministry.

It is not only churches that need vision: everyone does, even politicians. A true vision will never leave you. Why did you enter politics? Did you have a burden for this nation, or a desire to serve? Was it just a good idea at the time? Perhaps it is time for reflection. Our nation needs a Government and an Opposition that still have vision for a brighter, better nation.

Business Motion

14:04

The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick): Before we start business this afternoon, I would like to say a few words on behalf of all members of the Scottish Parliament. The shock of the tragic events at the weekend and the situation that has unfolded in Glasgow has affected us all deeply. I have written to the Lord Provost of Glasgow on behalf of the Parliament to express our profound sympathy and to reflect the pride that Glasgow and the emergency services can take in their response.

I was already scheduled to meet the Lord Provost of Glasgow tomorrow. That meeting will still take place. I will, of course, express in person all our condolences.

A book of condolence is now available for members to sign this afternoon in the black and white corridor. The book will be placed in the members' lobby for the remainder of the week to ensure an opportunity for all members and staff in the Parliament to contribute.

The next item of business is consideration of business motion S4M-08473, in the name of Joe FitzPatrick, on behalf of the Parliamentary Bureau, setting out a revision to this week's business programme.

Motion moved,

That the Parliament agrees to the following revisions to the programme of business—

(a) Tuesday 3 December 2013

after

2.00 pm Time for Reflection

followed by Parliamentary Bureau Motions

insert

followed by Ministerial Statement: Helicopter Tragedy in Glasgow

(b) Thursday 5 December 2013

after

followed by Education and Culture Committee Debate: Report on decision making on whether to take children into care

insert

followed by Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body Debate: Appointment of a new Commissioner for Ethical Standards in Public Life—[Joe FitzPatrick.]

Motion agreed to.

Helicopter Tragedy in Glasgow

The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick): The next item of business is a statement by Alex Salmond on the helicopter tragedy in Glasgow.

14:04

The First Minister (Alex Salmond): Presiding Officer, I would like to make a statement about the helicopter crash in Glasgow last Friday night. The whole chamber will wish to join me in expressing our deepest condolences to the families and friends of those who were killed or injured. All those who have been affected are in the thoughts and prayers of people across the length and breadth of Scotland.

At 10.25 pm on Friday 29 November, a Police Scotland helicopter came down on the roof of the Clutha Vaults in Stockwell Street, Glasgow. There were three people on board: the civilian pilot and two police officers. The Clutha Vaults was busy with more than 100 people enjoying a Friday night out. The helicopter was a Eurocopter EC135 T2+, which was owned and operated by Bond Air Services and leased to the Scottish Police Authority. There are some 1,100 of that type of helicopter in service around the world.

There were a significant number of casualties. Thirty-two injured people were initially taken to Glasgow royal infirmary, the Western infirmary and the Victoria infirmary. A number of casualties were subsequently transferred to the Southern general hospital. Nine people have been confirmed as having died in the incident and 11 people remain in hospital receiving treatment, three of them in intensive care units. All other casualties have now been released.

Six of the victims were in the Clutha Vaults when tragedy struck. At this difficult time, our thoughts are with the grieving families of Gary Arthur from Paisley, Robert Jenkins from East Kilbride, Samuel McGhee from Glasgow, Mark O'Prey from East Kilbride, Colin Gibson from Ayr and John McGarrigle from Cumbernauld. Three of the victims died in the helicopter. Constable Tony Collins, Constable Kirsty Nelis and Captain David Traill were members of Police Scotland's air support unit. On behalf of the Parliament and this country, I extend our deepest sympathies to the families of all nine victims. The procurator fiscal has concluded his work to identify those who died, and he has authorised the release of their bodies to their families today. That will allow the families, with assistance and support, to make their funeral arrangements.

As soon as news of the crash came through, a major rescue and recovery operation was co-ordinated by a multi-agency group that was led by

Police Scotland. I fully endorse the exceptional responses of the three emergency services, of the national health service, of Glasgow City Council and of all the other agencies that came so rapidly to the aid of the victims in a complex and often dangerous situation. The Scottish Ambulance Service was on the scene within one minute of receiving the emergency call. The Scottish Police Authority's forensic services staff also cancelled leave or continued to work extended hours to meet the needs of the investigation. A Police Scotland casualty bureau was operational from the early hours of Saturday morning to respond to over 600 calls from relatives and friends, and a family and friends reception centre was established by Glasgow City Council at the Gorbals leisure centre and then at Glasgow City Chambers.

The Scottish Government's resilience room was activated late on Friday night. The Cabinet sub-committee on resilience met on Saturday morning and has met twice daily since. The Cabinet Secretary for Justice and I went to Glasgow the first thing on Saturday morning, accompanied by the leader of Glasgow City Council. The Deputy First Minister, who has been in charge of the ministerial response in Glasgow, visited the scene of the incident on Saturday afternoon.

In recent days, the Deputy First Minister, the Cabinet Secretary for Justice, the Minister for Community Safety and the Minister for Public Health and I have all met many of the NHS and emergency services staff who have been involved in the response to offer our personal thanks for their tireless efforts. I visited the control centre and spoke to officers and emergency staff from Police Scotland, the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, the national health service and the Scottish Ambulance Service. I saw for myself the speed and effectiveness of the immediate mobilisation of the emergency services in dealing with the tragedy.

Today, with the Lord Provost of Glasgow, I met David Goodhew, assistant chief officer of the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, and expressed the Parliament's admiration and total support for the bravery, commitment and conduct of the rescue teams. It has been a very complex and dangerous operation because of the nature of the accident and of the building. The emergency services have been working to a clear hierarchy of priorities. First and foremost has been the rescue and recovery operation; secondly, they have been securing the site in extraordinarily dangerous circumstances; and, thirdly, they have ensured the integrity of evidence for future investigation. Their hard work and determination have been extraordinary and have been typified by the specialist rescue teams, which have worked in very confined spaces, with the danger of further collapse.

I briefed the Prime Minister about the incident on Saturday afternoon, and he expressed his condolences and sympathy. He also extended the offer of military support, which was not required, but the offer was appreciated nevertheless.

Messages of sympathy have been sent from around the world and from many nations in support of the bereaved families. Her Majesty the Queen has expressed her sadness and His Holiness Pope Francis has sent a message expressing his closeness to the people of Glasgow at this time. We have had many messages of solidarity and support from Governments across these islands and around the world, including from those of Canada, Latvia, New Zealand, Malawi and many, many more.

Many people in Glasgow have left flowers near the scene, have signed the book of condolence or have lit candles to remember the dead. The Deputy First Minister and the Cabinet Secretary for Justice attended the service at Glasgow cathedral, which was led with such dignity and compassion by the Rev Dr Laurence Whitley, who is also chaplain to the Police Service.

It is important now that we give the bereaved families not just support but the time and privacy to grieve.

Glasgow City Council has established a fund for affected families, and I can confirm that the Scottish Government will match the council's contribution. The council has established a hotline for people who want to make donations, as well as a dedicated helpline for those who are in need of support.

We also need to determine what caused Friday's tragedy, so that we can learn the necessary lessons. A full police investigation, under the direction of the Crown Office, is now under way into the circumstances of the incident. Today, the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service has put information on its website that is designed to explain that process to the public. It is the task of the Air Accidents Investigation Branch to carry out its investigation and to determine the cause of the incident. That investigation commenced on Saturday. We expect a preliminary report within the next few days, but full and final findings are not likely to be available for a number of months. We will make it clear that it would be very much in the interests of all concerned if that investigation were carried out as quickly as is humanly possible. Any decision by the Crown Office on further inquiry must await the full and final findings of the AAIB.

Finally, we must focus on getting Glasgow back to normal life. Glasgow City Council is co-ordinating that work, with the support of the Scottish Government and many other agencies

and organisations, but it is the people of Glasgow who will lead the way, just as they did on Friday night.

Friday was a black day for Glasgow and for Scotland, but we can take heart from the exemplary response of our emergency services, and from how people responded to adversity. We have all been inspired by the instinctive courage of ordinary Glaswegians in coming to the aid of their fellow citizens in a time of need. In the immediate aftermath of the crash, we saw people running towards—not away from—potential danger to help. We saw people who were in the Clutha Vaults and those nearby entering the building in the first seconds after the incident to form a human chain to help the injured to escape.

There have been many acts of kindness and concern: the local pizza restaurant staying open all night to feed the rescue workers; the Holiday Inn Express opening its doors to support casualties; health service workers reporting for duty even when they were not on shift; Glasgow Central Mosque offering support; Glasgow Taxis offering free transport for affected families; priests from the parish helping the injured and relatives; the Salvation Army handing out tea and coffee at the scene; a benefit concert being organised for victims; people queueing up to give blood; and many, many more. I wish to place on record this Parliament's gratitude to each and every organisation and individual who has stepped forward so selflessly to help others.

Tragedies do not define people, cities or countries. We are defined by how we respond to tragedy. As we mourn those who have died, we can also reflect on the compassion, sympathy and solidarity that have been demonstrated in recent days throughout Scotland and beyond. That should be a source of pride for us all, even in the face of such sorrow and adversity.

14:14

Johann Lamont (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab): I thank the First Minister. I appreciate his statement and acknowledge the way in which politicians and Governments at every level and from across parties have come together to ensure that the things that need to be done are being done. Everyone appreciates that.

There is a time for questions—there are many questions—but now is also a time for reflection. On Friday night, the frailty but also the strength of humanity shocked us and made us humble, and even proud. On that Friday night—the last payday before Christmas—friends and family gathered in one of Glasgow's warmest and friendliest pubs—then tragedy struck. It reminded us of the frailty of human life.

When I heard the news, I was going home after spending my Friday as the people in the Clutha had been spending it—listening to a band in a pub. My son was playing in that band. Even now, I feel the shock of hearing that, for the people in the Clutha, their evening had ended in such tragedy. Our hearts go out to the families of the nine victims and all who were injured.

What happened to the people in the Clutha Vaults is difficult to fathom, but the response of the people of Glasgow was truly remarkable. We would all like to think that when faced with such an incident we would do the right thing, but none of us really knows until we are tested. Well, Presiding Officer—hundreds of Glaswegians were tested on Friday night and we found out something marvellous about them all: their determination to do the right thing and not to worry about the cost. I am proud of the friends of mine who I know stopped to help their neighbours, and we are all proud of all those who refused to pass by on the other side. A lesson on the strength and beauty of humanity went out from Glasgow on Friday night.

We can also be proud of members of our emergency services, some of whom were on the scene within a minute. Police, fire workers and ambulance staff did not stop to grieve the loss of three of their own, but instead focused solely on saving lives, while council workers volunteered immediately to get in and do the practical things that needed to be done, including feeding people, making the street secure and so on. Those people are still involved in the aftermath—helping, supporting, caring for and restoring Glasgow.

We know that for some people this is more than just an event or an incident. Many will mourn now, while others will suffer injuries and trauma from their experience. For them, life will never be the same again and our thoughts and prayers are with them all.

Out of that tragic loss, however, we have gained pride in the spirit of our community. Surely that gives us all some light and hope.

14:17

Ruth Davidson (Glasgow) (Con): Nobody knows how they will react when the unimaginable happens. There is no handbook on how to respond to a tragedy that makes no sense—when, for example, a passenger airliner falls out of the sky above a town, an oil platform is engulfed in a fireball, a man walks into a primary school and opens fire or the rotors of a police helicopter stop spinning and it crashes into the roof of a city centre pub on a busy Friday night. Nobody knows how they will react when they are faced with such unimaginable scenes.

In Scotland, we pull together. On Friday, we saw people who had escaped the wreckage of the building turning around and going back in to help others. We saw passengers stop their cars and residents come out of their homes to join a human chain to help people to safety. We saw ambulance crews, fire officers and members of the police work through the night, the next day and the day after, sometimes at great risk, to save the living and recover the dead, knowing that their colleagues were in that wreckage. We then saw them form a simple, silent guard of honour as the last souls were recovered.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the families and loved ones of all who died and those who are injured, but our thanks go to those who ensured that that number did not rise. We saw some amazing acts of courage, generosity, thought and care: the son standing vigil by the police cordon throughout the night, knowing that his father's seat was exactly where the helicopter fell and never contemplating that a son's place would be anywhere other than where he was, waiting on the worst news that he would ever receive; the hotel opening its doors without question to the injured and exhausted; the pizza shop operating through the night to ensure that those helping at the scene received hot food; and the taxi firm waiving fares so that relatives could make hospital visits for free.

I record my thanks to the First Minister for speaking for Scotland on Saturday morning and again today, and to Glasgow City Council, which spoke for all of the city. Gordon Matheson and his team did not just co-ordinate the work but set the tone and reflected the mood of a Glasgow in shock, by cancelling St Andrew's day events because respect was more important than cost, by feeding police, fire and ambulance workers at the scene, by setting up a family reception centre as news filtered through and by immediately offering financial help for anyone who was suffering hardship as a result of what unfolded.

The city's slogan is "People make Glasgow", and on Friday night and thereafter, people's first, last and only thought was to help. No matter the risk and with no thought for themselves, people said, "What can we do?" All Glasgow will mourn Friday's events and all Glasgow gives thanks. This week, Glasgow stood together.

14:20

Alison McInnes (North East Scotland) (LD): On behalf of my colleagues, I join members from across the chamber in extending our heartfelt condolences to those who lost loved ones in the accident on Friday. It is hard to comprehend their loss. Our best wishes go out to all the other people who have been caught up in this tragedy—

especially to those who remain seriously ill in hospital.

It should have been a Friday night like any other at the Clutha Vaults bar—an opportunity to listen to some live music, to catch up with friends and family or to have a drink with colleagues after work. What occurred could not have been more unexpected. The vibrancy of a seemingly ordinary evening was brought to an end in tragic circumstances.

And yet, in the saddest of situations, we have seen the very best of the people of Glasgow, with courage, compassion and character from staff and customers of the Clutha, from passers-by and, of course, from our emergency services alike—from those who formed a human chain to carry people out of the bar, to the hotel staff over the road who opened their doors to help in any way they could, to the staff who rushed into hospitals to attend to the victims, and to the people who worked tirelessly and painstakingly day and night on the complex rescue and recovery operation.

Where the community first came together to respond, people now comfort and care for one another, united in grief for family, friends and colleagues. As well as continued support, the bereaved need information and certainty about what led to the loss of their loved ones, which is why the investigation must now be given the space that it needs in order to determine exactly what happened, thereby ensuring that everything possible can be done to try to prevent such a tragedy from occurring again in the future.

14:22

Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green): On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I also offer our deepest condolences to those who have been bereaved, our concern and best wishes to those who remain injured as the dedicated people of our national health service support their recovery, and our thanks to the emergency services and everyone on the scene, who reacted with instinctive concern for the wellbeing of others around them. We are relieved that, in large part due to that instinctive response, so many people escaped physical injury, although no doubt the shock and trauma of surviving will stay with them throughout their lives.

It is also worth saying that many people in the Scottish media are due real credit for their work not only in reporting the facts to a shocked city and country in the midst of such distress, but also for exploring sensitively the feelings of those who were affected.

The tragedy took place as Scotland was preparing for the festive season. Over the weeks ahead, I doubt that many of us in Glasgow, in

Scotland or indeed far beyond, in gathering together with friends and family, will not find ourselves feeling very differently about those celebrations this year. We will be all the more aware of our vulnerability, but also of how much we value one another. At such times, I am sure that we will all keep in our thoughts those who were lost on Friday night and also those who will live on.

The Presiding Officer: I call the constituency member, Sandra White.

14:23

Sandra White (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP): Having attended the scene and spoken to many of the people there, I echo the comments of the First Minister and the leaders of the Opposition parties and I thank everyone for their heartfelt contributions. The tragic incident at the Clutha has affected everyone in my constituency and people beyond, and my sympathies go to all who have lost their lives and their loved ones who grieve for them.

The courage that has been shown by the emergency services and the people of Glasgow is nothing short of heroic, and I pay tribute to every single person. It is said that Glaswegians are resilient—they are, but they are also courageous, as Friday night's incident has proved, and that courage and resilience will help us through the sad days ahead.

14:25

The First Minister: Everyone has spoken of the extent of the incident and the response. The impact of the incident will be felt most immediately by those who are bereaved, those who have been injured and their families, but it will go much wider. In the speeches today and in speaking to many people in Glasgow, I have been struck that the extent of the impact of such an incident is very wide ranging. What will undoubtedly be the case, as every member who has spoken has said, is that the spirit and solidarity that have been so extraordinarily demonstrated over the past few days will be of huge assistance to us all in the process of recovery that must now take place.

The Presiding Officer: Thank you, First Minister. I intend to have a suspension for a very short period. We will resume at 2.35.

14:25

Meeting suspended.

14:35

On resuming—

Women and Work

The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):

The next item of business is a debate on motion S4M-08462, in the name of Angela Constance, on women and work.

The Minister for Youth Employment (Angela Constance): This year marks the 100th anniversary of the death of Mary Lily Walker, who was a native of Dundee. The city is, understandably, celebrating the life of that remarkable woman, who introduced ground-breaking social and healthcare reform. One hundred years on, we have seen a huge change in the lives of working women. Women now work in every sector in Scotland—often at the top of their profession—or run their own businesses, and yet they still face barriers to and at work.

At last year's women's employment summit, which was held in partnership with the Scottish Trades Union Congress, delegates discussed the many barriers that women can face in the labour market. Since March this year, I have had support in monitoring progress since the summit from the strategic advisory group on women and work. I am grateful to the group for its passionate yet well-informed input to our wide-ranging mission. In addressing Parliament today, I hope that I am adequately reflecting its views and concerns.

Since the summit, we have had the timely report from the Equal Opportunities Committee on its inquiry into women and work, which considered childcare, occupational segregation and flexible working. However, although significant challenges remain for today's women, I stress that we are not here to debate bad news.

I invite members to consider the wider picture. Women are doing well in the labour market. The latest statistics show that the female employment rate is 69.5 per cent in Scotland, which is an increase of 3.2 per cent in the past year. Over the year, the number of women in employment in Scotland has risen by 54,000, and female underemployment has also decreased by 2.9 per cent over the past year.

However, we know that problems still exist, and we need to find ways within our powers to tackle them. The cost and availability of childcare is often cited as the key problem for working parents and women in particular. That is why we are legislating now, via the Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill, to increase the level of funded early learning and childcare from 475 hours to 600

hours per year for three and four-year-olds and, from 2014, for the most vulnerable two-year-olds.

Our white paper, "Scotland's Future: Your Guide to an Independent Scotland", which was published last week, set out our commitment, in an independent Scotland, to work towards a childcare system in which all children from age one to starting school would be entitled to 1,140 hours of childcare and early learning a year, which equates broadly to 30 hours a week, 38 weeks per year. That would be truly transformational and would enable more women to make greater choices about their working lives. In developing that commitment the Scottish Government is indebted to Professor Ailsa McKay, whose input has been invaluable, and I thank her for that.

Among the other topics that were discussed at the summit, occupational segregation is one of the most complex and challenging, but we must challenge it for the sake of our economy and of equality, including equal pay. Because the issues are so broad, the first recommendation from the summit on which we acted was the re-establishment of the Government's cross-directorate working group. In addition to Scottish Government officials, the group calls on the expertise of our external partners in the STUC, Napier's Scottish resource centre for women in science, engineering and technology, the close the gap project and the men in childcare initiative.

The group will oversee the work to progress the women's employment summit recommendations, alongside the recommendations that the Royal Society of Edinburgh made in its report, "Tapping all our Talents: Women in science, technology, engineering and mathematics—a strategy for Scotland"

One action that is already under way is the implementation of careerwise, which is a £250,000 fund to encourage girls and young women to consider careers in science, engineering and technology. Careerwise Scotland is being implemented by the Scottish resource centre. It will work collaboratively with employers, schools, colleges, universities and Skills Development Scotland to encourage and support young women into science, technology, engineering and maths learning and jobs.

It is worth mentioning that earlier this month, the Prospect union launched the Prospect pledge to encourage the Government and employers to do more to help women into STEM jobs. I assure Parliament that I fully support that ambition. Early next year, I will hold an event with the information technology industry with an emphasis on how to attract young women into the sector, which I hope will also contribute to that work.

On the modern apprenticeship programme and vocational education training, Skills Development Scotland is pursuing a range of activities including working with Scottish union learning to better target underrepresented groups in the apprenticeship programme, be that young women, members of the black and minority ethnic community or people with a disability. As members all know, we await the final report from the Wood commission.

However, we need to be clear that addressing occupational segregation is not just about getting more women into STEM jobs. Women are often drawn to particular sectors and types of jobs. It is crucial that we properly value all the work that women do—paid and unpaid—which contributes so much to Scottish society and to the Scottish economy.

Another topic of discussion at the summit was access to training for women of all ages. I recognise that women will need to access training at different stages of their lives and that those who are returning to the labour market may need to refresh existing skills or retrain in a new area.

Kezia Dugdale (Lothian) (Lab): I agree entirely with what the minister has said. I wonder therefore whether she regrets cutting 77,000 places for women in her colleges.

Angela Constance: The facts of the matter are that women are well represented as learners within colleges—53 per cent of learners are indeed women and women make up 51.5 per cent of the population. Given what we know about the barriers to women participating in the labour market, it is absolutely crucial that women get access to learning that is economically relevant and which will give them access to well-paid and fruitful careers.

On another matter, I have asked officials to identify any barriers to training that women face and to explore how those can be addressed in full. As part of that work, I am pleased to advise the Parliament that through the energy skills challenge fund, OPITO—the oil and gas skills body—and Fife College are specifically targeting women for courses that are due to commence in January 2014. The Scottish Government will pilot an offer of childcare support for those courses.

Mary Scanlon (Highlands and Islands) (Con): I welcome the minister asking officials to look into some background. Are the minister's officials also looking into why the average spend per male apprentice is 53 per cent more than the average spend per female apprentice?

Angela Constance: Absolutely. That issue has been debated and discussed within the chamber and also within the strategic group on women and

work and amongst the occupational segregation group.

We know that men are more likely to be in apprenticeship frameworks such as construction and engineering, which take longer to complete and are often at a higher level. However, as I said earlier, we do indeed want women to have access to opportunities in a variety of sectors, including those sectors in which women are currently underrepresented—sectors that can lead women to long careers and careers that will help to address equal pay issues, for example.

As regards women in enterprise, in Scotland only 21 per cent of small to medium-sized enterprise employers are women led. Following last year's summit, we facilitated a series of workshops, which were chaired by Professor Sara Carter of the University of Strathclyde and Jackie Brierton of Women's Enterprise Scotland.

A draft framework for action by the Scottish Government and its partners has been produced and we anticipate that it will be completed by the end of the year. Figures that Sara Carter has provided show that, if women in Scotland were to start businesses at the same rate as men, economic growth could be more than 5 per cent. That demonstrates the importance of addressing the enterprise gap.

The challenges for women in the workplace are many and varied. In the short time available, I have not been able to cover all the work that is under way by the Scottish Government and our partners. I hope that my colleague Shona Robison will address in her concluding remarks some of the wider equality issues and issues to do with women's participation on boards and in broader public and corporate life. I have not had time to touch on the excellent research and analysis that has been led by Professor Patricia Findlay, but there are good papers on the employability in Scotland website.

To end on a personal note, I assure Parliament that, within the scope of the powers that we currently have, we are taking steps across all areas of Government to tackle the barriers to employment or progression that women face. I for one certainly want to do more. One of the many reasons why I want to bring powers home to this Parliament is so that we can make a practical and long-lasting difference to women's lives.

I move,

That the Parliament recognises the significant contribution that women make to Scotland's economy; agrees that there is a potential economic impact from enabling more women into the labour market and that implementing the Scottish Government's commitment to a universal childcare system as outlined in *Scotland's Future, Your Guide to an Independent Scotland*, would significantly help raise women's participation; recognises the

commitment of the Scottish Government now and in an independent Scotland to increasing women's representation in public and corporate life; further notes that the Scottish Government remains committed to tackling all of the barriers faced by women that prevent their full participation in the labour market; notes the progress made since the Women's Employment Summit, which was held on 12 September 2012, and recognises the contribution of the STUC and other partners to that progress.

14:46

Kezia Dugdale (Lothian) (Lab): I welcome the opportunity to debate women and work. I commend the ministers who have signed the motion for coming together to address the issue as women—I say that as much to Aileen Campbell as to Angela Constance and Shona Robison. When they do that, it is powerful. However, their mission and their motion lack a degree of ambition. Today, I will outline why Labour would be much bolder and why we will continue to push the Government on the issue. I will talk about the role of women in the economy more generally and I will touch on childcare.

However, let me start with the Government's motion. It says:

“there is a potential economic impact from enabling more women into the labour market”.

“A potential”—why so timid? I have shared platforms with Angela Constance and Shona Robison to discuss women and their role in society. I know that they are both self-defined feminists who are committed to the cause. I want them to get angry and demand equality. I want them to talk about the patriarchy in a way that is not defined by borders or the constitution and to state without doubt or hesitation that our economy is weakened because women are just not equal players in it. That is why the Labour amendment leads with an aspiration for full gender equality.

The Government's motion also refers to the white paper on independence. I can assure the ministers that I have read it thoroughly. It has 170,000 words, but women get only 39 of them. There is no mention of occupational segregation, equal pay, flexible working or low pay, and the words “gender equality” appear only in connection with our international development responsibilities. If independence is key, where is the compelling vision for a more equal and just nation for women? If we follow the logic that an independent Scotland would have a written constitution that enshrines rights, why is there no mention of women? The Government tells us that social rights to a free education and prescription charges can be enshrined, but there is silence when it comes to a political and economic right to gender equality. We are promised “Dr Who” and our own Eurovision entry, but not equal rights as women. The white

paper lacks an ambition that is grounded first and foremost in equality and, so far, it has failed to capture women's imagination.

The Minister for Commonwealth Games and Sport (Shona Robison): I do not doubt for a minute Kezia Dugdale's commitment on the matter, and I have debated it with her on a number of occasions. Given her beliefs on equality and her criticisms of the white paper, why does Labour oppose having powers on equality here in Scotland? Why will Labour not support the devolution of equality legislation to this Parliament?

Kezia Dugdale: I do not support that, because I believe in the United Kingdom and I believe in raising the rights and opportunities of women across the United Kingdom. I care about the economic outlook of women in Glasgow, Manchester and Newcastle in equal terms, and I care about the lives of the children in those cities in equal terms. They face the same poverty every single day, and women's employment is the key to accessing a way out of that poverty. That is why we are here to talk about the issue today.

John Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP): Will the member give way?

Kezia Dugdale: I am sorry, but I want to move on and develop that point about the role of women in the economy.

We are coming out of a recession and going back into economic growth. It is more important than ever that women play an equal part in that economic growth. That is why I ask the Government to be more ambitious in what it says about the jobs of the future and women's ability to access them. We previously discussed the issue when we talked about the Wood commission report in the chamber. I will cite again some of the statistics that we used in that debate.

The number of awards for STEM subjects in further education in Scotland is falling—it has gone from 43,000 in 2008 to 30,000 in 2011-12—so fewer STEM subjects are being studied in our colleges. In the gender breakdown, the figure for women is falling, too. In 2008, 33 per cent of those who studied STEM subjects were women, whereas that is now down to 25 per cent. Not only are fewer STEM awards being made in our colleges but fewer women are studying STEM subjects.

The same principle applies to our modern apprenticeship framework. As the Minister for Youth Employment said, the number of women who are accessing the frameworks has increased, but the increase is in administration, retail and hospitality, and it tends to be at level 2. Women are not breaking into the technical modern apprenticeships—the level 4s—which take a

substantial time to undertake. In 2008, 2.1 per cent of those who studied engineering were women; now, the figure is 2.6 per cent. Progress of less than half a percentage point has been made under the Government that we face today.

The issue does not stop at modern apprenticeships. In today's programme for international student assessment—PISA—statistics for Scotland, boys outperform girls at a rate of seven to one in STEM subjects; they are seven points higher, whereas the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development average is one point. Why are women still failing to succeed in studying science subjects in Scotland? We need to do something about that.

That is why Jenny Marra and I wrote to Mike Russell on 7 October. We said:

"the Wood Commission report recommends that ... Modern Apprenticeships should be ring-fenced for STEM subjects."

We asked for gender quotas to be applied to the ring-fenced places, to ring fence 50 per cent of the opportunities for women. We wrote on 7 October, but we have still not heard from him. How can we have a reasoned and honest debate if ministers will not reply to our letters? The point that we made has not been addressed today.

Shona Robison: I wrote to the member's party leader, Johann Lamont, to ask for discussions about gender equality, but I am afraid that I still await a reply. It cuts both ways. I am about to write to Jackie Baillie in the same vein, and I hope that the Labour leadership will sit down to talk about areas of consensus.

Kezia Dugdale: The rebuttal is a blame game instead of showing keenness to address the reality. I will pick up that point if Shona Robison will ensure that Mike Russell replies to my letter. Come on—let us have a reasoned debate; this is not school. We are trying to bring issues to the chamber.

I referred to the jobs of the future, but we need to think about women's place in society now and the worth that we as a society place on the jobs that they currently do. Increasingly, women do low-paid, part-time jobs. Where is the ambition to challenge the status of some of the jobs that women do in society? What about caring jobs? What about the people who look after our grannies, granddads and kids? Why are we not talking about increasing their qualifications?

The Government is cutting the modern apprenticeship frameworks for childcare and for health and social care. Women have fewer opportunities than before to develop their skills beyond level 2. That is the reality of what the Government is doing and it needs to be addressed.

Six years ago, in 2007, Labour talked about increasing the skills of the childcare workforce. Another promise that was made six years ago was on childcare. The Scottish National Party's commitment to 600 hours of childcare provision is now six years old.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: You should draw to a close and move your amendment.

Kezia Dugdale: For all the reasons that I have outlined, the Labour Party believes firmly that we will get gender equality only when we put the lived experiences of women front and centre in the debate about our future. When the debate starts with the constitution, it ends in a bad place for women. That is why I move the amendment.

I move amendment S4M-08462.1, to leave out from "agrees that" to end and insert:

"aspires to full gender equality; believes in a United Kingdom where women can play a fulfilling and equal part in realising economic growth and creating a more social, just, fair and decent society; further believes that the barriers to women's participation include, but are not exclusive to, the lack of affordable, flexible childcare and that, among other issues, caring responsibilities, low pay and equal pay and tackling occupational segregation are just as important, and believes that progress will only be made when the debate is centred on the real, lived experience of women, not the constitution."

14:53

Mary Scanlon (Highlands and Islands) (Con): Today does not feel like a day for politics after the motion of condolence, but the work goes on. I am pleased to speak in what seems to be becoming an annual debate on women's participation in the workforce.

In the motion, the Scottish Government refers to proposals in its white paper on childcare and increasing women's representation in public and corporate life. However, as Kezia Dugdale said, most of the barriers that prevent women's full participation in the labour market can be addressed with the powers that the Scottish Parliament currently holds, just as we have all agreed to the increase in nursery provision to 600 hours a year in the Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill, which is going through the Parliament.

John Mason (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP): Will the member give way?

Mary Scanlon: Not just now.

A recent labour force survey shows that professional occupations including teaching do well; they are 50 per cent female. In that respect, I commend the many excellent female principals of our further education colleges, some of whom gave evidence to the Public Audit Committee recently. They made their points very clear indeed.

However, only 36 per cent of women are in managing director and senior official jobs. In skilled trades, 7 per cent are female and 90 per cent are male. In caring, leisure and service occupations, 82 per cent are female and 18 per cent are male. In sales and customer service occupations, two thirds are female and one third are male. On top of that, across Scotland in 2012 the average hourly pay for a male was 14 per cent higher than the average for females.

I welcome the fact that the minister is asking officials to look at opportunities for women, but the SNP has been in power for almost seven years. I will take up Kezia Dugdale's point: the commitment for 50 per cent more childcare was in the Scottish National Party's 2007 manifesto. There is no reason to blame Westminster—that commitment could have been met years ago. The manifesto said that the additional childcare would be phased in, but we did not expect to wait seven years for the phasing in to begin.

When the SNP came to power, the figure for total student enrolments in the college sector was almost 275,000. Last year it was 170,000—a fall of 104,000 in recent years. As Kezia Dugdale said, 70,000 of those students were female.

Apprenticeships are highly gendered. As I said in my intervention to the minister, the average spend per male apprentice is 53 per cent higher than the average spend per female. Females make up 53 per cent and males make up 47 per cent of level 2 apprenticeships, but of those who start the higher level 3 apprenticeships, 64 per cent are male and 36 per cent are female: for every two male apprentices in level 3's more thorough and intense training, there is one woman.

Last week at the meeting of the cross-party group on Scotland's universities and colleges, which the minister attended, we heard from Ken Milroy, the regional lead for Aberdeen and Aberdeenshire, and Sir Ian Wood, on his proposals, which we all support. I am very pleased to support them. Not only has the total headcount of students on school-college partnership activity fallen from 64,000 to 20,000 over four years, but the funding for those partnerships, which are opportunities for young women to get a taster of professions, trades and training, has fallen by a third.

The Equality and Human Rights Commission research shows gender bias in uptake of certain frameworks in Scotland. Not only is the average spend per male apprentice 53 per cent higher than the average spend per female, but modern apprenticeships that are taken up by men are double the duration of those that are taken up by women. That suggests that men receive far more training in modern apprenticeships.

If females are not getting the opportunity for training that men are getting, it is hardly surprising that we have increasing inequalities throughout life.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: We move to the open debate. We are very tight for time.

14:58

Christine Grahame (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP): I will leave the stats to be battled out on the front rows, but it is of concern that the demarcation of jobs continues to this day. The issue is much more complex than being just one of Government policy or even legislation. There is much more in the culture that stops girls taking science—and I speak as someone who took science and maths at school and got the prize in fifth year. Members are surprised, but then I have many surprises.

I will focus on the Labour amendment, much of which—apart from the obligatory reference to the United Kingdom—is reflected in what Scottish Government policy is now and will be in the future. I do not know why Kezia Dugdale's amendment says that the Government debate should be

“centred on the real, lived experience of women, not the constitution.”

I was not aware that the constitution was some kind of pure, self-contained, detached concept that has nothing to do with political change. That is not what it is all about; it is not self-determination for its own sake.

Kezia Dugdale: Will the member give way?

Christine Grahame: I have only four minutes—I am sorry.

The constitution is a means to an end, and the end is to deliver the kind of society to which I think both Kezia Dugdale and I aspire. We want a society that frees up women so that—to use that exhausted phrase—they can reach their potential.

While I recognise the Scottish Government's march to universal childcare, post independence I would want to see support, through a tax system or care allowance, for a woman or man who wishes to stay at home to be a full-time parent or carer for their children until, say, the children reach nursery school age. I would like to see that balance.

I speak as a real, live woman—sometimes too real and too live for some. I have had three professional careers: as a secondary teacher, as a lawyer and now as a politician. I have two degrees, two sons and a divorce. I have had a busy life. However, I was lucky. My father had four daughters and a son, and he made it plain that we should all have opportunities. At the time, girls left

school at 15 and aspired—at least on a working-class estate—to do nothing higher than become a clerk or a secretary. I was the first to get to stay on past 15 and I was the first to go to university. Decades on, it is very disappointing that there are glass ceilings that are not only not broken but not even chipped.

Kezia Dugdale's solution is to await a Labour Government riding on a white horse to rescue us all from the baddie Tories—real or in Lib Dem clothes. I am not sure whether Mr Miliband would be that white knight but, even if he was, that argument does not bear the scrutiny of history.

The trouble with me is that I have been around for a long time. I had eight years of Labour in power here with the Liberal Democrats and decades of Labour Governments at Westminster and I am underwhelmed by what they achieved. The rich got richer and the poor—mostly women—got poorer.

Through the deft financial management of Brown and Darling, the most recent Labour Government took us to the brink of bankruptcy. The continuing recession probably hits women more than anyone else because they are in low paid, low valued, often part-time and—to their employers—disposable jobs. Labour, or a coalition of Tories courtesy of the ever-obliging Lib Dems, will not make a jot of difference to Scotland's women, even in the unlikely event that England decided to go with good old Ed.

With independence, all the parties in Scotland have a chance to put forward their manifestos and bring forward their policies to provide women with the opportunities that should have been open to them during all the years that I have had those opportunities. That liberation of women in Scotland would, in my view, propel the rest of the UK to imitate it.

15:02

Siobhan McMahon (Central Scotland) (Lab): I rise to speak as a very proud member of the Labour Party and to address some of the points that Christine Grahame mentioned.

I am proud that it was a Labour Government that introduced the equal pay act, the national minimum wage and the disability discrimination act, and I am proud of our record on childcare. I take no lessons from those on the SNP benches on that.

I was extremely disappointed to read the Scottish Government's motion, although I was not surprised in the slightest. The line that stood out for me was:

"notes the progress made since the Women's Employment Summit, which was held on 12 September 2012".

The reason for that? The Equal Opportunities Committee recently conducted a report into women and work. We made a number of recommendations on issues such as occupational segregation, flexible working and childcare. We received a response from the Government in relation to those recommendations that fell extremely short of the mark. The curious thing is that, in that response, there is no mention of progress being made since the women's employment summit in 2012; there is just a simple statement saying that the summit took place.

I welcome the fact that such a summit took place and I welcome the fact that the Scottish Government is working with its partner agencies on that important matter, but I do not believe that we should run before we can walk.

The Scottish Government is aware that occupational segregation exists in the modern apprenticeship scheme. I fully recognise that that is an unintended consequence of the scheme. However, the committee stated in its report:

"We remain concerned about occupational segregation in the modern apprenticeship scheme, an issue we raised in our budget report in December 2012. There is a gender imbalance in that women are not making it through levels 3, 4 and 5 of the scheme, an issue on which we seek Scottish Government comment."

Angela Constance: I remind Ms McMahon that, in the Scottish Government's response to the Equal Opportunities Committee, we agreed with its recommendations. We agreed with the specific recommendation to undertake a marketing campaign looking to target young women and to get more of them into apprenticeships.

Siobhan McMahon: Absolutely—I was just getting to that point. However, the minister has still not answered the question about the funding, which has been put to her twice.

I know that the Government has agreed to the awareness-raising campaign, but I would welcome more detail from the minister in her closing speech on how that will be achieved. How will it be run? Who will be targeted? How will they be targeted? How long will the campaign last? How will the Government measure the success of such a campaign? If we are truly to speak of progress in this area, we need action rather than warm words, however agreeable those words might be.

I know that the Scottish Government's superficial manifesto commitment for universal childcare was set out in the white paper. I have to tell the chamber that that promise has only angered people who are asking for help now. I am currently trying to help a couple who have had

problems accessing childcare. That man and his wife both work full time and they are parents to five children aged six, five, three, two and eight months. They know that they will have to pay for their children's nursery education, but that is not the problem. The couple made a simple request that all their children be placed at the same nursery school, but that request has been turned down repeatedly.

The couple are more than aware of their entitlement; they are aware of what this Parliament has the power to do, so they are confused, upset and angry that this Government has done very little to help them and their situation. Of course, I have told them that, if they vote yes in the referendum, it will all be sorted for them—imagine their delight when I told them that. The couple are aware that the Scottish Government has pledged to extend free statutory early learning childcare for three and four-year-olds to 600 hours per year, but they know that without the crucial word "flexible" being added to that promise it will mean very little to them in reality.

In the Equal Opportunities Committee's report, we asked the Scottish Government what action it can take and we asked it to outline a timetable for the introduction of a statutory right to childcare, including older children and disabled children. The answer seemed to be that the first steps have to be taken through the Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill. I am extremely disappointed by that response, given that the bill does not mention disabled children at all. It does not make any provision for after-school care either—something that many parents and guardians have problems securing.

The Scottish Government has a moral obligation to do what it has promised. We need the action that is required now, not later.

15:07

Dennis Robertson (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP): It would appear that occupational segregation and inequality have happened since the SNP Government came to power in 2007.

Inequality and occupational segregation have been around for a long time. As Christine Grahame was suggesting, what is needed is a cultural shift. It is not just policies that need to change, and it is not just the Government that can put forward a policy and recommendations. We need to look at what is happening in our education system. We need a cultural shift. Opportunities are there for young women and girls, but perhaps they are not encouraged to take them up.

I come from a very affluent part of Scotland in the north-east. Last week I asked the minister about the provision of more opportunities for

women and young girls in the oil and gas sector. The Government cannot force the private sector, but we can ask it to take responsibility.

We can encourage the education departments to start saying to boys and girls through the subjects that they are taking to look forward, to have ambition and to have the aspiration to break through the glass ceiling, which Christine Grahame mentioned.

There are opportunities. In my constituency, the opportunities are taken into the schools: at secondary 2 level, there are modules that the young girls get involved in. They are now aware of the opportunities that are there for them, but they need to be encouraged, not just by the Government or by their teachers but by their parents.

Kezia Dugdale: If the Government is not responsible for leading a cultural shift in society, who is?

Dennis Robertson: The member is slightly off the mark. I am not suggesting that Governments are not responsible; I am saying that Governments are there to put down the policies so that the issues are progressed.

We also need the encouragement of our education department and parents to move on the culture. I am very proud that we have made significant progress—more women are in work and more are taking up modern apprenticeship opportunities.

Opportunities are available. For example, I welcome the opportunities through the careerwise initiative. I also congratulate Aberdeen International Airport on its appointment of a woman as its managing director, which follows the appointment of a woman MD at Glasgow Airport. However, those opportunities are too far apart.

Women have the ability, but flexibility in the employment sector is needed. I therefore urge the public, private and third sectors to look at flexibility for our women returning to work. Flexibility does not mean going to the office at 9 o'clock and leaving at 5 pm; flexibility is looking at the needs of the person who is returning to work. That could well mean the flexibility for people to work at home for part of the time. However, connectivity is needed to allow people to work at home in some areas.

I ask the minister, in her summing up, to cover the barriers that exist outwith the opportunities. An infrastructure barrier holds back a lot of women in some of our rural communities and does not allow the level of employment that could exist.

It is right that we say that there is potential for our women, but the issue is one of choice. Women

want the choice to return to the employment sector.

15:11

Jayne Baxter (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab): I am grateful for the opportunity to speak on the issue of women and work.

I have been a woman who works since I was 20 when, following my decision to drop out of medical school, I thought that I would opt for a simpler life and just get a job. However, being a woman who works is seldom simple and I have learned for myself the challenges of balancing the demands of family life with holding down a job, returning to work as a mother of young children, eventually returning to education as a part-time student and getting a degree 20 years after I first went to university.

Now, as a gran who works, I am an essential part of the childcare team and rota that make it possible for my daughter-in-law to have a job. I am therefore fully signed up to Labour's motion, which highlights the need to focus on the real, lived experience of women.

Too many women are underpaid, underemployed or not employed at all. Sadly, inequality in the workplace and in access to employment is still prevalent in our society. It is too often influenced by cultural factors and by the everyday sexism that often goes unnoticed and the impact of which is often insidious.

The excellent organisation close the gap has highlighted that women are more likely to be clustered in certain occupations, whereas men's involvement in the labour market tends to be more evenly spread across industry. I worked in local government for a long time and I lost count of the times that people whom I met assumed that, being a woman, I was employed as an administrative or clerical worker. Anyone who knows me will understand that I have few skills in those departments. I know that the assumption of what I did as a job was based on gender and not on those people knowing anything about me.

Tackling the gendered clustering in occupations, although not the only solution, would certainly help towards unravelling the complex inequalities women face at work, whether through pay, access to employment and lifelong learning, or access to affordable and appropriate childcare.

Scottish Labour has previously called for the implementation of gender quotas in STEM subjects, and particularly in modern apprenticeships. We know that the Wood commission report has recommended ring fencing modern apprenticeships for STEM subjects, and I

hope that Scottish Government takes forward that suggestion.

It is fairly well understood by now that, to properly tackle the occupation segregation that manifests itself in the labour market in later life, the gender stereotyping to which both girls and boys are subject to needs to be challenged from the outset.

The contributing factors towards occupational segregation are many, but the divide that exists along gender lines in modern apprenticeships is starkly illustrated by examining the breakdown by gender of 2012's modern apprenticeships: the health and social care intake is 87 per cent female compared with engineering at just 2 per cent female.

When we look at how those frameworks are funded—with the spend per person for engineering apprenticeships five times that of health and social care MAs, and the wages that apprentices receive in those sectors also unequal—we can see the financial consequences of such occupational segregation impacting on women before their careers have even begun.

As well as getting more women into non-traditional areas such as engineering, we need business, public sector bodies and educational establishments to work together to tackle the dwindling uptake of young people of STEM subjects across the board.

Colleagues across the chamber will not be surprised to hear that I want to highlight an example from Fife. Janet McCauslin of Fife College is the chair of Fife STEM strategy group, which is working closely with employers and the council across the kingdom to ensure that the 20 per cent of the education and training opportunities that are currently in STEM subjects continues to grow, and that gender segregation is monitored as that work progresses.

Those are welcome measures and, most importantly, they are steps towards change that are being taken now.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Before I call John Mason, I ask out of respect to all members that, if there are essential front-bench conversations that need to take place, they should be carried out at the back of the chamber.

15:15

John Mason (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP): There is not that much difference between the Government motion and the Opposition amendment when it comes to the fact that there is a problem, there is a need to tackle it and there is no easy solution.

Just yesterday, I visited the new Royal Mail delivery office in my constituency, as other members have been doing. I was somewhat taken aback by just how male-dominated the delivery office is and how few women are in that workforce, although I was assured that the two women who work there are more than holding their own.

As has been mentioned already, the Equal Opportunities Committee produced a report on this topic. It had a strong emphasis on childcare as referred to in the motion, because many witnesses talked about childcare. In fact, Opposition members have emphasised childcare in this chamber and in committees for quite a long time. However, now that the white paper contains the major commitment on childcare, the Opposition's emphasis seems to have shifted somewhat.

The Government motion talks about

“tackling all of the barriers”

and the amendment talks about barriers, including but “not exclusive to” childcare, so there is no big difference there.

The Equal Opportunities Committee report that was published in June focuses on the three key areas of occupational segregation, flexible working and childcare. Occupational segregation is therefore clearly recognised to be an issue and it has been referred to this afternoon. The tendency is also reflected when it comes to the modern apprenticeship programme, which has largely followed the traditional splits.

The report concludes at paragraph 181:

“schools are clearly an influence at a crucial stage ... although the problem in its entirety could never be resolved solely by schools”.

I was impressed in committee by examples of representatives from the oil and gas sector, to which Dennis Robertson has referred, and especially by women representatives who are going into schools in the north-east of Scotland. However, there appears to be a wider problem with engineering jobs being available but not enough people coming through to take them. Some of the young people who I speak to in Glasgow seem to have had little encouragement from their schools to go in the direction of the jobs. That certainly includes women.

When there has been some success in changing attitudes, it is very encouraging, and we should be positive about it. The committee heard about lawyers and the police having many more women recruits than there used to be, but the problem with those sectors is that not so many women are in the promoted positions. There is a variety of reasons for that and I hope that, over time, women will work their way through, but it will

not be automatic and a positive effort will be needed.

The big disagreement between the motion and the amendment is in relation to the constitution. The final line of the Labour amendment seeks to separate

“the real, lived experience of women”

from the constitution. Is that a fair split? Are the two completely separate? Subjects such as the minimum wage and childcare are not, in themselves, constitutional questions—although both could be included in a written constitution—but they could be improved by a better constitutional settlement. Women at work are inextricably linked with the constitution, and anyone who says that they are totally separate is not living in the real world.

The other major problem I have with the amendment comes through the words:

“believes in a United Kingdom ... creating a more social, just, fair and decent society”.

Is that just an assertion or is there any evidence for it? I see a United Kingdom that is one of the most unequal nations in the developed world. I see a United Kingdom in which women are getting a very raw deal. It seems to me that the United Kingdom has failed, and there is very little evidence that things will improve.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: You should be drawing to a close.

Jenny Marra (North East Scotland) (Lab): Will the member take an intervention?

The Deputy Presiding Officer: The member is closing.

John Mason: Even if a Labour Government could improve things in one term, it would be turned back by the next Tory Government.

15:20

Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD): Speaking as what Christine Grahame might describe as a real-life man, I approach the debate with some trepidation.

Like John Mason, I have been impressed by the agreement that has been reached across many vigorously argued points. Nevertheless, the debate has been an attempt by the Government to trumpet the promises on childcare that were contained in the manifesto that was published last week.

I do not think that I am alone in finding it strange that the flagship policy of that manifesto appears to be in an area of devolved responsibility in which the Government has powers already. The Deputy

First Minister's response to questions about why the policy was not being put into effect now was:

“Because if we did that now the increased revenues from that would flow straight to the UK treasury”.

Therefore, the issue is not about improving outcomes for children and young people or opportunities for women to return to or remain in work.

I accept that the minister's motion and her generally measured opening remarks go wider than that, but the policy is still hung on the premise of the constitution. Therefore, I agree with Labour's amendment that progress will be made only when the debate is centred not on the constitution but on the real, lived experiences of women, including Jayne Baxter's and Christine Grahame's impressive real, lived experiences.

Kezia Dugdale was also right in forcefully reiterating the need to remove barriers to women playing an equal part in the economy and society in the UK to create a more social, just, fair and decent society. For many of the reasons that Siobhan McMahon gave, I do not accept that that is contingent on breaking up the UK. That is not to say that a great deal of progress does not remain to be made in Scotland and across the UK in apprenticeships, the enterprise gap, the pay gap and representation in a range of spheres such as women in STEM. In all those areas, much more progress is needed.

Let us consider some of the facts. First, 427,000 more women are now in employment—almost 100,000 more in self-employment—than were in employment in 2010, notwithstanding Ms Constance's remarks about closing the enterprise gap. The creation of jobs must be the most effective way of helping with the cost of living.

Secondly, although low pay is an issue, 1.5 million women have been taken out of paying income tax altogether through the £10,000 personal tax allowance.

Thirdly, more flexibility has been introduced into rules on parental leave, unlocking potential female talent in the labour market and providing a fairer balance between men and women.

Finally, the new single-tier pension is properly recognising the years that have been spent raising children and is much fairer to women, who on average currently receive considerably less state pension than men.

The Government is right in pointing to childcare as one of the ways in which we can unlock that potential. On many occasions, I have welcomed the provisions in the Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill that extend childcare and early learning for three and four-year-olds. Nevertheless, all the evidence shows that

investment before the age of three delivers the biggest returns and that gaps are already opening up that may never be bridged.

Extending early learning and childcare to 40 per cent of two-year-olds from the poorest backgrounds is already benefiting 92,000 two-year-olds south of the border, and the figure will rise to 260,000 by next year.

Angela Constance: Will the member give way?

Liam McArthur: I do not have the time. I am sorry.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: The member is in his last minute, I am afraid.

Liam McArthur: Children are benefiting from that, as are parents, particularly women.

The Scottish Government has the opportunity to act through the Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill. It has the powers and can make the choices to deliver the resources. However, that needs political will, not constitutional change. Like Siobhan McMahon, I am not sure that women in Scotland will understand or take kindly to having their needs and those of their children held hostage while Scotland is put on pause for the referendum.

15:24

Jamie Hepburn (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP): At the outset, I will set out my reason for taking part in the debate. I am the father of a young daughter and have two young nieces, and I aspire for them to be able to grow up and live in a society in which their opportunities are not determined by their gender. I also recognise the hugely positive economic impact of women being able to participate in the workplace. It is very important that we consider how we can remove barriers to that.

I acknowledge Kezia Dugdale's personal commitment, but I disagree with the Labour amendment, not in its tenor—John Mason made that point—but in some of its inference. The first part of the amendment talks about childcare and suggests that the Scottish Government does not recognise that childcare is not the only important issue in the context of women and work. I refer Ms Dugdale and other members to the Government's motion, which talks about

"tackling all of the barriers faced by women that prevent their full participation in the labour market".

The Government has taken a range of measures to encourage women into the labour market using the powers that it has now, so let us not hear anything about Scotland being "on pause".

Kezia Dugdale: Will Jamie Hepburn take an intervention?

Jamie Hepburn: Ordinarily, I would, but I am afraid that I will not, because I do not have much time and I want to make a number of points.

In addition, the sentiment of the amendment seems to lessen the role of childcare. My wife and I have secured excellent childcare, which has enabled her to remain in work. She is hugely helped in that regard by the generous scheme of support that her employer provides, without which she might not have been able to remain in work. My experience underlines the importance of childcare to the debate.

The Equal Opportunities Committee's report on women and work has been mentioned. It highlighted the importance of childcare.

Jenny Marra: Will Jamie Hepburn take an intervention?

Jamie Hepburn: With respect, my answer is the same as it was to Ms Dugdale.

In conjunction with Save the Children, I hosted an event in the Parliament, to which many parents with young children who were struggling to secure childcare came. Many of them were young women in their late teens or early 20s who were raising a child on their own. They wanted to work or to study, but were struggling to do so. That is why the Scottish Government sees the extension of childcare as being so important. The transformative vision that is set out in the white paper—which has been denigrated by some members—is vital. It will put Scotland in a position that is akin to the situation in the Nordic countries. Let us not forget that in Denmark 79 per cent of mothers with children who are under the age of six work, whereas the UK figure is 59 per cent.

I absolutely understand the point that Siobhan McMahon made about the urgency of the issue and the fact that we need action now, but as well as thinking about the current generation of children, we must think about the future and what it holds for our grandchildren and subsequent generations.

I say to Liam McArthur that we can have all the policy-making leeway that we want, but when it is constrained by factors including the lack of leeway in the policy and budgetary assumptions of the UK Government and by the fact that, in reserved areas, we do not have control over all the resources in the country, which means that we do not have the money to pay for the policy that the Government wants to put in place under devolution, that is the perfect example of devolution being power retained.

In the 30 seconds that I have left, I want to focus on what the amendment says about the constitution not being important. The constitution is important; it is not about changing flags. It is

about three things: where power lies, who has it and what they are doing with it. All those things affect the real, lived experience of women and, indeed, men. What we see emanating from south of the border tells me—I think that it should tell every member—that we need the relevant powers to lie in our hands, rather than in the hands of the Government in London, which is damaging the prospects of women.

15:28

Margaret McCulloch (Central Scotland (Lab)): The debate provides a timely opportunity to consider the women and work agenda. I say that not just because of the topicality of childcare in last week's business, but because it has been well over a year since the women's employment summit of September 2012, which was jointly organised by the Scottish Government and the STUC.

In addition, the Scottish Government recently submitted its response to the Equal Opportunities Committee's report on women and work. While acknowledging many of the welcome comments in that response, I want also to stress that there are areas in which more could be done with the powers that Parliament already has to address unemployment and underemployment among women, and the inequalities that exist in the labour market.

On occupational segregation, the committee noted many examples of good initiatives that are being undertaken across sectors including education, industry and Government, and heard suggestions about further action that could be taken. In particular, the committee stressed the role that schools could play by bringing industry representatives into education and presenting a more accurate and holistic view of the job opportunities that are out there.

Occupational segregation is manifest in training, too; the committee expressed concern about the gender imbalance in modern apprenticeships. I welcome the commitment that has been given to an awareness-raising campaign to challenge some of the stereotypes and assumptions behind that imbalance. However, it is also important to point out that some committee members felt that the Government could have produced a stronger response.

The committee made some strong recommendations on flexible working. Although ultimately the legislation around flexible working is reserved, the Scottish Government is accountable for its own employment practices, and the wider public sector in Scotland should be accountable for its own practices, as well. The public sector should aim to be a good employer by leading by

example and by promoting flexibility for families, and public sector jobs should be subject to a presumption in favour of their being advertised as being suitable for flexible working or for being filled on a part-time basis. Crucially, flexibility in employment should not be code for a reduction in employees' rights; instead, it should mean a genuine accommodation between employers and their employees.

The committee was also clear that childcare should be viewed as an investment in an infrastructure that supports our children's futures, not just their parents' practical needs. As we know, improving maternal employment can reduce child poverty. It is not the whole picture, but it is a big part of it, so we have to create options for parents to help them to achieve a work-life balance that supports employment, brings down poverty and improves their quality of life. In some ways, the prominence of childcare in last week's debate was welcome, but we must not forget that Parliament has the power to act now, or that the extension of childcare that is provided for in the Children and Young People (Scotland) Bill was first promised well in advance of the 2007 election and is only now being considered in Parliament.

Whatever the outcome of the constitutional debate, I hope that Scotland can move to a position in which transformational childcare becomes a reality, and that we can eradicate the inequalities in the labour market that hold too many women back. We do not need independence to start us on that journey—we just need to show the will and make it happen now.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: We now move to the closing speeches. I call Mary Scanlon. Ms Scanlon, you have up to four minutes.

15:31

Mary Scanlon: I had thought that someone would speak about the interesting issue of gender equality in the Parliament. When we compare figures for the 2007 election with those from the election two years ago, we find that in 2007 25.5 per cent of SNP members were women and that, in 2011, the figure went up 0.5 per cent to 26 per cent. To Labour's credit, 50 per cent of its members were women in 2007; in 2011, the figure stayed pretty much the same at 49 per cent. As for the Conservatives—*[Interruption.]* Members can laugh if they wish, but these are the facts. Between 2007 and 2011, the figure for the Conservatives went up from 29 to 40 per cent. I think that in sitting here, lecturing the people of Scotland about the public and private sectors, modern apprenticeships and so on, the SNP should look at its own record and what it has done about gender equality.

Bob Doris (Glasgow) (SNP): Will Mary Scanlon give way?

Mary Scanlon: I apologise to Mr Doris, but I have used one minute and have only three left.

Moreover, the number of women SNP councillors fell from 26 per cent in 2007 to 21 per cent in 2012, which is not too good. The figures for Labour stayed pretty much the same, while for the Conservatives the figures rose from 12 per cent to 20 per cent. Those are the facts.

As for the 600 hours of free nursery provision a year, it is fair enough for people across Scotland to think that they will get a total of 1,200 hours of free nursery provision for their child. However, that is not the case, because it all depends on the child's birthday. Those who were born between September and December will get 200 fewer hours, while those who are born between January and the end of February and who will, as many do, start school at four and a half will get only 800 hours, or 400 fewer.

With regard to the thousands more jobs that there will be in nurseries, I point out that a member of my family works in a nursery. She is quite well qualified—she has her higher national certificate and Scottish vocational qualification—but she would actually earn more filling shelves in Tesco. There is a responsibility on each and every one of us to value the contribution that is made mainly by women in nurseries. It is all very well saying that there will be plenty more jobs, but if the same women worked in Tesco they would find the hours much easier.

I put out a call today that we should value the role of women in childcare. With meeting the requirements of the Care Inspectorate, looking after our children and doing the work that Liam McArthur mentioned with children aged between two and five, their responsibilities are far greater than they were 10, 20 or 30 years ago.

Gosh! My time is nearly up. I got carried away there. My third point is on waiting seven years for the increase. In the short time that I have left, I will say that I share Siobhan McMahon's acknowledgement of the lack of progress, and that Dennis Robertson made a great speech on opportunities for women. We need to do more in relation to the Wood commission report. I met young women and girls at Inverness College who are studying to become car mechanics and to work in construction, which is giving them a taster before they sign up to an apprenticeship.

Jayne Baxter reminded me that I went to university as a single parent because it was good for the school holidays—I could look after my children. I chose subjects that were taught between 9 and 3 o'clock.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: You must close now.

Mary Scanlon: When I graduated, I lectured at what is now the University of Abertay Dundee. For many of us, our careers are based on our childcare and family commitments.

15:36

Jenny Marra (North East Scotland) (Lab): One of the most significant points in the debate came when Jamie Hepburn described the situation in his home and said that childcare had allowed his wife to go back to work. I do not doubt that he has equal responsibility for childcare in his home, but he did not say that he would consider leaving Bob Doris and Mark McDonald a wee bit lonely on the back benches and give up work himself to take responsibility. That underlines quite—

Jamie Hepburn: I point out to Ms Marra and other members that they are not going to get rid of me that easily.

Jenny Marra: I am delighted to hear it. However, I think that that underlines something about childcare and the women and work debate. We are making a mistake if we badge childcare solely as being a women's issue. It is a family issue and, more important, it is an economic issue.

Bob Doris: I appreciate the opportunity to put on the record what I was going to say to Ms Scanlon. I have not yet been blessed with children, but I have three little nieces—Beth, Emily and Hannah. Gender equality is there for everyone, male or female, and it is important to put it on the record that, in this equality issue, we are all in it together. I want the best for my three little nieces.

Jenny Marra: I welcome Bob Doris's statement that he is behind equality—as, I think, we all are. The point that I was trying to make is that childcare, which is mentioned in the Government's motion and which we have discussed today, is an economic issue. It is about allowing people to get into the workplace and to fulfil their potential.

I would like to address a point that Christine Grahame and John Mason made; I hope that they will let me do that. Both members cast doubt on Labour's record on equality, which I think was a mistake. I would like to defend my party and talk about some of the initiatives that we have taken. When bold initiatives have been taken on women, equality and women in the workplace, the Labour Party has been in the vanguard.

John Mason: Will Jenny Marra take an intervention?

Jenny Marra: I will take Mr Mason after I have addressed this point.

If we look back, it was Barbara Castle who put through the Equal Pay Act 1970 and it was Labour that introduced maternity and paternity rights. Labour introduced the national minimum wage and campaigns hard both here and at Westminster for a living wage. It was Harriet Harman, our deputy leader, who put through the Equality Act 2010, which I believe gives the devolution settlement a lot more powers. Shona Robison is shaking her head, but I draw her attention to sections 153, 143 and 159 of the 2010 act, which I think give her the power to include gender quotas.

Shona Robison: In fact, the Equality Act 2010 does not give the UK Government powers over mandatory quotas. They are explicitly ruled out for the UK Government, for us and for everyone else.

Jenny Marra: I am sure that we will come back to that in a separate debate. That is certainly not my reading of the 2010 act.

John Mason: Will Jenny Marra give way?

Jenny Marra: I will give way in a minute.

I think that every member in the chamber would agree that those are five bold pieces of legislation. Mr Mason intoned that they would be overturned by a Tory Government, but none of those five pieces of legislation has ever been overturned in Westminster. I challenge Mr Mason to name me one bold piece of legislation that the SNP Government has over the past six years put through Parliament, and which has enhanced the role of women in work.

John Mason: The point that I hoped to make and will make is that Labour can do lots of good things at Westminster—as I said in my speech—but they can be undone by the Tories. The advantage of independence would be that good things here could not be undone by them.

Jenny Marra: I think that Mr Mason heard me cite five pieces of legislation that have not been overturned and which have made an incredible difference to women's lives and women in the workplace. He failed to answer my challenge to name one piece of legislation that the SNP has put through to improve the position of women in work.

John Wilson: Will Jenny Marra give way?

Jenny Marra: I challenge John Wilson to do the same.

John Wilson: I will give one example. The national minimum wage has been undermined by both Labour and Conservative Governments by the appointment of business leaders to the post of chair of the Low Pay Commission, which has hindered the rise of the minimum wage in the UK. The Scottish Government has introduced a living wage in the public sector where it can. That is a progressive move that the Government has made.

Jenny Marra: I doubt the veracity of a lot of Mr Wilson's intervention. We can check the *Official Report* later and perhaps come back to it.

Labour increased the national minimum wage in nine out of the 10 years after we introduced it. We are campaigning for a living wage, and we will certainly push for that in the Procurement Reform (Scotland) Bill.

My six minutes are nearly up; they have been taken up mainly by interventions.

The debate has been largely positive, and I hope that we can come back to the topic again soon.

15:42

The Minister for Commonwealth Games and Sport (Shona Robison): In the main, speeches have been helpful and insightful. I will deal with a number of points that have been made.

First, I will highlight for Jenny Marra and others some of the very positive things that the Government has done for women. They include support for the living wage, the welfare fund to mitigate the Tories' welfare reforms, and the raising of childcare hours from the 412 that we inherited to 600, which will start next year. Those are practical policies that have helped women in Scotland.

I turn to some other issues that have been raised, and will go back to a theme that Kezia Dugdale started with. I did not get a response on it that I fully understand, so I will ask again. Labour members say that they want the Scottish Government to take action now to improve the position of women in boards and companies. We are clear that we do not have those equality powers—it is very clear from legislation that we do not—and we say that we want support from across the chamber to gain them to do the things that Labour members say they want to do. However, Labour members then say, "No. We don't want those powers to come here to the Scottish Parliament; we want them to remain at Westminster." I just do not get it.

Kezia Dugdale *rose—*

Shona Robison: Can Kezia Dugdale explain?

Kezia Dugdale: There is really an issue of trust at the heart of this. We would believe the SNP's commitment to the issue a great deal more if it were to put gender equality and a commitment to gender quotas in its white paper. All that it has said that it will do is consult. [*Interruption.*]

The Deputy Presiding Officer: One at a time.

Kezia Dugdale: Read out the line.

Shona Robison: Page 106 of the white paper says:

"The Scottish Government will consult on a target for female representation on company—and public boards—and, if necessary, we will legislate as appropriate." *[Interruption.]*

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Interventions from sedentary positions are no more welcome now than they have ever been.

Shona Robison: Where is the alternative from the Labour Party? There is none. We had nothing on gender quotas in the 13 years in which it was in power in the UK—nothing was done. As far as I am aware, there is no alternative document that Labour members have that says that they are committed to gender equality. We have in the white paper a clear commitment to take forward gender equality, but the members on the Labour benches do not want us to have the necessary powers. I just do not understand why that is.

I will write to Jackie Baillie, as I wrote to Johann Lamont, asking for cross-party support, because when I go to the UK Government—as I have already, with regard to a section 30 order—to ask for those equality powers to come here because of what we want to do, my position is strengthened if I have the support of the Opposition. I do not know why Labour members would not want to support us in that. It puzzles me, and their reluctance to have the powers come to the Scottish Parliament undermines Labour's claim that it supports gender equality.

Mary Scanlon talked a lot about modern apprenticeships, and said that the spend on modern apprenticeships is different for men and women.

Jenny Marra: Will Shona Robison give way?

Shona Robison: No, I will not, thank you.

Angela Constance answered Mary Scanlon's question and said that the difference is due to the employed status of modern apprentices, which means that, in many ways, they reflect the occupational segregation in the labour market. As many members have said, the Wood commission made some good recommendations to tackle that, including the work that is being done on STEM subjects.

We have to intervene early and encourage young women to make employment choices that they are not making at the moment.

Mary Scanlon: I welcome that. Not only is 53 per cent more modern apprenticeships funding spent on men, but the apprenticeships are twice as long and the spending by the Government on partnerships between schools and colleges has fallen from £60,000 to £20,000 in the past few

years. I am asking for a commitment on that, and I support the Wood commission.

Shona Robison: That is why we need more women in higher-level apprenticeships and why we need to get girls to make their employment choices earlier. That is what the Wood commission is all about.

Kezia Dugdale: The Government always asks us to come to the chamber with positive ideas. We believe that we have put one forward on quotas for modern apprenticeships in STEM subjects. Is the Government seriously considering that? If not, will the minister at least give us a target for the number of women that the Government wants to be engineers by 2016? Give us something today, please.

Shona Robison: As I said earlier, we do not have power over quotas; that power is explicitly ruled out in legislation. However, following consideration of the Wood commission's recommendations, we will consider how we can encourage more women and girls into those careers.

Siobhan McMahon mentioned the Equal Opportunities Committee's report. As Angela Constance has already said, the Scottish Government's response agreed with all the recommendations of the report and agreed to implement them. However, I remind Siobhan McMahon about Labour's childcare record. We inherited 412 hours a year in 2007. We brought that up to 475 hours and we will deliver 600 hours from 2014. Of course, with the powers over the economic levers, we would go much further, as is outlined in the white paper.

Siobhan McMahon: The minister might have missed it, because she was having a conversation at the time, but I asked a number of questions about the awareness-raising campaign. Who will be targeted, how will they be targeted and how will the campaign's success be measured?

Shona Robison: I am sure that Angela Constance will write to Siobhan McMahon with those details, but she has obviously committed to that awareness-raising campaign.

Jayne Baxter made some interesting points, and ended on one that is pertinent, which concerned OPITO and Fife College leading on the energy skills challenge fund and, specifically, targeting women for courses that are due to start in January 2014. A lot of good initiatives are taking place; that is one that she should, rightly, be proud of in her area.

John Mason reminded us that the rhetoric of Opposition sometimes does not match the reality of what was done when that Opposition was in

Government. He made those points very well in relation to previous Westminster Governments.

I will end on childcare. This Government is very ambitious for childcare, but it is clear that in order to make the changes that we need in order that we can move towards the level of childcare provision that was set out in last week's white paper, we will require the revenues from the tax that women who are returning to work would pay as well as the reduced level of welfare payments that they might currently receive, all of which will go to Westminster under the current arrangements. Under independence, that money would stay in the Scottish economy and would be used to help to pay for the phased expansion of childcare that has been outlined. That is real ambition—it is not tinkering at the edges or shifting money around.

I presume that Labour members will tell us where they want to shift money from. Would it come from local government, for which they always want more money? Would it come from the health service, or from colleges, for which they are always calling for more money? Is that £600 million to come out of any of those budgets? It is disingenuous indeed for them to call for that £600 million to be spent when they are calling for money to be spent on all those other budget areas at the same time. The only way we can have that step change in childcare is to have powers over the economy and the powers of independence. I look forward to that happening next year.

Scotland's Census

The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):

The next item of business is a debate on motion S4M-08461, in the name of Fiona Hyslop, on Scotland's census.

15:51

The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop):

It gives me great pleasure to open the debate on the results of the 2011 census in Scotland, which was carried out by the Registrar General for Scotland. Those results tell us who we are and how we work and live in Scotland today.

The 2011 census marks 150 years since the National Records of Scotland—formerly the General Register Office for Scotland—took responsibility for organising the census in Scotland. The census was carried out at the same time as, but organised, processed and delivered independently from, the censuses in the rest of the United Kingdom.

It was this Parliament that decided which questions we should ask all the people living in Scotland. Throughout the planning, information gathering and processing, the census has been subject to external examination, not least by the UK Statistics Authority, which has designated the census results as national statistics, confirming that they are produced using robust professional standards of quality and reliability.

Detailed statistics from the census describe the characteristics of an area or community, such as how many men and women there are and their ages, ethnic group and educational level. The answers that people give help Government to develop policies and initiatives to help local authorities to plan services and to make effective use of resources that benefit the people of Scotland. They help to inform businesses and planning for a wide range of third sector and private sector bodies. Decisions are taken every day using census statistics, helping to provide services from the cradle to the grave and informing decisions on the number of places in schools, how many houses we should build and how many care homes, hospitals and fire services we need and where.

Today the census is the only survey of its kind to ask everyone in Scotland the same questions at the same time. Nothing else provides the richness and range of information that the census offers. It is widely acknowledged as playing a fundamental and unique role in the provision of comprehensive and robust population statistics, and I thank all those who have worked so hard in making the 2011 census a success.

To date there have been six releases of data from the 2011 census by the National Records of Scotland. That data covers population, household characteristics, ethnicity, identity, religion, language, health, housing, education and the labour market, and information on those topics is available from national level down to local level.

So, what does the 2011 census tell us about the people of Scotland? First, there are more people living in Scotland than ever before, and we have a population high of 5,295,403. The population is not spread evenly across the country: in the Western Isles and Highland there are only nine people per km², whereas in Glasgow there are more than 3,300 living in the equivalent space. Just two per cent of our population live on the more than 90 islands of Scotland. Providing services to remote rural communities and to those in densely populated areas presents different challenges for the Government and for policymakers. The census helps us to plan those services.

Our household structures are changing, and understanding the type of changes helps us to plan our housing and community needs for the future. More people are living in Scotland now who are from a minority ethnic group than ever before. That change in our ethnic profile is not so surprising when the census shows that 7 per cent of people in Scotland were born outside the UK. Such migration brings an increase in the number of languages that are spoken in Scotland—178 separate languages were recorded as being spoken by 10 or more people in Scotland. Even with that linguistic diversity, only 1 per cent of people in Scotland said that they were unable to speak English well and just 0.2 per cent reported that they could not speak English at all.

Although more of us come from different countries than ever before, 83 per cent of us consider ourselves Scottish. The population growth between the 2001 and 2011 censuses of almost 5 per cent was the largest increase between two censuses in 100 years. Some of that growth was due to natural increase. Between the beginning of 2002 and the end of 2011, there were 5,200 more births than deaths. It is important that academics, commentators, the media and politicians understand that having more births than deaths in a country is most significant for population direction and the dynamic of a society.

Much of the population increase, however, was due to net migration to Scotland and we are proud of the warm welcome that we give migrants to Scotland, encouraging those who want to work hard to build a life here for their families. We know that migrants enrich our culture and our communities with their traditions, skills, food and languages.

The census figures form the basis of our annual population figures and projections and the latest set of projections—published by the National Records of Scotland only last month, on 6 November—show that the population is expected to continue increasing, growing by 9 per cent over the next 25 years, with almost three quarters of that growth coming from net migration. There is always uncertainty when projecting into the future. That figure of 9 per cent is the principal projection, representing the best estimate based on current evidence. The reliability of projections decreases as we look further into the future.

Developed countries around the world face demographic pressures and Scotland is no different. The 2011 census was the first time that the number of people aged over 65 years was greater than the number aged 15 and under. The population projections that were produced on 6 November show that between 2012 and 2037—over 25 years—the number of people over state pension age is projected to increase by 27 per cent in Scotland compared with a projected increase of 31 per cent for the UK as a whole over the same time.

Scotland's dependency ratio—the number of working age people compared with the number of dependents—is growing, although our position is not as challenging as that of the rest of the UK. As a key driver of sustainable economic growth, achieving population growth—in particular among those of working age—is arguably one of the most significant tasks facing Scotland and other advanced economies.

The fact that our population is growing and ageing was underlined by last month's Institute for Fiscal Studies report. Although highly uncertain, the IFS projections show the risks of remaining part of the UK and therefore underline the urgent need for Scotland to achieve independence to tackle that legacy of low relative growth in the economy and the population.

Lewis Macdonald (North East Scotland)
(Lab): I am grateful to the minister for taking an intervention. Does the minister accept that what the Institute for Fiscal Studies says in part is that the population of Scotland is expected to age more rapidly and that the consequences of that for the Government in Scotland, were Scotland independent, would be even greater than the consequences for the UK as it currently stands?

Fiona Hyslop: The projections are for between 2012 and 2037—over 25 years. As I have just stated, the number of people over state pension age in Scotland over that period is projected to increase by 27 per cent compared with a 31 per cent increase for the UK, so the figure is greater for the UK than it is for Scotland.

The wording of the Labour amendment reflects the period in the census from 2001 to 2011—I acknowledge that—but it does not reflect the position going forward. That is why I have some issues with the amendment as it is presented.

In Scotland, the dependency ratio—the working-age population relative to the pension age and under-16 populations—is projected to be better than the ratio in the rest of the UK until the early 2030s. That fact is acknowledged on pages 145 and 146 of the referendum white paper. The Labour amendment does not recognise the change in policy that we need. Having full powers would allow us to increase our working-age population and to support families with childcare. With independence, we will be able to grow our working-age population by ensuring that young Scots have the opportunity to build a career in Scotland and by making it easier for the highly skilled people who come to study at our universities to work here.

A controlled immigration policy will be another gain. We have set out those matters on pages 267 to 274 of the white paper. There is no doubt that current United Kingdom immigration policy is heavily influenced by the priorities of the south-east of England and is based on the values of the current UK Government, which is driven by a desire to reduce the number of incoming migrants. A controlled immigration system that is based on the foundations of, and is similar to, the points and tier system but that enables us to attract highly skilled working-age people who will work and pay taxes will aid Scotland to achieve sustainable economic growth. Our immigration system will be robust and secure and will take into account Scottish values and principles of fairness and compassion.

Interestingly, the European Commission has recently confirmed:

“The vast majority of migrants go to the UK to work, and they actually contribute more to the welfare system than they take out, purely because they tend to be younger than the average population, and of working age”.

That explodes the myth that migrants drain resources. In Scotland, we want to welcome those who have so much to offer. Boosting Scotland’s population has been a priority for successive Administrations since the re-establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 1999. The results of the census allow us all to judge how well we are doing that. The large growth between the censuses is a major achievement for our country.

The census is our national stocktake. We cannot predict the future with any certainty, but the census gives us the information that we need to take decisions about Scotland today. I am proud that we have such high-quality and impartial

information available to us all. I invite members to support the motion in my name.

I move,

That the Parliament welcomes the results of the 2011 census in Scotland, which present a detailed picture of a vibrant, diverse and dynamic nation, as set out in the six publications to date covering population, households, identity, ethnicity, religion, language, marital status, qualifications and economic status.

16:02

Patricia Ferguson (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (Lab): Like the cabinet secretary, I thank all those who worked so hard and diligently to bring the 2011 census to us. It is often not an easy task, but it is important and we value it. Of course, censuses are historical methods of gleaning information—a point on which my colleague Lewis Macdonald will expand—but they remain an important tool.

I rise to move the amendment in my name and to speak in the debate as a member of a majority group—not the majority group at present in the Parliament, but certainly the majority group in demographic terms, because we learn from the census that women make up 51.5 per cent of the population of the country. The census provides us with interesting information about the population of Scotland. It does what a census should do, which is to allow us to pick out trends. Perhaps most important, it gives local and national Government, the voluntary sector, businesses and those who provide services an idea of the trends, which they can use to plan efficiently for the future.

Some intriguing facts emerge from the survey. For example, just over 1 per cent of the population speak Gaelic but, by a coincidental quirk, some 1 per cent of the population speak no or very little English at all. We learn that 86 per cent of households in Aberdeenshire have a car or van available to them whereas in Glasgow the figure drops to 49 per cent. That particular statistic can of course be partly accounted for by the rural nature of Aberdeenshire and the need for people to have their own transport, but it will in large measure be a result of the differing economic profiles of the two areas.

Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP): Will the member take a short intervention?

Patricia Ferguson: I am happy to do so, Mr Stevenson.

Stewart Stevenson: It is just to help the member. Aberdeenshire has the highest proportion of people living in a rural area of any county in mainland Scotland—the proportion is even higher than in the Highlands—so perhaps the figures are not so surprising.

Patricia Ferguson: I think that I made that point before Stewart Stevenson intervened. I said that the rural nature of Aberdeenshire was probably the cause but that the economic diversity between Aberdeenshire and Glasgow perhaps accounted for some of the difference, too. I do not think that even he would deny that.

I hope that the Government takes into account such matters when planning and—more important—funding bus and train services in constituencies such as mine, where the car ownership level is even lower than the average. A similarly stark fact is that, in the Orkney Islands, the Shetland Islands and Aberdeenshire, 3 per cent of the economically active population were unemployed, whereas that figure rose to 10 per cent in Glasgow.

We welcome very much the increase in the number of people who live in Scotland. Like the cabinet secretary and others who are here today, I have been a member of the Parliament long enough to have heard many of the debates over the years about what we need to do to increase Scotland's population, so it is good to see the work of Governments of whatever complexion beginning to bring dividends to our country. There was a time when we were almost despairing about the drop in Scotland's population. It is fortunate that the position appears no longer to be as critical as it was, but we must not take our eyes from that.

The number of one-person households—they form 35 per cent of households—bears further investigation, to establish whether they involve mainly older people whose circumstances mean that they are living alone or predominantly young people who are perhaps living outside the parental home for the first time. Such questions suggest that we need to consider carefully our priorities for house building in the private and social rented sectors, for example.

As the motion suggests, overall, the census demonstrates how diverse and dynamic Scotland is. It gives us a snapshot of Scotland.

We must pay heed to a number of the statistics that have been revealed to us. Nowhere are they more stark than in relation to our ageing population. The strapline for the census was, "Shaping our future". None of us can predict with certainty what our personal, political or constitutional future might look like, but of some things we can be certain. The number of people who are aged 80 and over has increased by 19 per cent since the previous census, in 2001. We have arrived at a situation in which our population is ageing faster than that of the UK as a whole. For the first time, more people in Scotland are aged 65 and over than are aged under 15, which must give us pause for thought.

Professor David Bell's report "Social Protection in Scotland" suggests that that trend will continue. It predicts that the number of Scots pensioners will increase by 80 per cent between 2010 and 2060. Most of that increase is to occur from 2010 to 2035. Medical advances, better nutrition than previous generations enjoyed and a greater understanding of the value of keeping healthy mean that people are living longer. Of course, we all want that trend to continue, but we must recognise that it brings challenges in how we support and care for our older citizens.

In its "Fiscal Sustainability of an Independent Scotland" report, the Institute for Fiscal Studies predicts that spending on health services, long-term care, pensions and public service pensions will grow more in Scotland than in the UK in the next 50 years.

Fiona Hyslop: Will the member give way?

Patricia Ferguson: I am happy to do so.

The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick): Patricia Ferguson is in her last 30 seconds.

Fiona Hyslop: I will let Patricia Ferguson carry on.

Patricia Ferguson: I am sorry, Presiding Officer.

The Scottish Government's fiscal commission noted that Scotland's dependency ratio will increase more rapidly than that of the UK, which reflects the particularly sharp increase in Scotland's pension-age population.

The challenge for us is to have an honest debate about how we manage the growing numbers of people who will have support needs in coming years and how we will find the money to pay for that. It is clear that we put ourselves at a distinct disadvantage if we decide to separate from the rest of the UK. The evidence suggests that, if we took control of our welfare benefits and all the issues that go with that, we would need to raise additional revenue to meet the increased costs of state pensions, not to mention the cost of setting up an entire bureaucracy to underpin a new structure.

The Presiding Officer: You need to close.

Patricia Ferguson: Sharing risk and supporting one another are a key component of the political union that is the UK. The evidence from the census strengthens that case.

I move amendment S4M-08461.1, to insert at end:

"; notes that the census demonstrates that Scotland's population is ageing faster than that of the rest of the UK, and considers that this presents major challenges to policy makers and to those delivering services in Scotland's communities."

16:10

Cameron Buchanan (Lothian) (Con): I am pleased to contribute to this debate on the results of the 2011 census, which is in fact the 23rd census.

The results of the census inform and shape the future of public policy in a number of areas. However, when one considers how the questions have changed over time and the type of information that we have collected in the past, it is clear that changes in society are as much reflected in the questions asked as they are in the answers received. Indeed, the first census of 1801 had a strong focus on identifying manpower for the navy and militia and on ensuring that there was a sufficient supply of corn to feed the populace.

Of course, these days the census is very much about planning for the future provision of our public services and public policy in general, and in that context there are some very interesting initial findings. For instance, the fact that Edinburgh has seen an 18 per cent increase in children under the age of five raises significant questions about primary places in the capital. Only a month ago, parents across the city were warned that there was little chance of their child getting a place anywhere other than their local primary. We now have confirmation that the situation is not set to improve anytime soon and indeed there could be worse in store. In that respect, the census merely backs up the trends that we already have empirical and anecdotal evidence of.

Fiona Hyslop: Does Cameron Buchanan agree that the increase in the number of under-fives is a good thing for the population? I know that it brings policy challenges, but that increase in the number of young people and families is a good thing for the city and the country.

Cameron Buchanan: Certainly I agree, but we are seeing an awful lot of school closures at the same time, and those two things do not go together. The problem is that people want their children to go to the good schools, not the bad schools—that is part of the mindset.

The census backs up the trends and, although we have a lot of young people in Edinburgh, our population is ageing. At the Local Government and Regeneration Committee we have consistently had evidence of that change and the pressures it is placing on already stretched health and social care budgets, which is the very point that Patricia Ferguson made.

I was interested to note the statistics on marital status, which, at first glance, seem quite straightforward. There has been a 5 per cent drop in those who are married and a corresponding increase of 5 per cent in those who are single. Indeed, I would encourage anyone who is single to

visit Edinburgh in my region. Edinburgh boasts a population, 45 per cent of which is single—it is behind only Glasgow and Dundee in the lonely heart stakes—so aspiring romantics should head for the capital, where they are bound to meet like-minded singletons. Whether they like them is another matter, for which I am not responsible.

However, here lies a warning. We are waiting for the publication of further Scottish Government statistics and even when we have all the evidence to hand we should be careful in extrapolating any trends or interpreting the data. For example, within the marriage statistics, the “single” label is used in a fairly strict legal sense and basically refers to anyone who has not yet married or entered a civil partnership. Anyone who identifies themselves as having a partner is included in the single category, which changes the dynamic of the statistic entirely. For the purposes of planning and general information gathering, I would suggest that it is of far greater use to know how many couples are out there, rather than how many are legally married or not. The old adage of there being lies, damned lies and statistics holds true, and we should approach the data with suitable caution.

We must also be aware of the broader limitations of the census and we should not read too much into it. Given its comprehensive nature, it gives us a valuable insight, particularly into the groups, both geographical and demographic, that are sometimes overlooked. However, that comprehensiveness of population knowledge comes at a price. The census must strike a balance between seeking information and not seeking so much that it becomes off-putting for those who fill in the forms and too costly and complex to process the results. Hence we have a strict approach to the questions that are considered and the associated tick-box answers.

Although I see no alternative to that approach, we cannot overlook the problems that it throws up. There was some controversy over the religious question in 2011, with the British Humanist Association campaigning to encourage people who were not actively religious to say so. Indeed its campaign argued that the religious question was a cultural identifier as opposed to a question about active or passive worship. That is an important point. I need hardly say that religion and people’s feelings towards it are complex. I suggest that having relatively simplistic questions on the subject means that a good deal of wriggle room is left for subjective answers. Put simply, the question may be written the same way on every census form, but it will not be read with the same uniformity.

Leading on from that point, I would contend that the very active campaign by the BHA means that it is very difficult now to point to any changes in the

figures on religious observance and talk with absolute certainty about changes in the number of those who are practising religion.

Some people may well have answered that question differently because of not a change in their behaviour but, rather, a change in their interpretation of the question. I am not questioning the trend but raising the issue whether people are identifying less and less with a religion, and drawing attention to the fact that the census form is perhaps not the medium to gather data about such a complex issue.

The Presiding Officer: We move to the open debate and speeches of four minutes.

16:15

Roderick Campbell (North East Fife) (SNP): I welcome the opportunity to speak in the debate.

Civilisations around the world have been using censuses for around 5,000 years and possibly longer. The first known ones were carried out in ancient Egypt and Greece. The practice has continued in Scotland because it provides the most detailed snapshot possible of our nation and its people. As Cameron Buchanan said, we have carried out 23 censuses.

The trends and changes that censuses reveal allow us to develop informed policy with a clear vision of what is likely to lie ahead. However, there are limits to their use and they cannot be used as a crystal ball. The Registrar General for Scotland makes projections for future population estimates based on the figures in the census. The standard of the methodology used in those figures is no doubt professional, but let us look at how population projections vary.

In 2012, the population of Scotland was estimated at 5,413,000. Just one decade earlier, in 2002, figures calculated using census statistics projected that the population in 2013 would fall to 4,970,000. Even with the most rigorous analysis, the 2002 projection turned out to be half a million people off the mark. For the future, the difference between the 2002 and 2012 projections for the population in 2027 is 814,000. The point that I am making is that although the census is the most accurate head count that we have, trends do not necessarily continue and sometimes vary dramatically.

The 2011 census was certainly innovative. It included new questions, for example on language, national identity and long-term health conditions. One of the things that the 2011 census confirmed was that our population is still an ageing one. It is worth noting, however, that Scotland's ageing population challenge is by no means unique or insurmountable. It is a challenge that faces every

country in the European Union, and more around the world, as a result of people living longer, healthier lives. In many ways, it is something to celebrate.

Indeed, University of Edinburgh research published in the *British Medical Journal* this month shows that the demographic time bomb—if I may use the expression—may not be as big a problem as many claim it to be. The researchers argue that the standard way of measuring dependency ratios is inherently flawed. In their view, the ratio of elderly dependants to working-age people is actually falling. According to the research, as the health of older people improves, the prospect of elderly people having longer working lives increases.

Therefore, while it is important that we remember not to conflate old age with dependency, the Scottish Government is right to take forward the direction set by the Christie commission through the integration of health and social care, the pursuit of preventative spend policies and an overriding focus on making services work better.

The 2011 census results for my constituency of North East Fife were similar to Scotland's as a whole, with the exception that the proportion of people aged 16 to 29 was considerably higher than the national average, at 22.4 per cent compared with 18.5 per cent across Scotland, while the proportion of those aged over 65 was slightly higher than the national average.

However, more generally, the simple fact is that Scotland's economy would grow if the proportion of economically active people increased. In practical terms, notwithstanding what I said earlier, that means increasing the number of people of working age in employment. There are many levers that could be used to make that happen. I take the view that the increase in the number of overseas-born people in the past decade is a positive and not a negative. I believe that there should be easier access for international students and graduates.

The Presiding Officer: Can you start to wind up, please?

Roderick Campbell: Okay.

In the UK, that is unlikely to happen. David Cameron implies that immigrants are a drain on public services. The UK Border Agency's reluctance to provide visas for international students in Scotland is increasingly a barrier to expanding the number of international students who come to study and work here and who, if they were allowed to come, would spend money and help us to grow our economy.

As the white paper illustrates, independence will allow Scotland to take a different approach—one that is more suited to its needs.

The Presiding Officer: I remind members that they must keep to their time limit, which is four minutes.

16:19

Hanzala Malik (Glasgow) (Lab): This is an important subject. The census data is used to inform and plan a wide variety of services such as employment, health and housing. The census is our main source of information about major changes in demographics in Scotland.

The number of people from ethnic minorities in Glasgow has grown by almost 50,000, from 41,900 in 2001 to 91,600 in 2011. As a percentage of the population, there has been growth, from 7.2 per cent in 2001 to 15.4 per cent in 2011.

I am glad to be focusing on information about the increasing diversity in Scotland in general and in Glasgow in particular, where it has been a reality for a long time. Glasgow started taking in large numbers of asylum seekers in 1999. Upon being granted refugee status, those people found work and set up homes across Scotland.

Did we really need to wait 14 years for the evidence that Scotland is becoming much more ethnically diverse? My argument is that, unfortunately, we did. There seems to be a disconnect between the changes in Scotland and the services that we provide. Whenever a community asks for support, it is required to produce evidence. The information that is available is in the census, which cannot give a good indication of emerging need and is often dismissed as being out of date as soon as the information is released.

I have several examples from Glasgow. One is that pupils in Glasgow's schools use up to 40 different languages. Schools are genuinely struggling with a lack of resources. I am sure that the Scottish Government could assist with that.

Another example is the work that I am doing with my colleagues in support of women who have been subjected to female circumcision and mutilation. I know from people working in the field that despite the fact that thousands of women from countries that practise female genital mutilation now live in Scotland, many front-line health and child protection workers do not believe that it is an issue in Scotland. I do not understand that.

The census data shows that we have a lot more ethnic minorities living in Scotland now than we did 10 years ago, although that does not automatically make Scotland a diverse and vibrant place. Effective policy making and on-going

monitoring of changes need to be coupled with evidence-based policy making.

I call on the Scottish Government once again to use the census data to ensure that all people within our communities receive equal opportunities in employment and service provision, which currently is not the case.

I hold John Swinney to the commitment that he made on 9 October 2013 to take action on the underemployment shown in the 2011 census.

16:23

Marco Biagi (Edinburgh Central) (SNP): Statisticians and demographers see the census as quite a rare gold standard. I suppose we could say that it is a bit like the world cup: it only comes around every few years and it is the highlight of the period.

Unlike all the other surveys, the census is the best at showing exactly how Scotland is, rather than how it is estimated to be. That really matters, because the publications that are based on the census include the annual survey of hours and earnings, the Scottish health survey and the social attitudes survey, which all really influence Government policy and resources.

I want to make a few observations about the census based on what I have seen from the data, which might be relevant to some decisions. The relevant ministerial responsibilities are sport, equality, housing and welfare and parliamentary business, so perhaps I will simply be putting points on the record.

Given that I am a constituency member, my eyes first turned to the data from my constituency of Edinburgh Central, where I learned that the median age of 29 for women and 30 for men meant that it was second only to Glasgow Kelvin in youth. That sounds appealing, but imagine how I felt when I realised that, compared with my constituents, I am now officially middle aged. What that means for Sandra White I will leave for another day.

Members: Oh!

Marco Biagi: I take that back. [*Interruption.*] I can more than imagine how she feels, Presiding Officer. I heard your comment.

Like 50 per cent of my constituents, I do not have a car, and like 53 per cent of them, I have a degree. I am single and unmarried, and in that respect I am like 63.3 per cent of my constituents.

In light of our debate a fortnight ago, I note that Edinburgh Central does not win the accolade of being the gayest constituency in Scotland—that goes to Malcolm Chisholm's Edinburgh Northern and Leith constituency, with 427 civil partnerships

in comparison with 286 in Edinburgh Central. However, more worrying is that, after Glasgow Kelvin's third place with a score of 249, the number drops away sharply. I would like to think that our inner cities are magnets for same-sex couples for the same reason that they act as magnets for all types of residents, but I suspect that other factors may be at play outwith our cities.

The census also confirmed the experience of community councils and the concerns of tenants groups that the size of the private rented sector has exploded. Now 39 per cent of all Edinburgh Central households are in private rented housing—almost a doubling in the past decade. In the City Centre ward, which is home to Georgian townhouses, 45 per cent of households pay rent to a private landlord every month for the roof over their head. That changes services and neighbourhoods, and it creates new regulatory challenges for local authorities. Perhaps local authorities will experience difficulties in filling primary schools but, at the same time, they will need more and more staff and resources to enforce landlord registration.

One thing that worries me is the health of our democracy. Edinburgh Central's total population is 84,000. The population over 18 is 75,440, which is the highest in the country. However, I know from looking at the electoral register that only 55,300 people are registered to vote. Where are those missing 20,000? Some will be students, but in no other constituency are there more residents than people registered on the electoral roll. Only about 15 per cent of residents were born outside the European Union, and many of them will be naturalised or Commonwealth citizens.

I note in passing that, under the procedures set out in the 14th amendment, the United States allocates members of the legislature to states based on their population rather than electoral registration. Edinburgh is cosmopolitan, but also transient. We must be aware of that and take action to resolve the situation.

I offer my most fulsome apologies to my colleague from Glasgow Kelvin.

The Presiding Officer: I should think so, because I am going to tell her.

16:27

Christian Allard (North East Scotland) (SNP): I, too, welcome the results of the census, particularly with regard to the new question about identity. I have a lot to say about that, but I will also talk about migration, citizenship and freedom, which are interests of mine.

First, 83 per cent of respondents indicated that they felt Scottish. That is important because that is

all about who we are as Scottish people living here in Scotland. I feel that way. If I was asked in the census how I felt—and I was asked that question—I would tick the “Scottish” box. That is because I feel Scottish—and not only do I feel Scottish, but I was made welcome in this country very quickly as somebody who is Scottish. No one, whether they are a member in this Parliament or anybody else, would be justified in asking me why I should not feel Scottish. That is very important.

The question shows how Scotland is leading Europe and the world. There is an idea here that people can hold multiple identities while still keeping a very strong Scottish identity. Unfortunately, so far, that does not reflect what they have in their pocket. In my pocket I have an identity card that says that I am French. However, we do not have a Scottish identity card. It is quite strange for a nation that feels so proudly Scottish—as I do—not to have the paperwork for that identity. Is that important? Is it important to have that paperwork? I see Cameron Buchanan shaking his head. I agree—it is not that important. It is like the shirts that people wear. Marco Biagi mentioned football, and although I do not have a lot of time just now to watch international football in my local pub, when I do so, I have no problem wearing a Scottish shirt, a French shirt or even—because my mother happens to be Portuguese—a Portuguese shirt.

Cameron Buchanan: How can the member say he is Scottish with that Maurice Chevalier accent?

Christian Allard: I thank the member.

I just mentioned my mother being Portuguese. Portugal is like Scotland; it is the same kind of country with the same population and a shared history of migration. A lot of people have migrated out of this country and people are still doing so today. We are talking today for the first time about a modern Scotland retaining its youth, which is very different from what happened in the past. A modern Scotland will attract people from across the world because it is seen as the land of opportunity, and that is reflected in the census.

I was delighted to see that Dundee and Aberdeen are becoming more multicultural and diverse. This afternoon, pupils from Albyn School in Aberdeen came to see us, and one of the children who asked a question came from France. I was astonished at that.

I would also like to talk about population growth. The way to grow our population is not only through inward migration or by asking people not to migrate away from Scotland.

The Presiding Officer: You need to bring your remarks to a close, Mr Allard.

Christian Allard: I will close straight away, Presiding Officer.

There is a great possibility for a baby boom. We could have more and more children. There is a 5 per cent increase in the number of under-fives and we could do a lot more in the years to come. I am already waiting for the next census to come out.

16:31

Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab): It is a great pleasure to follow Christian Allard because, in welcoming the general increase in Scotland's population over the 10-year period, I also welcome the increase in the ethnic minority population from 2 to 4 per cent, which is a significant reason, but not the only one, for the general increase. As the cabinet secretary reminded us, that increase came about partly because of the encouragement that was given to inward migration by successive Administrations in Scotland.

One of the most interesting, but not so well-known, facts in the census relates to the number of single-person households. At 35 per cent, single persons now make up the largest percentage of households, whereas 50 years ago, they made up, at 14 per cent, the lowest percentage of households. That is a really significant social change that is not often commented on, and it has significant implications for housing and lots of other issues.

The better-known figure is that the number of people who are aged 80 and over increased by 19 per cent in that 10-year period. That issue is much discussed, along with the implications for health and many other policies. However, the situation should not be overstated because the ideal is healthy ageing. Having said that, I think that it presents a significant challenge and, as we have been reminded today, it has become part of the constitutional debate. I do not really want to go into that in too much detail but it is worth quoting—or re quoting, because I think that Patricia Ferguson mentioned this—what the Scottish Government's fiscal commission said, which is that Scotland's dependency ratio will increase more rapidly than that of the UK. The issue is quite simply the dependency ratio, so when we are having debates about that, that is what we should concentrate on, rather than the absolute number of pensioners, which the cabinet secretary highlighted in comparing Scotland with the UK.

That is really good news about older people, and it is based on lots of reasons, including advances in health. Of course, older people are not the only ones who are living longer. For example, in Edinburgh, the total number of people with learning disabilities who are known to the

council increased by an average 5 per cent per year between 2006 and 2012, and the number of children and adults with physical disabilities has also increased. People are now living longer than they would have done in the past. Of course that is good news, but it has implications for services.

The most striking feature of the census was the increase in the number of children aged under five. For Scotland as a whole, the increase was 6 per cent, but for Edinburgh it was 18 per cent. From my local constituency point of view, that was the single most salient fact in the census. Cameron Buchanan alluded to that point, with particular reference to schools.

The City of Edinburgh Council has projected a 20 per cent increase in many of the city's school rolls until 2019. Many of the spaces that are available in schools are not in the catchment area where there is current demand. That is manifesting itself in my constituency, because seven primary schools either have or will have within the next 12 months extra classrooms in their playgrounds. I welcome the population increase, as did the cabinet secretary, but I have to say that there must have been some deficiencies with the previous administration of the City of Edinburgh Council. I do not want to be too party political about it, but that administration must have known five years ago what the population increase was going to be, yet it still closed schools. We must learn lessons from that.

The other issue that is emerging relates to the number of general practitioner practices, some of which are closing their lists, which affects both young and old people. We must also use the census information to plan services effectively. For example, in 2001 one of the problems with the original costings for free personal care was that people did not have the benefit of the 2001 census, and that is the main reason why the figures were not totally accurate. Let us use the information that we have to plan services effectively.

16:35

Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP): The Labour amendment states that

“the census demonstrates that Scotland's population is ageing faster than that of the rest of the UK”.

Numbers are funny things. Table 4 in the registrar general's report shows that in 2012 we had 59 people per 100 in dependency, that in 2017 the number will drop to 58 and that in 2022 it will drop to 57. Rod Campbell was right to point to the difficulties with the way in which we calculate the figure, because the way in which it is calculated means that I am considered to be in dependency, as is my good friend Gil Paterson. It is done simply

by age, not by whether we are still working and in employment. That is equally true for the rest of the UK—I am not saying that Scotland is any different—and it shows that we need to be careful about the numbers.

Two members have claimed that there have been 23 censuses in Scotland, but I think that there have been 21, because there have been 22 periods of 10 years since 1801 and there was no census in 1941. That is, unless we count the Dál Riata census of approximately 670 AD, which was conducted in part of Scotland by the Irish. In England, of course, the first census was the Domesday book of 1086. However, in modern times, there have probably been 21 censuses in Scotland.

I felt so uncomfortable with what Patricia Ferguson said about cars that I popped out to get the up-to-date numbers. I can tell the chamber that the number of cars per household is substantially lower in London than in Glasgow. The reason for that is not economic; it is that London has a first-class public transport system. Someone who lives in London would probably not want to own a car, and I suspect that I would not, either. The figure for Beijing is higher than that for any city in Scotland, and it is higher than the figure for London. We need to be careful with numbers.

The interesting thing for me is that the figures in table 6 in the registrar general's report show that I am in a cohort of 137,000 people. In 10 years' time, should I be spared, I will be in a cohort of 104,000, and five years later I will be in a cohort of 82,000.

As part of my preparation for the debate, I went on to the ScotlandsPeople website and ended up very puzzled. According to the website, in 2012 there were 133,322 registrations, which is so far adrift from the numbers in the report that I had to find out why. To my immense bafflement—I have not yet worked out why this should be the case—a number of births appear multiple times in the registrations. I even found someone in the city of Edinburgh—because they are still living, I will not make specific reference to them—who has been registered three times with three different names. There are quite a lot of examples of that, so we need to be careful. One of my wife's relatives appears twice in the census because they were counted both at home and while they were away somewhere else.

In my constituency, at least 19 languages are used in the local school in Peterhead. My nephews and nieces are in eight countries around the world. Presiding Officer, migration is an essential part of the modern world and censuses help to measure what is going on.

16:39

Cameron Buchanan: It has been a valuable debate, in which even Fiona Hyslop managed to find some favourable points from the report by the Institute for Fiscal Studies, which impressed me greatly.

I talked about the fact that there are lies, damned lies and statistics, which was borne out by the dependent Mr Stevenson. I do not know whether there have been 23 censuses in total, but it is certainly the case that there have been 23 modern censuses. I cannot count the Domesday book as one.

Two point seven per cent of people identified themselves as "White: Polish", which is more than double the national average; heaven knows how many French people there were. The good news is that we are attracting economic migrants but, as many members have said, we must ensure that we are planning to provide extra resources, particularly in education, to ensure that our public services can respond to demographic change.

The debate has produced a number of interpretations of the statistics and a variety of comment on the picture of Scotland that it paints. I discussed some of the shortcomings that I found with the census, but the debate has highlighted one other fundamental flaw with the questionnaire. It tells us who is answering, when they travel, where they work, what they work as, what they believe and a multitude of other things, but it cannot tell us why. That is for us to interpret, extrapolate and guess at.

I am thinking, in particular, of the transport infrastructure debate, in which I called for a joined-up strategy to ensure that people can get where they want, how they want and when they want. When we have a questionnaire that tells us that someone generally travels to work by car, the great unknown for us as policy makers is the reason or reasons why they have overlooked public transport. That is the sort of information that is invaluable in the design of public services.

The other issue that flows from that and from the debate in general is what the future holds for the census. There has been some discussion about possible alternatives, including an e-census or an administrative census. Although a number of members have identified some of the failings of the existing system, I hope that we do not throw out the baby with the bath water with a change that is too dramatic.

The invaluable aspect of the present census is its comprehensive coverage and the fact that, for the past 50 or 60 years, the same questions—more or less—have been asked. I would have to be persuaded that any administrative alternative would achieve the same result and that there

would not be groups that would be missed out. It is clear that the potential of an e-census is worth exploring further, because increasing difficulties are already being experienced in engaging with certain groups, such as young men. Anything that makes the census more accessible and easy to fill in must be looked at. We must consider all the options that are available to us and what will deliver the most comprehensive and useful data for policy makers.

In the meantime, I am content to welcome the census and the results that it throws up and, for that reason, I will support the Government motion and Patricia Ferguson's amendment.

16:42

Lewis Macdonald (North East Scotland) (Lab): The cabinet secretary and Patricia Ferguson rightly paid tribute to the people who conducted the 2011 census, but it is important that we do not take their professionalism or the impartiality of a national census for granted.

When Mary and Joseph were required to travel to Bethlehem, the census was designed to enable a poll tax to be collected. That poll tax was as unpopular as the later version in the 1980s. When medieval Scottish and English kings surveyed their kingdoms in the *Senchus fer n-Alban* and the Domesday book, they, too, had taxation in mind. When the first version of the current census was brought forward in December 2009, it included detailed questions about household incomes and, to many, it looked and felt like the poll tax revisited.

That was one of the reasons why I and other members of the Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee resisted the draft order in question and spent some weeks seeking to achieve some important changes to the questions that would be asked. The then minister, Jim Mather, eventually accepted that questions about income could not be included without putting at risk the consent of the wider public.

The draft order also posed a false choice between Scottish and British, which is a choice that many people do not wish to make. Again, the minister came to agree that a less stark choice made more sense. We debated a number of other issues. For example, we agreed that Africans should be able to identify themselves as African rather than as black, and we dropped the original proposal that the census should count pagans but not Episcopalians.

The point of that process was to achieve a consensus on the census. Such a powerful tool of Government must be subject to effective parliamentary scrutiny, and the questions that are asked or not asked are a matter of legitimate

political debate. I am glad that we got there and that we can debate the results of the census in the knowledge that we all agreed that the right questions would be asked in the first place.

We on the Labour side have raised the issue of Scotland's demographic balance and the challenge posed by a population that is ageing faster than that of the UK as a whole. Of course, as has been said, an ageing population is not an insoluble problem but it poses a challenge to future Governments of whatever party. The census confirms that Scotland's current over-65 population is 1 per cent greater than that of England and the IFS has pointed out that over the next half century the Scottish people's median age will increase by six years as opposed to a UK average of only four years.

Fiona Hyslop: Does the member accept the figures produced on 6 November that show that between 2012 and 2037 the number of people of state pension age and older will increase by 27 per cent in Scotland but by 31 per cent in the UK?

Lewis Macdonald: A very important point is that those figures are starting from a higher base. My point is that, between now and 2062, the median age will increase by more in Scotland than it will in the whole of the UK.

As the cabinet secretary pointed out, the Labour-led devolved Governments in the first and second terms of devolution saw immigration as part of the answer to helping to change the demographic balance and increase the proportion of taxpayers to pensioners in the future population. Clearly, Scottish National Party ministers hold the same view. I guess that the difference between the approach pioneered by Jack McConnell and that now promoted by Alex Salmond lies in our view that increased immigration is best achieved in partnership within the UK while the SNP proposes to increase immigration by leaving the UK. That difference matters because we and our neighbours in England and Wales occupy the same island, share many of the demographic features that have been highlighted today and have had the same systems for managing migration within a single UK market for the past 300 years.

When ministers argue that Scotland needs immigration in a way that England does not, they seem to overlook one vital part of the picture. Operating within a single immigration system under the same rules and on the same island, Scotland in recent years has achieved only half the level of net migration achieved by England next door. That is why Jack McConnell persuaded the then UK Labour Government that Scotland needed a stronger system of incentives for overseas students to stay after graduation and

why Labour introduced the fresh talent initiative in Scotland in the context of UK immigration policy.

When, last week, Alex Salmond published his “Scotland’s Future” white paper, he suggested that a UK Tory Government was holding back more migration into Scotland because it did not suit south-east England’s needs as opposed to the needs of the rest of the UK. Indeed, the cabinet secretary made a similar point this afternoon. However, the truth is that, for all its faults, the UK immigration system is not the reason why fewer people have chosen to migrate to Scotland than to England. It is about the choices that people have made and, above all, the opportunities that have been open to them.

Christian Allard: What does the member think about the van that the Westminster Government used to tell people who were not born in this country that they should go home?

Lewis Macdonald: That is not the point. The point is that in Aberdeen, a city that the member knows well, 16 per cent of the population were born outwith the UK, and they are here because of the many opportunities to train and work in the energy industry. Although that figure is comparable with English cities of similar size, it is double the average for Scotland as a whole.

Fresh talent can be attracted to Scotland, even in the context of an increasingly restrictive UK immigration policy over the last three years, but what we cannot have is a Scottish immigration policy that is different to and separate from that in the rest of this island—unless we want border posts between Scotland and England to control the movement of people who are legal migrants—*[Interruption.]*

The Presiding Officer: Can the member bring his remarks to a close?

Lewis Macdonald: It is a straightforward point. If there are people who are legal migrants in one part of this island but illegal migrants in another, it is inevitable that controls on movement within the island will be required.

Members: Nonsense!

Lewis Macdonald: I hear members saying “Nonsense” but I would like them to answer that point rather than simply shouting abuse.

Kevin Stewart (Aberdeen Central) (SNP): Will the member give way?

The Presiding Officer: The member is winding up now.

Lewis Macdonald: I am sure that the cabinet secretary will have the opportunity to respond to the point.

I understand the Government’s need to argue that everything will be better in the event of independence. However, after next September, when I believe that most Scots will vote to remain in the UK, I hope that we will return to the question of how we attract fresh talent to Scotland in the context of UK immigration policy and that we look to develop further the sort of policy that brought so much benefit to Scotland’s demographic balance in the 10 years before the latest census was carried out.

16:49

Fiona Hyslop: In closing today’s debate, I thank parliamentary colleagues for an interesting discussion on what might, at first glance, have seemed to be dull and dry facts and figures. The richness of the debate and members’ interest in the statistics—not least in relation to their constituencies—has brought life to the subject.

I say to Lewis Macdonald that independent Ireland—which was his example—has its own immigration and migration policy and is within the common travel area.

Lewis Macdonald: Will the cabinet secretary give way?

Fiona Hyslop: I ask Lewis Macdonald to let me develop my points; I am about to agree with him on one point. It was appropriate that he relayed the history of the census and the scrutiny that it has been given in Parliament, and Rod Campbell mentioned how innovative it is.

I pay tribute to Kenny Gibson. I am not sure whether he is in the chamber, but he was one of the first members to identify in the chamber in the first session of Parliament the issue of population and the challenges that lie ahead.

I was supportive—as we all were—of the measures that were taken with the fresh talent initiative. Unfortunately, however, the current UK Government has taken away that tool, which is one reason why we believe that we need the powers to make such decisions. We certainly welcomed the initiative at the time.

As the debate has showed, the census figures tell us about Scotland in all its shapes, sizes and guises, and they are important in relation to the policy challenges that lie ahead of us. Hanzala Malik talked about underemployment among ethnic minorities in Glasgow. Malcolm Chisholm, in reflecting on his constituency, also set out some challenges.

The information that the National Records of Scotland has released to date focuses on population and household numbers, aspects of identity and economic factors. There is more to come; the next release of information from the

census on 18 December will provide insights into family structures. The answer to Cameron Buchanan's question about how many people are married and how many are cohabiting will be in that release, as will information on living arrangements, which covers household composition and dependent children. In addition, the release will include information on the number of rooms and overcrowding.

I say to Patricia Ferguson that we will learn about methods of transport that are used to get to work and study. That information will be important in setting out future transport policy, as she identified in relation to her constituency, and in planning transport infrastructure.

All the information is freely available on the Scotland's census website, together with a range of tools that help to bring the data to life.

At the start of the debate, I mentioned the long history of the census in Scotland; it is one of the longest-running continuous data collections in the country, but what is the future of the census and will we have one in 2021? The 2011 census is successfully providing high-quality statistics that will be used for the next decade. As we have heard today, changes in society have resulted in an increasingly mobile population—Marco Biagi mentioned that—and people regularly move to other areas and countries. That, together with increasing complexity in social structures and a desire for results to be produced more quickly and frequently, presents challenges for the traditional census.

At the same time, improvements in technology and the Government's commitment to a digital future for Scotland mean that we need to look again at how we can best collect and provide information in the future.

Many members will be aware that the UK Office for National Statistics is consulting on the issue. Two main options are proposed; namely, an online census and a census that is based on administrative data and surveys. We are also considering the best way forward for Scotland. However we decide to collect such information in 2021 and beyond, we will ensure that it continues to meet the needs of all users and that it is of high quality. Parliament's views and wishes will, of course, be a key part of our deliberations to determine what we will do in the future.

In discussing the opportunities and challenges of an ageing population, Rod Campbell made the important comment that we should not equate old age with dependency, and Malcolm Chisholm also brought something important to the debate in discussing healthy ageing. There is a great deal to be welcomed in the opportunities that a healthy older population can provide; we should remember

that when we are thinking about and developing policies in the area.

I repeat the point that Labour's amendment reflects the period 2001 to 2011, but does not reflect the projections that were released on 6 November, which show that in the 25 years from 2012 to 2037 the number of people of state-pension age and above will increase by 27 per cent in Scotland but by a bigger percentage—31 per cent—in the rest of the UK. That provides challenges for Scotland and the rest of the UK. How we deal with those challenges and what we can do to tackle them will make a difference.

Overall, the dependency ratio in Scotland will be relatively better than that in the rest of the UK until the early 2030s. We know now, of course, that expenditure on social protection in 2011-12 was 14.4 per cent of gross domestic product in Scotland, and that it was 15.9 per cent in the UK. Scotland is therefore in a strong position in sustaining support for social protection.

We have talked about ageing, the challenges that all western demographics face, and how we might deal with them, but the younger population has also been a key part of the debate. It is significant that under-fives have increased by 6 per cent. Again, that natural increase is a strong steer for the economy and the population. It is interesting that, in my area—West Lothian—19 per cent of the population are under 15. That is a strong position, but it also provides challenges in terms of services. The average under-15 population is 16 per cent.

Patricia Ferguson: The points that the cabinet secretary has made latterly have thrown up the challenges that come from the census. I do not want to be in any way provocative; I simply want to ask the cabinet secretary a question. What action is the Scottish Government taking to review the findings of the census and react to them? More than a white paper will be needed to deal with those matters.

Fiona Hyslop: "Scotland's Future: Your Guide to an Independent Scotland", is a very good guide to some of the challenges and some of the opportunities and decisions that we can take. This debate has been an opportunity for members to reflect on the content of the census and to identify some of the challenges. We talked earlier about the challenges of schooling in Edinburgh in particular, with the growing younger population in the city. Those challenges are absolute. The challenges are not just in transport; they relate to health, younger people, universities and a wide range of other things. We need the valuable statistics from the census.

Marco Biagi provided a good description of the census. He described it as the "gold standard" and

the statistical equivalent of the world cup.
[*Interruption.*]

The Presiding Officer: One moment, cabinet secretary.

Will members who are coming into the chamber please do so quietly and allow those of us who have been sitting here for most of the debate to hear Ms Hyslop winding up?

Fiona Hyslop: The census is robust and credible and can provide us with a guide for health and transport, the challenges for education, and the challenges of an ageing population, which we have also reflected on, for this country and the rest of Europe.

On how we can tackle those challenges, we have opportunities—the biggest of which is in growing our working-age population to ensure that we have the people who can provide the engine for economic growth in Scotland.

A great number of people worked long and hard on the census, so it is important that we record our thanks to them for their work in providing it.

The statistician John Rickman, who was a 19th century champion of the census, stated:

“the intimate knowledge of any country must form the rational basis of legislation and diplomacy”.

Our Parliament can make informed decisions only if we properly understand who we are, how we work and how we live in Scotland today. The census results provide us with that understanding.

I thank all those who delivered the census for us. The best that we can do with it is to use it to make informed and wise decisions and, as Patricia Ferguson said, to reflect on what it tells us and build our evidence-based policies around that.

Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Bill: Financial Resolution

16:59

The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick): The next item of business is consideration of motion S4M-08027, in the name of John Swinney, on the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Bill financial resolution.

Motion moved,

That the Parliament, for the purposes of any Act of the Scottish Parliament resulting from the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Bill, agrees to any expenditure of a kind referred to in paragraph 3(b) of Rule 9.12 of the Parliament's Standing Orders arising in consequence of the Act.—[*John Swinney.*]

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

Decision Time

17:00

The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick): There are five questions to be put as a result of today's business. The first question is, that motion S4M-08462.1, in the name of Kezia Dugdale, which seeks to amend motion S4M-08462, in the name of Angela Constance, on women and work, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Baker, Richard (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Baxter, Jayne (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brown, Gavin (Lothian) (Con)
 Buchanan, Cameron (Lothian) (Con)
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Ferguson, Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (Lab)
 Fergusson, Alex (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Goldie, Annabel (West Scotland) (Con)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (Lab)
 Hilton, Cara (Dunfermline) (Lab)
 Hume, Jim (South Scotland) (LD)
 Johnstone, Alex (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kelly, James (Rutherglen) (Lab)
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Macintosh, Ken (Eastwood) (Lab)
 Malik, Hanzala (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Provan) (Lab)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McCulloch, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 McDougall, Margaret (West Scotland) (Lab)
 McGrigor, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 McInnes, Alison (North East Scotland) (LD)
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)
 Milne, Nanette (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mitchell, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Murray, Elaine (Dumfriesshire) (Lab)
 Pearson, Graeme (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Pentland, John (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Central Scotland) (SNP)
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Allard, Christian (North East Scotland) (SNP)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Biagi, Marco (Edinburgh Central) (SNP)
 Brodie, Chic (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burgess, Margaret (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Campbell, Roderick (North East Fife) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Don, Nigel (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Eadie, Jim (Edinburgh Southern) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gibson, Rob (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Ingram, Adam (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Keir, Colin (Edinburgh Western) (SNP)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robertson, Dennis (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Salmond, Alex (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)

Abstentions

Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 51, Against 59, Abstentions 2.

Amendment disagreed to.

The Presiding Officer: The next question is, that motion S4M-08462, in the name of Angela Constance, on women and work, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Central Scotland) (SNP)
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Allard, Christian (North East Scotland) (SNP)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Biagi, Marco (Edinburgh Central) (SNP)
 Brodie, Chic (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burgess, Margaret (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Campbell, Roderick (North East Fife) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Don, Nigel (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Eadie, Jim (Edinburgh Southern) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gibson, Rob (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Ingram, Adam (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Keir, Colin (Edinburgh Western) (SNP)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robertson, Dennis (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Salmond, Alex (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)

White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)

Against

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Baker, Richard (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Baxter, Jayne (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brown, Gavin (Lothian) (Con)
 Buchanan, Cameron (Lothian) (Con)
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Ferguson, Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (Lab)
 Fergusson, Alex (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Goldie, Annabel (West Scotland) (Con)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (Lab)
 Hilton, Cara (Dunfermline) (Lab)
 Hume, Jim (South Scotland) (LD)
 Johnstone, Alex (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kelly, James (Rutherglen) (Lab)
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Macintosh, Ken (Eastwood) (Lab)
 Malik, Hanzala (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Provan) (Lab)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McCulloch, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 McDougall, Margaret (West Scotland) (Lab)
 McGrigor, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 McInnes, Alison (North East Scotland) (LD)
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)
 Milne, Nanette (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mitchell, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Murray, Elaine (Dumfriesshire) (Lab)
 Pearson, Graeme (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Pentland, John (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 61, Against 51, Abstentions 0.

Motion agreed to,

That the Parliament recognises the significant contribution that women make to Scotland's economy; agrees that there is a potential economic impact from enabling more women into the labour market and that implementing the Scottish Government's commitment to a universal childcare system as outlined in *Scotland's Future, Your Guide to an Independent Scotland*, would significantly help raise women's participation; recognises the commitment of the Scottish Government now and in an independent Scotland to increasing women's representation in public and corporate life; further notes that the Scottish Government remains committed to

tackling all of the barriers faced by women that prevent their full participation in the labour market; notes the progress made since the Women's Employment Summit, which was held on 12 September 2012, and recognises the contribution of the STUC and other partners to that progress.

The Presiding Officer: The next question is, that amendment S4M-08461.1, in the name of Patricia Ferguson, which seeks to amend motion S4M-08461, in the name of Fiona Hyslop, on Scotland's census, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Baker, Richard (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Baxter, Jayne (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brown, Gavin (Lothian) (Con)
 Buchanan, Cameron (Lothian) (Con)
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Ferguson, Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (Lab)
 Fergusson, Alex (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Goldie, Annabel (West Scotland) (Con)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (Lab)
 Hilton, Cara (Dunfermline) (Lab)
 Hume, Jim (South Scotland) (LD)
 Johnstone, Alex (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Rutherglen) (Lab)
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Macintosh, Ken (Eastwood) (Lab)
 Malik, Hanzala (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Provan) (Lab)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McCulloch, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 McDougall, Margaret (West Scotland) (Lab)
 McGrigor, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 McInnes, Alison (North East Scotland) (LD)
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)
 Milne, Nanette (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mitchell, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Murray, Elaine (Dumfriesshire) (Lab)
 Pearson, Graeme (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Pentland, John (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Central Scotland) (SNP)
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Allard, Christian (North East Scotland) (SNP)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Biagi, Marco (Edinburgh Central) (SNP)
 Brodie, Chic (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burgess, Margaret (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Campbell, Roderick (North East Fife) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Don, Nigel (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Eadie, Jim (Edinburgh Southern) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gibson, Rob (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Ingram, Adam (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Keir, Colin (Edinburgh Western) (SNP)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robertson, Dennis (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Salmond, Alex (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 53, Against 59, Abstentions 0.

Amendment disagreed to.

The Presiding Officer: The next question is, that motion S4M-08461, in the name of Fiona

Hyslop, on Scotland's census, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Central Scotland) (SNP)
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Allard, Christian (North East Scotland) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Baker, Richard (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Baxter, Jayne (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Biagi, Marco (Edinburgh Central) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)
 Brodie, Chic (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Brown, Gavin (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Buchanan, Cameron (Lothian) (Con)
 Burgess, Margaret (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Campbell, Roderick (North East Fife) (SNP)
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Don, Nigel (Angus North and Mearns) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)
 Eadie, Jim (Edinburgh Southern) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Ferguson, Patricia (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (Lab)
 Fergusson, Alex (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gibson, Rob (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Goldie, Annabel (West Scotland) (Con)
 Grahame, Christine (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (Lab)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hilton, Cara (Dunfermline) (Lab)
 Hume, Jim (South Scotland) (LD)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Ingram, Adam (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Johnstone, Alex (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Keir, Colin (Edinburgh Western) (SNP)
 Kelly, James (Rutherglen) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)

Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Macintosh, Ken (Eastwood) (Lab)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Malik, Hanzala (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Paul (Glasgow Provan) (Lab)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McCulloch, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
 McDougall, Margaret (West Scotland) (Lab)
 McGrigor, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 McInnes, Alison (North East Scotland) (LD)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)
 Milne, Nanette (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Mitchell, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Murray, Elaine (Dumfriesshire) (Lab)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Pearson, Graeme (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Pentland, John (Motherwell and Wishaw) (Lab)
 Robertson, Dennis (Aberdeenshire West) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Salmond, Alex (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
 Scott, Tavish (Shetland Islands) (LD)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
 Torrance, David (Kirkcaldy) (SNP)
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)
 Watt, Maureen (Aberdeen South and North Kincardine) (SNP)
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 112, Against 0, Abstentions 0.

Motion agreed to,

That the Parliament welcomes the results of the 2011 census in Scotland, which present a detailed picture of a vibrant, diverse and dynamic nation, as set out in the six publications to date covering population, households, identity, ethnicity, religion, language, marital status, qualifications and economic status.

The Presiding Officer: I ask the members who caused the vote by saying no to reflect in the future before speaking.

The next question is that motion S4M-08027, in the name of John Swinney, on the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Bill financial resolution, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to,

That the Parliament, for the purposes of any Act of the Scottish Parliament resulting from the Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Bill, agrees to any expenditure of a kind referred to in paragraph 3(b) of Rule 9.12 of the Parliament's Standing Orders arising in consequence of the Act.

Local Development Trusts and Community Initiatives

The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):

The final item of business is a members' business debate on motion S4M-07776, in the name of Christine Grahame, in praise of local development trusts and other community initiatives. The debate will be concluded without any question being put.

Motion debated,

That the Parliament recognises the significance and professionalism of the many local development trusts and community initiatives across Midlothian and the Borders and Scotland at large, the many individuals who give up their time, skill and energy to improving their communities such as Auchendinny, Gorebridge, Lamancha and Newlands, community hubs, Penicuik, Silverburn and Eddleston with projects such as The Lost Garden of Penicuik, Silverburn Community Garden and Hall, The Great Polish Map of Scotland at Eddleston and many more community initiatives; considers that these are solid testimony to their efforts, and notes their encouragement for other communities to dip their toes in trust waters.

17:05

Christine Grahame (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP): I thank the Presiding Officer for his forbearance, as it is the second time today that he has had to listen to me.

I thank all those who signed the motion that allowed the debate to take place, and I welcome to the public gallery representatives of various trusts and community initiatives from across my constituency. I remind them—not that they need reminding—of the reception afterwards, to which the Minister for Local Government and Planning has said, lest he forget, that he will come, albeit briefly.

The minister also pledged in an answer to me last week in this very spot that he would set up an information website to assist communities to establish community trusts and to access funding. There will be a questionnaire at the reception for representatives to fill in to inform the website's structure—there is no such thing as a free nibble on my watch.

What are development trusts and community initiatives, why do they exist and what do they do? When I entered the Parliament 14 years ago I had no idea, and no answer to any of those questions, but, as my granny would say, “Ye ken noo”.

The motion refers to a sample of those trusts and initiatives that I have come across in the past 14 years, such as Auchendinny, which was building its community centre while the other building was quite literally falling down. It looks smashing now, and fit for a “Grand Designs” visit.

The same goes for Silverburn's community hall, which was reclaimed from a disused water storage building. Silverburn is a small community, but it has a lot of get up and go. In fact, the team from "The Beechgrove Garden" has already been there to see the community garden that has been established.

The Newlands project arose when the people of Romanno Bridge and the surrounding area were galvanised when their local school was threatened with closure and they took it into their own hands to keep the school and add community facilities. They fought for funding from the lottery—which was just over £800,000; not a hill of beans—and from other sources such as European funds. That process was—as they and I know—pretty painful and stressful for them, but they got there.

There are other projects such as Gorebridge Development Trust, which is, as a community hub, well on its way from drawing board to build, and has secured more than £1 million of lottery funding. Penicuik Development Trust has its fingers everywhere, and has secured some funding to restore the lost garden of Penicuik. Not content with that, it has prepared a business case to establish a paper-making museum in Penicuik, which members should all know was the home of paper-making so long ago, and it does so much more.

I should also mention the great Polish map of Scotland at Eddleston, and the restoration project—for which, again, initial funding has been secured. All those projects not only give pride to a community but can generate income for the local community through local people working locally.

Lamancha has a community centre with an exotic barbecue hut, which I invite members to visit. When I say "hut", I mean a posh Nordic version with a lock door, proper seating, places for candles and a proper barbecue centre. These people know how to do it and how to build within their communities—and those are only a few examples.

The projects have a lot in common. They are community based with a dedicated team of activists who are often working quite thanklessly and are in for the long haul, facing obstacles and learning pretty hard on the job, especially with regard to securing funding. Ultimately, all of them have achieved community success, and I know that those that are still at the drawing-board stage will also achieve community success. I know that they have done it through blood, sweat and tears—quite often literally, as it took huge acres of stamina out of the parties to stick with that work.

Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD): I am sure that the member will be aware that development trusts are now a firm feature in my

constituency in Orkney. One of the most interesting things about the development trusts' work is not just the projects that they help to deliver but the capacity that they build in the community, stretching beyond the usual suspects to bring in those who otherwise would perhaps have struggled to get engaged with such projects.

Christine Grahame: Absolutely. When I talk about the few working very hard, it really is the few—sometimes it is only when the building is actually going up and they are about to cut the ribbon to open it that the community realises what has happened on its doorstep and begins to become engaged with it. Of course, that is not the end for the trust. Such buildings have to be used; the trust has to get resources and it has to get revenue in from the community using the building. However, I know that trusts can be extremely successful at that. Quite often for these development trusts and community trusts, their job just continues into a different phase once the building is up and running.

I have huge regard for the people involved. I am not just saying that. I have a really huge regard for people who take up the cudgels for their community. They tough it out and they stick with it and they are not getting paid to do it; they are not getting press recognition and quite often nobody is patting them on the back. They are doing it because it is the right thing to do for their community. They give a project a kick-start and say, "This matters where I live." They build for their communities—real buildings. I have visited Newlands community centre; I have visited Silverburn's community centre; I have been to the Lamancha hub; and I have stood right where the great Polish map of Scotland was before they made it a health and safety issue—we are not allowed to do that now. I have been to those places.

The lost garden of Penicuik is a wonderful project but it needs a lot of work and I can see how people in the early stages in particular have a really tough time. I know that other people will speak about community trusts in their areas. All the community trusts and development trusts should take pride in what they build: it is a tangible example of their efforts. Not many politicians can say that. Even after 14 years here, I cannot point to a building that I have put up or a community that I have contributed to in that way, but the trusts have, so my congratulations to them all. I say to those communities that are a bit wary of doing such projects, speak to the development trusts and community trusts in your area, see what lessons they have learned and take something on for your community. The reward will be in seeing a building go up that the community will use for generations to come.

17:12

Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP): The motion is some 103 words—it would take nearly a minute to read it out if someone were to do so—but fortunately there are four words in it that are “and Scotland at large”. I am at large, speaking on behalf of some of the people in the north-east of Scotland who, like those in Midlothian and the Borders, are heavily engaged in trust work.

In Peterhead, we have Peterhead Projects Ltd, which is working on community woodland. That is about developing people as much as it is about putting up buildings. In Banff and Macduff, we have the Princess Royal Sports and Community Trust. It of course has buildings—it has gyms and it is making sure that people get fitter—but, more fundamentally, it is going out and engaging with schools and with young people to show the value of physical exercise.

In Portsoy, the Scottish traditional boat festival has grown under the local trust's aegis from the first year, when it attracted 200 people, to a festival to which a five-figure number of people come. People come from Australia and New Zealand each year to participate in that festival. It has taken on the salmon bothy and the PORT's boatshed. It is into buildings.

The Boyndie Trust just along the coast from Portsoy runs a cafe and a community bus service. It provides training for 70 people who would otherwise find it very difficult to get into employment and, in the cafe, it procures from local sources, supporting its own community.

On the borders of my constituency on the other side is the Huntly Development Trust. There is also a development trust in Keith. In Buckie, the football club there, through the Highland league and its work, is reaching out, using its facilities to reach others and ensure that their attributes are deployed and that people are getting fitter.

Of course, we have little community harbour trusts in many of the communities round the coast, some of which have been extremely successful in bringing very old facilities back into use.

I want to talk in particular about Fraserburgh Development Trust. Fraserburgh is a town of some 15,000 people where probably more than 20 languages are spoken. People have come to Fraserburgh from all over Europe and the world. The town earns its living the hard way—in the fishing industry, both onshore and offshore. It has seen some pretty tough times, but it is definitely on the way up, and Fraserburgh Development Trust is an important part of that. It has been running community markets, or super Saturdays, to ensure that people know what is good about Fraserburgh. It is not simply the place with the mainland

Scotland wind speed record of well over 100 miles an hour; it is a warm and friendly place, even if in the middle of winter it is far from feeling like that.

The trust is involved in the community garden and is trying to set up a renewables project, which will help the town to go green and, fundamentally, will help the trust to have a regular funding stream. The trust is working with Social Firms Scotland to consider taking over a local bakery, which will save jobs and create the opportunity to provide others with locally sourced food of good quality. The trust is working in the town centre and with a community health development officer. Fundamentally, as Christine Grahame said, the trust works through and with volunteers. Unlike Boris Johnson, who says that the top per cent of earners in London should get knighthoods, I think that the volunteers in our community trusts should get knighthoods.

17:16

John Wilson (Central Scotland) (SNP): I congratulate Christine Grahame on bringing the motion to the chamber. I declare an interest and draw members' attention to my entry in the register of interests because, tonight, I am going to tell members the story of a local community organisation in the village that I live in and that I am actively involved in. The organisation is run by the community and has a small dedicated staff team of one full-time worker and a couple of part-time workers, who bring together 120 volunteers. Those volunteers deliver a community cafe, which in 2013 had more than 12,000 visits. The cafe also helps with the delivery of meals to elderly and vulnerable people in the community, which assists more than 180 people to live independently in the community.

The organisation has delivered a village park play area, which was a £0.5 million project that the council said could not be done. That project was designed and delivered by the community on behalf of the children and teenagers in the community. The body also organises four events a year, including a gala day. This Saturday, there will be the switching on of the Christmas lights in the village square. It also operates an autumn group, of which I am a member, as it is open to anybody over the age of 50. It also assists young people to complete the Duke of Edinburgh awards and creates employment opportunities for people who live in the area.

The organisation delivers training courses, with more than 60 local people participating in first aid, flexible learning, information technology and catering skills courses. Those opportunities are opened up to community members and allow people to apply for employment in other areas. The organisation also delivers community

transport in the village and the surrounding area. It has two community-owned minibuses, with the option of getting a third.

We have to ask what the future holds for communities that are actively engaged in that type of work, and I hope that the minister will raise some of the issues in summing up the debate.

Community asset transfer proposals are to come forward next year. My community wants to create a life centre that will become a hub and an anchor for the community. The activities that the body delivers would be delivered from that community hub. The organisation wants to move forward with ownership of the building concerned and taking on the commitment to deliver the services.

We must look at what the community empowerment and renewal bill will mean for communities. Some of the work that Christine Grahame and Stewart Stevenson described shows what communities throughout Scotland are doing; communities can deliver on their own when they have the correct support and the correct assets. We must allow a hands-off approach—unfortunately, local authority support sometimes comes with a heavy hand. If we let communities develop and grow, they will deliver services in their areas.

Many funders have shown confidence and trust in communities to deliver projects. The Big Lottery Fund, the Coalfields Regeneration Trust, BBC Children in Need and Radio Clyde have all given communities funding to deliver services and opportunities. I put on record my thanks to the Development Trusts Association Scotland, which provides a great deal of support for communities throughout Scotland that allows them to have imagination and vision and assists them to deliver projects that they identify are needed.

I thank Christine Grahame for initiating the debate.

17:21

Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab): I thank Christine Grahame for lodging the motion. As a West Lothian councillor from 2003 to 2009, I was there at the beginning of the developing community development trust initiative in my county. In 2005 and 2006, I saw the potential in the vast array of community groups that operated in my home village of Fauldhouse—a working-class, ex-mining community that is not without its challenges but which has great people who have a lot of initiative.

In that community, we had groups doing youth work, pensioners groups, religious organisations, sports groups and so on. They were all doing fantastic work in the community to support people

and develop new projects, but they often competed for the same relatively small pots of money. Some inevitably felt frustrated and disappointed when the effort to raise funds through grant applications was unsuccessful.

What did we do? In the first instance, I got together with a then West Lothian Council officer called Paul White, who now works for the Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations. I name him because he was influential in what developed. He and I looked at what was out there and saw the community development trust model as providing a potential opportunity to galvanise the community and take things forward.

A year of often tortuous development work took place, funded by a European Union grant. That allowed the concept to develop in the minds of the groups concerned, which began to see the potential benefits of the new organisation. We were grateful for the encouragement that we received, particularly from Gorebridge Community Development Trust. Archie Pacey, who is in the public gallery, was a great help and an inspiration when we really needed someone to give us a bit of a boost—he certainly did that.

Eventually, we formed a community development trust—a company limited by guarantee with charitable status. We appointed a skilled board with a wide range of people at the helm. I pay particular tribute to the chairman, Robert Russell, and the other board members, who have given up their time and put in effort over the years to make the trust a success. I served as company secretary and as a director for the first five years of the trust's existence—I resigned this year only because of work pressures. I suppose that I should declare that as an interest.

Since the trust was established, it has gone from strength to strength. It has grown projects and income as it goes along. The point is to generate enough income for the trust to be sustainable. We employ staff. We employed about 16 future jobs fund trainees on an environmental project before the Tories scrapped that scheme, and the trust employs community jobs Scotland trainees.

With lottery funding and grant funding from the Levensat Trust, the Coalfields Regeneration Trust and others, the trust bought and transformed an ex-council office. It now has a community cinema, a soft play area, a dementia cafe, a food bank drop-off point, a walking group, and it hosts the credit union, a fruit and veg co-op, a time bank project and an anti-sectarian project. It has meeting rooms and a conference room, it has held music festivals and organised remembrance Sunday events, and it hosts an annual fair. It helps to recruit volunteers for its projects and those of all the other community groups that operate in the

area. It does that because it has dedicated staff who work at the grass-roots level to seek out the funding that can make things happen. The staff do not make everything happen themselves, because that is not the point. They help others to facilitate projects and help with grant applications that allow other organisations to grow and develop. That is part of the business plan and what they are supposed to do.

The trust is a social enterprise that works at the coalface and delivers benefits in the community. I am proud of the work that it does and proud that I was involved from the start.

Community development trusts do not and should never replace local government—that is not what they are there to do. In my area, we could not have set up the trust without local government support and I am very grateful to West Lothian Council for all its assistance over the years.

17:26

Annabelle Ewing (Mid Scotland and Fife) (SNP): I, too, congratulate my colleague Christine Grahame on securing this members' business debate. I am very pleased to hear of the range of successful trusts and other models of community engagement in other parts of Scotland. As an MSP for Mid Scotland and Fife, I am pleased to report that there are a number of examples of successful development trusts across the region, from Callander Community Development Trust in the west across to the Levenmouth my bus operation in Fife and at many points in between.

All those development trusts are a tremendous credit to their communities and speak to the determination of local people to make a positive difference to the lives of their towns, villages and, indeed, in some cities, their neighbourhoods.

In the short time available to me, I will focus on an example that could not be closer to home: the Comrie Development Trust, which was established in 2006 in the village that I am proud to call my home. I point out that I am a member of the trust, along with more than 700 other people, and I also draw members' attention to my entry in the register of interests, which states that I did project support work for the trust some years ago.

From its inception, the Comrie Development Trust has gone from strength to strength. It may be most well known for successfully navigating the not inconsiderable hurdles to effecting the community buyout of the former Ministry of Defence army camp at Cultybraggan, just outside the village. That was a tremendous achievement for the volunteer board of the trust, whose determination to succeed was inspirational.

I well remember the excitement when the deal was secured, very much at the 11th hour, and I remember too the quiet delight of many villagers, who had never in all their years owned land—nor had generations of their families before them. They found themselves having a stake and therefore a say in what would happen to 90 acres of land on their doorstep.

Since the buyout of Cultybraggan, progress has been made on the community development of the site. Some of the Nissen huts have been refurbished and let out to local tradesmen and other businesses and groups, and an award-winning catering company has relocated to the site.

There has also been the establishment of very successful community allotments, alongside which Comrie in Colour, another Comrie voluntary organisation, has its very successful polytunnel. We have established a community orchard and I believe that planning permission has been obtained to develop sports facilities at the camp. We have renewables activity on the site and the trust is running a carbon challenge project in the village. Work is going on to create a heritage centre to reflect the site's history as a prisoner of war camp during the second world war and, importantly, much input from local folk has been secured to capture the stories of that time.

A lot of work has been carried out and a lot of work is still to be done. Although funding has been secured by the trust to employ some members of staff over the years, it is fair to say that much of the impetus is still with the volunteer directors and the many other volunteers who are involved in the various working groups that the trust has set up. Without their tireless contribution, very little of what I have outlined would have been achieved.

I add my praise for my very local development trust to the debate. Although at the outset it was the new kid on the block among the community initiatives in Comrie—a village where there were already some 56 voluntary organisations, in addition to the excellent and hard-working community council—it is fair to say that the trust has become part of the firmament.

There is no monopoly on good ideas; nor should any ceiling be placed on enthusiasm and the determination to make a positive difference to the lives of a community. All volunteers share that estimable goal and there is space and, indeed, demand enough for everyone, working in co-operation with each other, to make their contribution.

17:30

Mike MacKenzie (Highlands and Islands) (SNP): I am pleased to speak in the debate

because it was partly my involvement as a founding member of the community development trust on my home island of Easdale that led me into politics. We were aided in our early stages by the CADISPA Trust, an umbrella organisation that continues to offer help to communities all over Scotland. I owe a personal debt to CADISPA's director, Dr Geoff Fagan, who taught me a lot about the concept of capacity building—which Liam McArthur has referred to—and the wisdom of that approach.

Rather than giving grants or advising people on how to get them, CADISPA's approach is unique, in that the focus is on building capacity within our communities to meet whatever challenges they face, now and in future. That is the route to resilience and true sustainability.

If community development trusts are to help to build a better future, they need to be well equipped with the skills to do so and, as they do so, to learn from, and in turn teach, others. That is a mechanism that multiplies the effect that any single community trust can have on its own. It is a method for building widespread resilience and sustainability into the fabric of our society. Sadly, in the current climate of economic difficulty, CADISPA is battling for its own survival, even as it continues to help other organisations.

It would be easy to praise the remarkable achievements of the many community development trusts across the Highlands and Islands. I would be the first to pay tribute to the many people who tirelessly and often thanklessly do so much for their communities. However, I would like to use this opportunity to deal with some of the problems that such organisations face.

In order to set that in context, it is necessary to realise that many community development trusts were first set up in order to tackle long-standing problems that public authorities had failed to tackle, sometimes for many years. It is ironic, then, that a principal complaint of many successful community organisations and development trusts is that they are often given insufficient respect or assistance by the public agencies with which they need to interact. Indeed, community organisations are often faced with barriers that are erected, I suspect, for no reason other than that their success can challenge the very authorities that failed to help them in the first place.

If we in Parliament have a genuine wish to empower local communities, we must recognise the iron-bound principle that power is neither created nor destroyed; it is merely passed from hand to hand. Empowerment of communities implies disempowerment somewhere else.

We often have debates in Parliament about the balance of power between national and local government but if we truly want to make a difference to our society, we should perhaps focus on taking power from local government and giving it more directly to local communities.

17:34

The Minister for Local Government and Planning (Derek Mackay): This has been a useful debate on the importance of development trusts and their place as community anchors and key organisations that deliver services and realise the local potential that exists throughout the country. The number of members who have been able to explain their local circumstances just goes to show the impact that development trusts have had at a local level. There are stories from right across the country that are inspiring and will fuel the debate around where power lies in Scotland as further opportunities emerge.

I congratulate Christine Grahame on securing the debate and the next diary commitment. I also congratulate her on securing by way of a ministerial response last week the pledge on the website—supported by civil servants who understand the task at hand, which is to ensure that development trusts are supported and made aware of further opportunities.

Christine Grahame helpfully covered many of the issues around support for development trusts to realise local potential, generate income and be a social enterprise, as well as the obstacles that organisations sometimes face. Sometimes the obstacles are bureaucratic; sometimes they are about resource; and sometimes there are other barriers in the way, which other members spoke about.

I hope that the work that the Government will undertake to support the third sector will address some of those obstacles, partly through the community empowerment (Scotland) bill and partly through a range of other actions that we are taking.

One of the key things that Christine Grahame talked about was communities doing it for themselves. It is that sense of empowerment that makes the difference, so that communities are not disempowered but have the tools to do the job. The Scottish Government wants to create those conditions. That was touched on in Liam McArthur's intervention on the sense of local empowerment, capacity and delivery.

Stewart Stevenson, not unexpectedly, gave us a north-east perspective and explained how communities that have seen tough times have taken advantage of the opportunities that exist.

John Wilson spoke about making things happen. That is very much what development trusts do: they make things happen. They do not just debate the issues, complain and criticise; they take projects forward and deliver them at a local level on the ground. Their very responsive nature was illustrated by his description of the range of services that are provided, including lunch clubs and a host of other services. He gave the example of the council official explaining what could not be done, which was overcome by a community-led determination to make things happen.

I was asked about community asset transfers. We should behave right now as if the community empowerment (Scotland) bill was already in place, because we know that community asset transfers work. We know that community ownership works; it is an incredibly empowering device to make things happen at a local level.

Neil Findlay outlined a number of cases. He spoke of the experience in the mining community, where despair was replaced by activity and a vision to deliver.

Neil Findlay: I reassure the minister that there has never been despair in my community. There has always been grit and enthusiasm to take things forward—not despair.

Derek Mackay: I am more than happy to be corrected. I was reflecting on the words of Jimmy Reid, who said that the greatest danger to our society is despair, when communities feel disempowered and do not have the tools to do the job. When communities feel empowered and have the right conditions and support, that can make the difference. That is why the empowerment agenda is so important.

I still commend the work within the area that Neil Findlay mentioned and I agree that community trusts should not be seen as any threat to or replacement for local government services; what is being delivered by development trusts and other community anchor organisations builds on the statutory services.

Annabelle Ewing spoke about the fantastic development trust in Comrie, with which I am familiar. Empowerment supported by community ownership helps to make the difference by making projects happen. Doing things for ourselves is an aspiration often repeated when it comes to development trusts and the projects that they have delivered.

Mike MacKenzie mentioned the opportunities that have been realised during difficult economic times. That just goes to show that great projects can come from adversity, as we take advantage of the opportunities that exist.

Through the community empowerment (Scotland) bill, which will, I think, transfer further assets into community ownership, through the expansion of the community ownership support service and through the support that we provide through DTAS—I was delighted to meet Ian Cooke today to discuss the bill—we can address some of the other barriers that exist and support and enhance community development trusts across the country. By doing so, we can upscale the great local-led work that we know is making a difference, and further replicate the success stories across the country that we have heard about. Those were best exemplified by Christine Grahame—other members gave examples, too—but it is worth mentioning the communities of Auchendinny, Gorebridge, Newlands, Penicuik and Silverburn and the work on the great Polish map of Scotland at Eddleston. Those are great examples of the work of development trusts. The Government will continue to support and commend their work.

Meeting closed at 17:40.

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

Available in e-format only. Printed Scottish Parliament documentation is published in Edinburgh by APS Group Scotland

All documents are available on
the Scottish Parliament website at:

www.scottish.parliament.uk

For details of documents available to
order in hard copy format, please contact:
APS Scottish Parliament Publications on 0131 629 9941.

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact
Public Information on:

Telephone: 0131 348 5000
Textphone: 0800 092 7100
Email: sp.info@scottish.parliament.uk

e-format first available
ISBN 978-1-78392-254-3

Revised e-format available
ISBN 978-1-78392-270-3

Printed in Scotland by APS Group Scotland
