



The Scottish Parliament  
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

## Official Report

# MEETING OF THE PARLIAMENT

Wednesday 20 February 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](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk) or by contacting Public Information on 0131 348 5000

---

## Wednesday 20 February 2013

### CONTENTS

	<b>Col.</b>
<b>PORTFOLIO QUESTION TIME</b> .....	16741
<b>CULTURE AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS</b> .....	16741
Diplomats (Meetings) .....	16741
Television (URTV stations) .....	16742
Shambellie House .....	16743
China .....	16744
China .....	16745
Robert the Bruce (Sculpture and Visitor Centre at Turnberry) .....	16746
International Development Priorities (Independent Scotland) .....	16746
Glasgow 2014 Celebrate Fund .....	16748
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE, INVESTMENT AND CITIES</b> .....	16749
Welfare Reform (Bedroom Tax) .....	16749
Capital Projects .....	16751
Welfare Reform (Bedroom Tax) .....	16752
Kessock Bridge (Resurfacing) .....	16753
Scottish Water (Procurement) .....	16754
Regeneration (Glasgow Kelvin) .....	16755
Business Rates Incentivisation Scheme .....	16756
Demographic Change (Impact on Housing) .....	16757
<b>CAPITAL PROJECTS</b> .....	16759
<i>Motion moved—[Gavin Brown].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Nicola Sturgeon].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Richard Baker].</i>	
Gavin Brown (Lothian) (Con) .....	16759
The Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities (Nicola Sturgeon) .....	16762
Richard Baker (North East Scotland) (Lab) .....	16765
John Mason (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP) .....	16768
Margaret McCulloch (Central Scotland) (Lab) .....	16769
Richard Lyle (Central Scotland) (SNP) .....	16771
Willie Rennie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD) .....	16772
Stuart McMillan (West Scotland) (SNP) .....	16774
Alex Johnstone (North East Scotland) (Con) .....	16775
Lewis Macdonald (North East Scotland) (Lab) .....	16777
Kenneth Gibson (Cunninghame North) (SNP) .....	16779
Elaine Murray (Dumfriesshire) (Lab) .....	16781
The Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth (John Swinney) .....	16782
Gavin Brown .....	16785
<b>NEW MEDICINES</b> .....	16788
<i>Motion moved—[Jackson Carlaw].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Alex Neil].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Jackie Baillie].</i>	
Jackson Carlaw (West Scotland) (Con) .....	16788
The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil) .....	16792
Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab) .....	16794
Aileen McLeod (South Scotland) (SNP) .....	16796
Duncan McNeil (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab) .....	16798
Bob Doris (Glasgow) (SNP) .....	16800
Nanette Milne (North East Scotland) (Con) .....	16801
Jayne Baxter (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab) .....	16803
Mark McDonald (North East Scotland) (SNP) .....	16805
Dr Richard Simpson (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab) .....	16806
Alex Neil .....	16808
Jackson Carlaw .....	16810

<b>BUSINESS MOTIONS</b> .....	16813
<i>Motions moved—[Joe FitzPatrick]—and agreed to.</i>	
<b>PARLIAMENTARY BUREAU MOTION</b> .....	16815
<i>Motion moved—[Joe FitzPatrick].</i>	
<b>DECISION TIME</b> .....	16816
<b>HISTORIC BUILDINGS</b> .....	16827
<i>Motion debated—[Chic Brodie].</i>	
Chic Brodie (South Scotland) (SNP) .....	16827
George Adam (Paisley) (SNP) .....	16829
Graeme Pearson (South Scotland) (Lab) .....	16830
Graeme Dey (Angus South) (SNP) .....	16831
Jamie McGrigor (Highlands and Islands) (Con) .....	16833
Christine Grahame (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP) .....	16835
The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop).....	16836

---

## Scottish Parliament

Wednesday 20 February 2013

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

### Portfolio Question Time

#### Culture and External Affairs

##### Diplomats (Meetings)

**1. Mark McDonald (North East Scotland) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what international diplomats it has met recently and what issues were discussed. (S4O-01799)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop):** Scottish ministers meet diplomats regularly to discuss matters of mutual interest. Ministers have recently held meetings in Scotland with a range of diplomats, including the ambassadors of Denmark, Hungary, Bulgaria and Switzerland, in which a range of topics were discussed to strengthen the links between Scotland and those countries. The First Minister met European Union ambassadors last week in London. The Minister for External Affairs and International Development met the consul general for Iraq on 19 February, when they discussed the links between Scotland and Iraq. This afternoon, the First Minister and I will meet Oscar Kerketta, the new Indian consul general, to welcome him to Scotland and to discuss links between Scotland and India.

**Mark McDonald:** When the cabinet secretary next meets diplomats from Namibia and Togo, will she apologise for the sneering way that their nations were dismissed by Johann Lamont recently at First Minister's question time? Will she also apologise to Denmark for the coalition Government's sneering dismissal of that country in the papers recently and to diplomats in Ireland and Iceland for the "arc of insolvency" slur that has been propagated by Labour politicians? Will she join me in calling for the anti-independence parties to stop insulting other nations in order to undermine Scotland's ability to govern itself as those proudly independent nations do?

**Fiona Hyslop:** I very much appreciate the point that Mark McDonald makes. We all have a responsibility to support and build relations for the future and in the present. Commercial and other interests are important. I assure members that any comments that are made in this chamber or elsewhere are heard in other countries. We all have to be responsible, as we will all be judged by how our country is seen internationally.

##### Television (URTV stations)

**2. Chic Brodie (South Scotland) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what plans it has to secure a connected network of local URTV stations and in what timescale. (S4O-01800)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop):** The Scottish Government has met the URTV broadband network of community-owned, hyper-local television channels. Nesta is currently running a programme of funding 10 pilots across the United Kingdom, three of which are in Scotland. Creative Scotland has partnered with Nesta in Scotland and provided 50 per cent of the stage 1 project costs of the three participants.

I am delighted that URTV was one of the three successful applicants in Scotland and that it secured a £50,000 grant from NESTA to build a network of community-owned, not-for-profit, hyper-local news channels.

The Scottish Government is also supporting the Annan broadband pilot in the south of Scotland as part of the digital strategy. The URTV model is an important component of the Annan broadband pilot, as it is an effective means of encouraging people in Annandale to use the internet and access public services and information online. Work is under way to embed the project in the local community.

**Chic Brodie (South Scotland) (SNP):** I thank the cabinet secretary for her very welcome answer. Television is about more than entertainment, and the installation of super-fast broadband affords the opportunity to develop an interconnecting network of local TV stations. That would allow the fast sharing of best practice across Scotland and contribute to efficiency savings and major customer benefits in the provision of services such as preventative healthcare, police and fire services and many other public sector offerings.

Will the cabinet secretary write to all local authorities to seek information on their intentions and their progress towards the development of local TV provision?

**Fiona Hyslop:** The member is quite right. Indeed, the first director general of the BBC talked about the importance of public service broadcasting's mission not just to entertain but to inform and educate.

The possibilities of broadband are extensive in this area. Of course, the Scottish Government is committing more than £240 million of public funding to the step change 2015 programme, which will deliver a step change in next-generation broadband that will particularly focus on rural areas. Obviously, we will work closely with local

authorities on that. Dumfries and Galloway Council is a co-funder of the example that I gave of the Annan broadband pilot in the south of Scotland. There are extensive opportunities for public services and television as part of that partnership and we will encourage local authorities to see the opportunities in that way.

### Shambellie House

**3. Jim Hume (South Scotland) (LD):** To ask the Scottish Government when the feasibility study of future uses of Shambellie house will be published. (S4O-01801)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop):** I want to see a sustainable future for Shambellie house, which provides benefits for the local community. The Scottish Government has, therefore, provided £20,000 to fund a feasibility study into the future use of the house, to be facilitated by National Museums Scotland. I expect the study to report over the next few months, once the relevant parties have all participated. I also strongly encourage National Museums Scotland and the local authority to work together on developing improved access to the national collections in the wider Dumfries and Galloway area.

**Jim Hume:** Does the cabinet secretary agree that the time for any kind of study was before Shambellie house was threatened with closure, not after the doors had been bolted for the last time? That way, a means better to promote the museum might have been identified.

Will the cabinet secretary assure me that Shambellie house will remain a resource for the people of Dumfries and Galloway to continue attracting visitors to the area? Will she also provide details of the roving exhibitions that we can look forward to in Dumfries and Galloway, as promised by National Museums Scotland?

**Fiona Hyslop:** On the latter point, I make it clear that I expect not only roaming but regular exhibitions to be provided throughout the region.

I am committed to Shambellie house. As I have said on a number of occasions in the chamber, the resource should be available to the local community. However, it will take all partners to come together to achieve that. Advice from the local members as to how it can best be used might be welcome. They could also provide advice on whether they, local councillors or Dumfries and Galloway Council centrally would provide the best steer on that.

**Alex Fergusson (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con):** During earlier discussions and debate on the issue, the cabinet secretary was at pains to point out that she could not direct NMS towards any particular course of action, although

she wanted to ensure that Dumfries and Galloway was given what she referred to as a better offering from NMS than the simple closure of the national museum of costume. How will she measure the eventual offering that NMS proposes? What steps will and can she take to make certain that a better offering is delivered?

**Fiona Hyslop:** I have made it quite clear to National Museums Scotland that I expect a better offer for Dumfries and Galloway. Other examples in places such as Kilmarnock and the northern isles show that there have been much-improved opportunities for sharing and, as we have just discussed, more regular and roaming exhibitions.

As part of ensuring that there is a better offer, we must address two issues. One concerns the wider Dumfries and Galloway area. The other concerns the commitment to Shambellie house being used for the local community. We must ensure that that service exists.

On measurement, I will be quite clear to National Museums Scotland about what I expect. In the feasibility study, I expect opportunities to emerge in both the areas that I mentioned.

### China

**4. Liz Smith (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con):** To ask the Scottish Government how it will implement its working with China strategy. (S4O-01802)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop):** The Scottish Government's "Working with China" publication itself sets out how implementation and delivery will be taken forward. It will be for stakeholders throughout Scotland to work in partnership to achieve the objectives of the China strategy. The Scottish Government's role is to support that engagement where it can and to encourage greater co-operation between partners.

**Liz Smith:** I put on record my thanks to the cabinet secretary for showing interest in the area and our collective thanks to Judith McClure and the Scotland China education network.

Will the cabinet secretary tell us a little bit more about how the Scottish Government intends to develop links with local authorities and local businesses to find more people who can help to teach Chinese and help young people to learn about China? More specifically, how will it engage with finding more teachers of Chinese?

**Fiona Hyslop:** Liz Smith makes an important point. I also echo her thanks to Judith McClure and the SCEN for their work.

There are currently 13 teachers of Mandarin in local authority schools. That compares with eight in 2008-09. I share with Liz Smith the view that we

need to increase the opportunities for those who can share language skills.

I spoke at the cross-party group on China recently. Part of our discussion was about a hub that would help to connect people who are doing work in China, whether local authorities or businesses. That should also provide opportunities to identify skills. That is work in progress, but Liz Smith is right to identify the need to mobilise the talent that we have in Scotland to achieve the step change that we need in language skills.

**The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick):** Question 6, in the name of Tavish Scott, has not been lodged. The member has provided an explanation—[*Interruption.*] I am sorry, I am ahead of myself again. I call Colin Keir to ask question 5.

### China

**5. Colin Keir (Edinburgh Western) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what recent contact it has had with representatives of China and what issues were discussed. (S4O-01803)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop):** Following the publication of the Scottish Government's China strategy, "Working with China", the Chinese consul general wrote to the First Minister in December 2012 to highlight the fact that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Beijing had positively received the strategy. I met a delegation from the Beijing municipality that month to discuss possible collaboration across culture and tourism interests, as well as trade and industry.

The Minister for External Affairs and International Development met the Chinese consul general on 10 October 2012 to consider closer co-operation between Scotland and China. I attended a dinner at the Chinese consulate in May 2012 to discuss a range of issues, including strengthening relations between Scotland and China.

**Colin Keir:** What is the Scottish Government doing to take advantage of the improving cross-strait relationship between mainland China and Taiwan to increase trade and culture links with Taiwan?

**Fiona Hyslop:** Scottish exports to Taiwan are extensive. We have strong links with Taiwan on trade, tourism and higher education. We estimate that exports to Taiwan in the five years to 2011 were worth about £955 million. Taiwan was the fifth-ranked nation by value for exports of Scotch whisky.

Scottish Development International has had an office in Taipei City for more than 15 years and it continues to work closely with potential prospects from Taiwan. Renewables, life sciences, information technology and finance are key

sectors for the future. As for culture, there was a Taiwanese performance of "King Lear" during the Edinburgh international festival in 2011, which was well received.

**The Presiding Officer:** I have already explained about question 6.

### Robert the Bruce (Sculpture and Visitor Centre at Turnberry)

**7. Adam Ingram (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government whether it will support Carrick community councils forum in creating a lion of Alba sculpture and visitor centre at Turnberry, birthplace of Robert the Bruce, as a permanent legacy of the 2014 year of homecoming. (S4O-01805)

**The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop):** We recognise the strong associations that Carrick has with Robert the Bruce and we support the community in planning to celebrate them. I wrote to Councillor Alec Oattes of South Ayrshire Council in August and December last year to direct him to key contacts and relevant funding sources. I hope that Carrick community councils forum can take this interesting and appropriate project forward.

**Adam Ingram:** I thank the cabinet secretary for her positive response. I understand that much of the funding for Robert the Bruce-related events for the 2014 Bannockburn anniversary has focused on the Stirling area, for obvious reasons. Will she give an undertaking that the Scottish Government and its agencies, such as Creative Scotland and EventScotland, will engage with the significant efforts that communities in Carrick are making to raise awareness of and celebrate the area's links to Robert the Bruce, such as through the creation of a grand pageant of his life at Culzean castle?

**Fiona Hyslop:** I have heard of proposals for the grand pageant, which is innovative as a celebration and as a way of promoting future tourism opportunities. I encourage the partners, including South Ayrshire Council and the local member, to engage with agencies to access appropriate funding. If Adam Ingram would like to meet agencies such as Creative Scotland and EventScotland to take forward plans, I will facilitate that.

### International Development Priorities (Independent Scotland)

**8. Drew Smith (Glasgow) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government how the international development priorities of an independent Scotland would differ from current United Kingdom aid policy. (S4O-01806)

**The Presiding Officer:** I call the cabinet secretary.

**The Minister for External Affairs and International Development (Humza Yousaf):** I have been promoted. Fantastic!

My officials are developing proposals for international development under independence, to inform the white paper that is to be published later this year. That initial work has included a focus on more and better aid, the championing of climate justice, the concept of doing no harm, the concept of policy coherence for development and careful consideration of unjust debt. We believe that at the centre of all that work must be a focus on gender equality.

In addition, the Scottish Government has said that it will meet the 0.7 per cent target—which successive UK Governments have failed to meet. I welcome the opportunity to hear the thoughts of the development community and others on how an independent Scotland could add most value to global efforts for economic justice.

**Drew Smith:** Last month, the minister said that a separate Scottish aid programme might go beyond the internationally agreed aid target of 0.7 per cent—perhaps even to 1 per cent, or more. On the basis of our current financial position, what would a 1 per cent commitment amount to in cash terms? Does he consider that, after the costs of setting up a separate Administration, that would be a greater cash amount than Scotland's current share of UK aid? If so, what other spending would be cut to fund that?

**Humza Yousaf:** First, Drew Smith will know that there is no estimate of Scottish gross national income, which is what the 0.7 per cent target refers to. I find the lack of ambition from the Opposition parties quite unbelievable. That is my reaction to the member's comments. [*Interruption.*]

**The Presiding Officer:** Order.

**Humza Yousaf:** The countries against which we should be benchmarking ourselves are those that are aspiring to meet, and are already meeting, 1 per cent targets, including Norway and Luxembourg. If they can do it, why on earth cannot we? I urge the member to have a little bit more ambition. The full detail of our ambition, of course, will be in our white paper later in the year.

**Jamie McGrigor (Highlands and Islands) (Con):** Does the minister agree that Scotland already benefits from the expertise that the United Kingdom has built up over many decades in delivering aid to developing countries?

**Humza Yousaf:** Of course the Department for International Development in the UK Government achieves much success, and of course we would look to continue that relationship where we could,

as we maintain relationships with other countries and nations in our development programmes. What I am talking about, and what I have talked about previously, is having in some respects a different set of values. There are some things that the UK Government does in international development that we would not do—aid's being tied to security, being an example. Aid's being tied to arms that we are selling to General Suharto or to the Argentinian junta and so on is the kind of value that we would move away from.

There are benefits to the UK's expertise, but I believe that the benefits of independence and having control of international development here will mean that we can shape a policy that takes on not just economic justice but social justice. That will be much better for our country.

### Glasgow 2014 Celebrate Fund

**9. Hanzala Malik (Glasgow) (Lab):** Good afternoon, Presiding Officer.

To ask the Scottish Government what it is doing to ensure that equalities groups and smaller community groups will receive support from the Glasgow 2014 celebrate fund. (S4O-01807)

**The Minister for External Affairs and International Development (Humza Yousaf):** The celebrate fund is being designed to be as accessible as possible. The lottery distributors that are developing the fund are working to ensure that the criteria reach and capture a diverse and inclusive range of local groups. It is expected that the fund will be launched in April 2013. In developing it, the lottery distributors have considered equality issues and the needs, expertise and experience of people from different backgrounds, in line with their normal approach. The celebrate fund will build on the experiences that the lottery distributors have gained in delivering similar programmes, such as awards for all, which has a good track record of reaching a wide range of diverse groups throughout Scotland.

The Scottish Government's legacy 2014 website continues to raise awareness of the many opportunities in which individuals and communities throughout Scotland can get involved in the lead-up to the games and beyond.

**Hanzala Malik:** A number of my constituents have approached me to ask how they can get involved in holding cultural events leading up to and during the 2014 games. I have first-hand experience of explaining how and helping community groups to apply for funding. However, I am concerned that many small groups in Glasgow do not have the capacity and capability to apply for such grants, so doing so would place an additional burden on them. Some of them may be left out—in particular, genuine community groups that wish to



participate. What assurances can the minister give me on how such groups can tap into support if they need it? Where will that support come from?

**Humza Yousaf:** I thank Mr Malik for raising that issue. I know that, since he has been in Parliament, he has rightly raised equality issues on a number of occasions.

We are trying to do things to bridge the gap that might exist. For example, in the volunteers programme, there is £500,000 to help to overcome practical and financial barriers. One of the specific barriers could relate to involvement of people from ethnic minority groups in particular.

I take on board what Hanzala Malik said and I am more than happy to meet him to discuss the matter in more detail. If the issue is capability and capacity for filling out grant applications, there are many good organisations across Scotland, such as the Council of Ethnic Minority Voluntary Sector Organisations and Black and Ethnic Minority Infrastructure in Scotland—with which the member will be familiar—with which we can perhaps work and raise the issue of capacity building.

## Infrastructure, Investment and Cities

### Welfare Reform (Bedroom Tax)

**1. George Adam (Paisley) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what impact the forthcoming bedroom tax will have on families in Scotland. (S4O-01809)

**The Minister for Housing and Welfare (Margaret Burgess):** We estimate that 105,000 Scottish households are set to lose an average of £600 per year. More than three quarters of those households include someone who is disabled, and 15,000 families with children are affected. We have been consistent and clear in our opposition to this United Kingdom Government measure.

**George Adam:** I thank the minister for her answer. She will be interested to know that the local authority in my area—Renfrewshire—expects almost 2,000 tenants to be affected by the changes, and there are only 114 vacant one-bedroom homes. Does the minister agree that the changes have not been thought out properly and are targeting those who are least able to defend themselves?

**Margaret Burgess:** Yes—I agree with George Adam. We have made it clear to the UK Government that only 26 per cent of occupied social rented properties in Scotland have one bedroom, and we know that 60 per cent of tenants need one-bedroom properties in order to meet the Department for Work and Pensions underoccupancy rules.

This Government is doing what it can, within its devolved powers, to mitigate the impact of the UK Government's damaging welfare reforms, and we will continue to consider all reasonable ways to lessen the impact that reforms such as the bedroom tax will have on Scottish households. However, a Scottish Government in an independent Scotland could make decisions about welfare that would support the economy, incentivise work and protect vulnerable households. That is not possible under the current constitutional arrangements.

**Richard Baker (North East Scotland) (Lab):** The minister is quite right to highlight the concerns over the impact of the bedroom tax, but would the situation not at least be alleviated if housing associations were able to build more one-bedroom properties, which many cannot do because of the Scottish Government's decision to cut the housing association grant?

**Margaret Burgess:** This Government has its affordable housing supply and we have said that we would build 30,000 houses by the end of this session of Parliament. Richard Baker is trying to suggest that we are responsible in some way for the bedroom tax and its impacts. We are not, and that has to be made clear. The suggestion is that the answer to the UK Government's bedroom tax is for us all of a sudden, out of the blue, to build enough one-bedroom houses by 1 April. As has been said, we cannot do that. The answer is to have no bedroom tax and to have the Scottish Parliament in control of the welfare system in Scotland.

**Alex Johnstone (North East Scotland) (Con):** Does the minister agree that the use of the phrase "bedroom tax" is an inaccurate and misleading description of the underoccupancy charge, and that—given the outburst by her colleagues in Westminster over the so-called pejorative use of language for the simple use of the word "separation"—there appears to be one rule for this Government and another rule for the rest of us?

**Margaret Burgess:** Alex Johnstone is trying to trivialise a serious matter. Whether it is called "bedroom tax" or "underoccupancy rules", the effects will be the same, and our vulnerable citizens will suffer from those effects.

**Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green):** I share the minister's anger about the unfair and unjustified proposal.

To return to some of the actions that we could take now, is the minister aware of proposals that the City of Edinburgh Council will, in the near future, be considering from my party colleagues about reducing the risk of evictions that could arise from the proposal? Reduction of that risk could be achieved either by allocating additional funds or by

redesignating rooms. Will the minister encourage all social housing providers and local authorities to take any creative approach that they can find to reduce the impact of the measure in the short term?

**Margaret Burgess:** I am talking to housing associations and local authorities throughout Scotland. All of them are taking the matter seriously and are seeking ways to mitigate its impacts and to protect their tenants, as well as their rental income.

**Malcolm Chisholm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab):** Does the Scottish Government, in discussions with local authorities and housing associations, take seriously the possibility that there is a loophole in terms of the definition of “bedroom”? Will the minister raise that issue with local authorities and housing associations as a possible way round the problem? Also, when the minister is talking to them, will she urge them not to evict any tenants solely because they have not paid that portion of their rent that has been withdrawn through the bedroom tax?

**Margaret Burgess:** The Scottish Government will take seriously any proposals—as mentioned by Malcolm Chisholm—that we can legitimately use to mitigate the effects of the bedroom tax and protect our tenants. The issue is actively being looked at.

We want to ensure that anything that we suggest or propose, or that local authorities propose, will not make the position worse for tenants. We will certainly look at every possible option to reduce the effects of the bedroom tax on our tenants.

### Capital Projects

**2. James Kelly (Rutherglen) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government what steps it is taking to invest in capital projects. (S4O-01810)

**The Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities (Nicola Sturgeon):** The Government is determined to invest in Scotland’s infrastructure to stimulate growth in the short term and to lay the foundations for long-term economic success. Our recently updated infrastructure investment plan demonstrates exactly how we will do that, despite the substantial cuts to our capital budget by Westminster.

We are using all the levers at our disposal under current constitutional arrangements to maximise investment and support growth, and between 2012-13 and 2014-15 we will support investment of more than £10 billion. That will be funded by way of the capital budget, revenue-financed investment through the non-profit-distributing pipeline and regulatory asset base rail

enhancements, capital receipts, and switching more than £700 million from resource budgets into capital.

**James Kelly:** The Deputy First Minister mentioned the NPD pipeline, through which only £20 million has been allocated out of a possible £353 million in the past year. It would seem that this shovel-ready Scottish Government is only shovelling fresh air.

**The Presiding Officer:** Do you have a question, Mr Kelly?

**James Kelly:** Leaving all the spin and bluster aside, can the minister say what specific steps she is taking to bring forward NPD capital projects as opposed to simple press stunts?

**Nicola Sturgeon:** That was a demonstration of the better together campaign in action. The member is reduced to parroting Tory lines. It is a bit rich for a member of the party that planned every penny and more of the capital cuts that are currently being imposed by the Tory Government at Westminster to come to Parliament and talk about capital investment. It is rich indeed.

Let me give the member the facts about the NPD projects. [*Interruption.*]

**The Presiding Officer:** Mr Baker, please.

**Nicola Sturgeon:** The member and other members might want to listen to what I have to say. As of now, £1.6 billion of projects have entered procurement or development through the hub. In 2011-12, three projects went into procurement, and they will start construction this year. In 2012-13 so far, 16 projects have entered procurement. Progress is being made.

I will finish where I started by reminding the member that it was essential for the Government to introduce a £2.5 billion NPD pipeline because our capital budget was cut by 26 per cent, every single penny of which cuts were first planned by the Labour Party and Alistair Darling.

### Welfare Reform (Bedroom Tax)

**3. Christine Grahame (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what discussions it has had with the United Kingdom Government regarding the budgetary impact of the so-called bedroom tax. (S4O-01811)

**The Minister for Housing and Welfare (Margaret Burgess):** We have written to the United Kingdom Government on a number of occasions about the budgetary impact of the bedroom tax. The bedroom tax does not make economic sense. In the short term, it reduces UK Government expenditure by taking money away from vulnerable people and families. In the long

term, it is likely to result in a net economic loss of more than £100 million from the application of the measure in Scotland alone.

There has been concerted opposition to the bedroom tax from stakeholders throughout Scotland. No one disputes the need to reform the welfare system. It is the way in which it is being done that we disagree with, particularly with unfair measures such as the bedroom tax.

**Christine Grahame:** Does the minister share my concern that the bedroom tax will impact substantially on the funding for refuge services in Scotland that are partly funded by housing benefit, and that, together with the higher cost of providing safe accommodation and the introduction of universal credit, it spells misery for many vulnerable and desperate women and children?

**Margaret Burgess:** I share the member's concerns about the impact on refuges. A significant number of refuges are categorised as support-exempt accommodation, and, as such, the bedroom tax will not apply to them. However, we are concerned that some women's refuges might not be so categorised. We are seeking clarification from the Department for Work and Pensions and, as with all the changes, we will seek to have Scottish interests taken into account. I will certainly update the member with any response.

#### Kessock Bridge (Resurfacing)

**4. David Stewart (Highlands and Islands) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government whether it will provide an update on the completion of the resurfacing of the Kessock bridge. (S4O-01812)

**The Minister for Transport and Veterans (Keith Brown):** The first phase of the essential resurfacing works covering the northbound carriageway and footway started on 11 February and is programmed to take 17 weeks. The second phase of the works will start on 10 February 2014 and is programmed to take 20 weeks. Regular updates on progress will be publicised.

**David Stewart:** I acknowledge the mitigation measures that the minister has developed, especially the reopening of the Conon Bridge railway station, but the gaping hole in the strategy is the lack of a park and ride at Tore. Such a facility could take hundreds of cars from the Black Isle and beyond off the bridge at peak times. Even at this the 11th hour, will the minister look again at that proposal to prevent traffic mayhem on the Kessock bridge and win the gratitude of legions of frustrated north drivers?

**Keith Brown:** We are well past the 11th hour. As I described, the work has been on-going for a week, and the traffic chaos to which David Stewart referred has not transpired. The projections that were made and the plans that have been put in

place have coped with the additional traffic. There have been delays, but we always said that that would be the case.

The provision of a park-and-ride facility at the Tore site was investigated by Transport Scotland along with council officials, but it was deemed that there was insufficient evidence to show the long-term viability of such a project. That is why the suggestion was not proceeded with.

The Conon Bridge station to which the member referred has been very successful. Indeed, when I opened the station a couple of weeks ago, almost the entire community turned out to see the new facility, which provides young people such as Niamh—who was one of those who attended—with the prospect of being able to travel to Dingwall for the library or to Inverness for shopping.

The station is a great addition to the rail network for the people in that community. My hope is that the shift from road to rail while the Kessock bridge works are on-going will, for many people, become a permanent move, so that we can thereby increase the use of the railways and reduce congestion in future.

The plans have been put in place and are working well.

#### Scottish Water (Procurement)

**5. Willie Coffey (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what plans it has to review Scottish Water's procurement processes. (S4O-01813)

**The Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities (Nicola Sturgeon):** The Scottish Government is fully advised of Scottish Water's procurement approach. Scottish Water is currently setting out a new long-term procurement model for the 2015 to 2021 regulatory period that is fully consistent with the statutory obligations that apply to it. The new model is intended to reflect Scottish Government procurement policy, including the suitable inclusion of regional-based contractors.

**Willie Coffey:** As the cabinet secretary may be aware, smaller companies are sometimes at a disadvantage in engaging with the procurement process, which often favours larger companies due to economies of scale. First, can she clarify whether the public utilities will be included within the public procurement reform bill? Secondly, what advice can the Scottish Government offer to those small companies that do not make it on to Scottish Water's various frameworks on how they can continue to develop their businesses?

**Nicola Sturgeon:** On the first point, Willie Coffey will be aware that the Government has

committed to introducing a procurement reform bill before the summer recess. The analysis of the consultation, along with other views such as those that have been raised today, will help to inform the development of the bill as it makes its way through the legislative process. We expect the application of the bill to be subject to further detailed discussion as the proposed legislation develops, and I am happy to keep Willie Coffey and other members fully advised of progress.

On assistance to small companies, a key benefit of Scottish Water's approach to procurement over the next regulatory period is that it will help to secure a strong Scottish supply chain involvement. I would be very happy to meet Willie Coffey directly to discuss such matters or to arrange for Scottish Water officials to meet any constituents of his to discuss Scottish Water's procurement approach and to advise on how best to engage with it. I would certainly be happy to talk to Willie Coffey about more general advice for small companies that are looking to be competitive in securing public contracts.

### Regeneration (Glasgow Kelvin)

**6. Sandra White (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what plans it has for regeneration in the Glasgow Kelvin constituency. (S4O-01814)

**The Minister for Housing and Welfare (Margaret Burgess):** The Scottish Government is committed to the regeneration of all of Scotland's most disadvantaged areas and to the strengthening of local communities. "Achieving a Sustainable Future: Regeneration Strategy" outlines our vision for a Scotland where such communities are supported and where all places are sustainable and promote wellbeing.

The Scottish Government has a key role in setting the vision and strategic direction for regeneration across Scotland and in providing an overarching framework for delivery. The community planning partnership and Glasgow City Council have responsibility for delivering local economic development and local regeneration, including in Glasgow Kelvin. The Scottish Government and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities recently issued joint guidance to community planning partnerships on the scope and content of their strategic outcome agreements. The guidance highlights the need for a clear and evidence-based understanding of place to drive improvement, to identify priorities for interventions and to promote better partnership working and more effective use of resources.

**Sandra White:** I thank the minister for that detailed reply. In fact, I attended a meeting on that issue on Monday with the Local Government and Regeneration Committee.

Is the minister aware of reports that George Square will undergo no redevelopment before the 2014 Commonwealth games, despite the redevelopment being part of a tax increment financing agreement? Does the minister have more information on that?

The minister might also be aware that parts of Byres Road and Sauchiehall Street in my constituency are suffering badly due in part to Glasgow City Council's policy of lumping them together with more prosperous areas of the same streets. Will the minister meet me to discuss those issues and perhaps consider an action plan for those areas?

**Margaret Burgess:** The Scottish Government is engaging with Glasgow City Council on the Buchanan quarter tax increment financing scheme, which includes improvements to George Square. We expect that a package of improvements to the square will be delivered in time for the Commonwealth games in 2014. Overall, we hope that the TIF investment, which is worth £80 million, will regenerate Glasgow city centre by levering in private sector investment of £310 million and generating about 1,500 jobs.

The member is right that her constituency contains some more disadvantaged areas but, as I have said previously, it is for Glasgow City Council and its community planning partnership to identify priorities through discussion with local communities and groups. However, I am happy to meet the member to discuss how her constituency can benefit from various initiatives and funding supports that cover the city and adjoining areas.

### Business Rates Incentivisation Scheme

**7. Lewis Macdonald (North East Scotland) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government whether the Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities has had discussions with the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth on the impact on cities of the business rates incentivisation scheme and whether she has communicated the outcome to the city councils. (S4O-01815)

**The Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities (Nicola Sturgeon):** I have regular discussions with the finance secretary about a wide range of policies that are intended to grow Scotland's economy and support our cities, including discussions about the business rates incentivisation scheme. The city councils have been informed of the scheme as part of the local government finance settlement communications and they are clearly well placed to benefit from the scheme.

**Lewis Macdonald:** Can the cabinet secretary confirm that, when she met the chief executive and the leader of Aberdeen City Council late last year, she discussed the scheme with them? At that time, it was estimated that the scheme was potentially worth more than £7 million to Aberdeen City Council in the current financial year. If that is the case, and if the £7 million is no longer available to the council, will she explain to the citizens of Aberdeen why that is and what has changed since November?

**Nicola Sturgeon:** On the first part of Lewis Macdonald's question, we discussed the scheme when I met the chief executive and leader of Aberdeen City Council at the end of last year. From memory, one issue on which they sought clarification was about whether councils are able to keep 50 per cent of any extra business rates income over the jointly agreed targets, which is the case.

On the 2012-13 targets, Lewis Macdonald will be aware that, under the rules—which, incidentally, have been agreed by the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities—the targets can be reviewed by either the Government or local government in the light of a significant event that impacts on the amount of business rates income that is collected in a year. An apparent delay in settling business rates appeal cases in 2012-13, which is caused by the need to await the outcome of a particular appeal case, has resulted in an expectation that more income will be collected this year than had been predicted.

The Scottish Government has notified Aberdeen City Council that the 2012-13 targets are not fixed and that we are currently examining the latest business rates returns with a view to revising the targets, which are currently the subject of discussion and agreement with COSLA. Of course, other things being equal, any adjustment to increase the targets for 2012-13 as a result of the slippage of the settlement of appeals cases will mean a reduction in the targets that would otherwise have been set for 2013-14, when the appeals cases are likely to be settled.

### **Demographic Change (Impact on Housing)**

**8. Siobhan McMahon (Central Scotland) (Lab):** To ask the Scottish Government what preparations it has made for the impact on housing of demographic change, in light of the Finance Committee's recent report, "Demographic change and an ageing population". (S4O-01816)

**The Presiding Officer:** I would appreciate a brief response, minister.

**The Minister for Housing and Welfare (Margaret Burgess):** Okay. We published "Age, Home and Community: A Strategy for Housing for

Scotland's Older People: 2012-2021", our 10-year strategy for housing for Scotland's older people, jointly with the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities in December 2011. We are working to deliver the strategy with our partners across the housing sector and beyond.

**The Presiding Officer:** We can have a brief supplementary from Siobhan McMahon.

**Siobhan McMahon:** The minister will be aware that the number of pensioner households requiring adaptation is projected to increase from 66,300 in 2008 to 106,000 in 2033. Concerns have been raised about the current funding system for adaptations.

**The Presiding Officer:** I am sorry, but we need a question. We are tight for time in the following debate.

**Siobhan McMahon:** The adaptations working group has stated that increased funds are likely to be necessary and has recommended the creation of

"a single local funding pot".

Does the minister plan to act on that recommendation?

**Margaret Burgess:** We are grateful for the recommendations of the adaptations working group and we will shortly respond formally to its report. We will work to take forward the group's recommendations on the future organisation and funding of adaptations.

## Capital Projects

**The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick):** The next item of business is a debate on motion S4M-05653, in the name of Gavin Brown, on capital projects. I remind members that this and the subsequent debate are extremely tight for time. We will keep you closely to your allocated time limit.

14:40

**Gavin Brown (Lothian) (Con):** Our objective this afternoon is to have a focused debate on the non-profit-distribution pipeline, a Scottish Government flagship programme that was first announced in November 2010. It is an important subject to debate and is completely devolved. Responsibility for the programme, in terms of its positive results or otherwise, rests in Edinburgh, with the Scottish Government. That is why it is an appropriate subject for us to debate in full this afternoon.

The other reason for bringing the debate to the chamber is that, in our view, some key information about the programme is still absent. We have sought information over a period of months, through committees, through parliamentary questions—at First Minister's question time on three occasions and at topical question time—and through budget debates, but the Government has yet to divulge some critical information. The debate gives the Scottish Government the chance to explain fully the results of the programme thus far, particularly the results on the ground.

When it responds to the debate, it is important that the Government acknowledges the results on the ground and does not talk incessantly about procurement, business cases and what may happen. It must talk about what has happened on the ground thus far. We want the Government finally to explain the real reasons for the delays.

**Jim Eadie (Edinburgh Southern) (SNP):** Notwithstanding the member's characteristically reasonable tone, would he not like to take the opportunity to apologise to the people of Edinburgh for the excessive private finance initiative charges that mean that before a penny can be spent on education in this city, we pay £30 million in PFI charges?

**Gavin Brown:** That was a fairly predictable intervention from a Scottish National Party back bencher. The only surprising aspect was that it took one minute and 56 seconds for Mr Eadie to intervene—about a minute longer than his whip said. That is very disappointing.

Let us hear from the Scottish Government about the lessons that it has learned, so that we can not

only acknowledge what has happened but prevent future slippage of the NPD programme, which is to run over the next seven or eight years. I challenge the Scottish Government to use its time in the debate to explain what has happened, rather than to reflect the content of its amendment and simply pile the blame on Westminster. As I said, the NPD pipeline is completely devolved and is the responsibility of this Holyrood Government.

**The Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth (John Swinney):** Before Mr Brown proceeds much further in his analysis, will he acknowledge that one of the reasons why the Scottish Government has had to embark on an NPD programme is the 26 per cent reduction in our capital budget made by the United Kingdom Government?

**Gavin Brown:** Long before the economic crash, we had PFI and public-private partnerships. At that time, the then wanting-to-be Scottish Government had a not-so-clear plan about what it was going to introduce. NPD was always something that was going to happen and, for decades, it has sat alongside a conventional programme. I hope that, in return, Mr Swinney will acknowledge that his budget will go up next year in cash terms to the tune of £7 million. It is entirely up to him—*[Interruption.]* If Mr Swinney wishes to intervene again, he may care to stand up. *[Interruption.]* I will give way in a moment—let me finish the point first. It is entirely in the cabinet secretary's gift how much of that money he decides to switch to capital. He cannot switch the other way around, but if he is unhappy about the division between revenue and capital, he can switch more from revenue to capital.

Let us consider what was projected at the time of the 2011 spending review.

**John Swinney:** Will the member give way?

**Gavin Brown:** I am happy to.

**John Swinney:** For completeness, would Mr Brown observe and confirm the fact that the Scottish Government has had its capital budget cut by 26 per cent by the United Kingdom Government?

**Gavin Brown:** It has never been denied from this side of the chamber that, over the course of the spending review, the Scottish Government budget has been reduced in real terms. However, as we all know, next year it goes up in cash terms.

The SNP is determined to discuss anything but the NPD programme; it wants to talk about anything and everything, except areas for which it is responsible.

Let us look at the facts. At the time of the 2011 spending review, the Government said that its capital spending would be between £50 million

and £150 million in 2011-12, £353 million in 2012-13 and £686 million in 2013-14. What happened on the ground in 2011-12 was precisely nothing; the spending in 2012-13, we are told, will be £20 million, instead of £353 million; and the latest spend projections for the next financial year are £338 million instead of £686 million.

The Parliament and the country deserve an explanation. Initially, when it was clear that the Government had overpromised and underdelivered, its strategy was simply not to mention it in the budget or anywhere else. It said in the budget that it was accelerating the NPD pipeline; it did not admit that it was being decelerated. It said that the pipeline was so good that everyone else around the world wanted to copy what it was doing.

They also said that the figures were different because of a variance. However, when a Government says that it will spend £353 million and only delivers £20 million, that is stretching the definition of variance to quite a degree.

Since the Government has finally had to confront the issue, we have had numerous excuses for it. At First Minister's question time, the First Minister—at least twice—said that it was the fault of the Aberdeen western peripheral route. However, when we got the Government's official document about the forecast profile, it was clear that money was not projected to be spent on the Aberdeen western peripheral route until 2013-14. That does not explain the situation in 2011-12 or 2012-13, even by a penny.

Then it was the fault of the Edinburgh sick kids hospital, which the Government said was a big project that had been delayed for a number of reasons. However, when we got the Government's official paper, money was not projected to be spent on that until 2014-15. That does not explain the position either.

Then we had a partially true excuse: the Government said that it was all down to the Borders rail link, because that project is worth more than £300 million and that explains the difference. However, when we got the Government's official paperwork, we saw that there was no spend on the Borders rail link in 2011-12 and that it accounts for £39 million out of the £353 million in the current financial year. None of those excuses explains the situation at all.

We move then from the incorrect to the inept. When the Scottish Government was asked for a list of projects that had been delivered, the First Minister stood up in the chamber and reeled off a list of 20 projects that had not been delivered—in most cases they had not even been started.

We heard from the Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment

and Cities at topical question time the reason given for the delays:

“These are large, complex projects that are being procured by a wide range of procuring authorities.”

Those were always “large, complex projects”; they were always

“being procured by a wide range of procuring authorities.”

We also heard from the Deputy First Minister that they are delayed because time was taken up on

“the preparation and design stages”.—[*Official Report*, 5 February 2013; c 16357.]

That was always going to be the case: with any construction project in the history of the world, there is a preparation and a design stage.

We now know which broad areas were held up. We know that the areas in which there were delays and in which projects failed to happen this year—to which none of the excuses that have previously been given apply—were community health, to the tune of £84 million; colleges, to the tune of £65 million; schools, to the tune of £119 million; and roads, to the tune of £27 million.

**The Presiding Officer:** You must bring your remarks to a close.

**Gavin Brown:** We ask the Government to publish the list for the year before, to explain why so little has been delivered thus far and why little will be delivered next year, and to give us a guarantee that the latest projections for this year and next will be delivered in full.

I move,

That the Parliament notes the Scottish Government's claim that every £100 million spent on capital investment supports around 1,400 jobs; is therefore extremely disappointed with the result so far of the non-profit distribution (NPD) pipeline, which delivered nothing on the ground in 2011-12 and is projected to deliver only £20 million on the ground in 2012-13, compared with the £353 million projected in the 2011 spending review; is wholly unconvinced by the reasons given for delay thus far by the Scottish Government; calls on the Scottish Government to publish immediately the complete high-level overview for 2011-12, to explain in detail why the delivery of the NPD pipeline has been weak in 2012-13 and why the current projection for 2013-14 is far lower than was predicted in the 2011 spending review, and further calls on the Scottish Government to give an assurance that the current projections for 2012-13 and 2013-14 will be either met or exceeded.

**The Presiding Officer:** Let that be an example to everyone—Mr Brown finished bang on time.

14:50

**The Deputy First Minister and Cabinet Secretary for Infrastructure, Investment and Cities (Nicola Sturgeon):** I welcome the debate, not least because it gives me the opportunity to outline the progress that the Scottish Government

is making in our capital programme in general and the NPD programme in particular.

I think that we can all agree that infrastructure investment is fundamental to delivering sustainable economic growth, which makes it all the more galling that the Tories are slashing our capital budget. The bare-faced cheek of the Tories—who are slashing our capital budget—in coming to the chamber to lecture this Government on capital investment will not be lost on anyone anywhere in Scotland.

**Willie Rennie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD):** Will the cabinet secretary take an intervention?

**Nicola Sturgeon:** If the member lets me make a bit of progress, I will give way in a moment.

It is because we believe that capital investment is fundamental that we published the revised infrastructure investment plan in December 2011, in which we set out our priorities for investment and our long-term strategy for the development of public infrastructure. That plan sets out why we invest, how we invest and what we will invest in from now until 2030.

Earlier this month, we published a report on the progress that has been made, sector by sector, since the publication of the revised plan just over a year ago. We announced newly updated and more detailed investment pipelines that contain 30 major programmes and more than 100 individual live projects, which we will continue to update regularly.

The progress report outlined that, during 2012, nine of the major infrastructure projects that were included in the infrastructure investment plan, which have a value of more than £600 million, have been completed and are now in use. Gavin Brown did not see fit to mention that. He would surely have done so if he was at all interested in the reality on the ground.

**Gavin Brown:** Just for clarity, how many of the NPD projects were delivered on the ground in 2012?

**Nicola Sturgeon:** I am coming on to the NPD programme.

Does Willie Rennie still want to intervene?

**Willie Rennie:** I am intrigued by the cabinet secretary's UK Government angle. Is she saying that the UK Government forced the Scottish Government to mishandle the NPD programme?

**Nicola Sturgeon:** The UK Government, of which Willie Rennie's party seems to be a proud member, slashed this Government's capital budget by 26 per cent. If Willie Rennie cannot understand the implications of that, I suggest that he go back to the drawing board and do a bit more research.

Despite those savage cuts to our capital budgets by Westminster, we are maximising our capital spending to support infrastructure investment and jobs. Over the three-year period from this year to 2014-15, we will support investment of more than £10 billion through our capital budget, the NPD pipeline and rail investment through the regulatory asset base, and by switching more than £700 million from resource to capital. The £3.1 billion of capital investment in this year is estimated to support 40,000 jobs across the economy. That figure will rise to £3.4 billion next year, when several projects are expected to be completed and become operational, including the Aberdeen community health and care village, Lasswade and Eastwood high schools and Glasgow School of Art estate development.

We expect significant progress to be made on the NPD programme in 2013-14, with major projects such as the Dumfries and Galloway royal infirmary entering procurement, and others such as Inverness College and City of Glasgow College moving into construction. Taking forward a substantial programme of NPD investment—which I remind the chamber is worth £2.5 billion—is part of this Government's approach to mitigating the impact of the cuts to our capital budget.

I will respond to some of the points in the Conservative motion. As we have made abundantly clear, there has been a reprofiling of investment compared with the 2012-13 forecast. How do the Tories know that? Because of the transparency with which this Government has made the information available. The high-level estimate of the profile of capital investment was provided to the Finance Committee in January 2011 and a similar profile included in a graph in the draft budget for 2012-13, based on early estimates prepared by the Scottish Futures Trust.

There is a range of reasons for the changes in timing. Gavin Brown might find it inconvenient, but the fact is that 50 complex projects are being taken forward by 30 procuring authorities. Significant work has been undertaken with these many authorities to develop each project and the updated profile of capital investment reflects the more detailed level of scrutiny and planning.

In his opening remarks, Gavin Brown seemed to suggest that we should somehow ignore business case planning and procurement processes. Perhaps it is that kind of irresponsibility that has characterised decisions made at Westminster by those on the Opposition benches here. The fact is that, as Infrastructure UK's 2010 cost review pointed out, time taken now to prepare projects thoroughly will deliver better value for money overall, through a fuller consideration of opportunities for joined-up asset planning; better



building efficiency leading to cost savings; clearly specified projects allowing faster procurement than has previously been the case; and appropriate blending of funding to de-risk projects and make them more deliverable. As I have indicated—and am happy to indicate again today—progress is speeding up significantly as a result of that careful preparatory work.

Here is another fact that the Tories do not like to hear: the estimated total value of NPD projects that have already entered procurement or have entered development through hub is around £1.6 billion. The first NPD health project is already in construction and will be completed in 2013. Inverness, Glasgow and Kilmarnock colleges, along with the M8, M73, and M74 motorway improvements and a range of smaller community health and schools projects, will move into construction over the course of this year. The reality is that the Government is making significant progress, despite the cuts that have been made by the Tories and which were first planned by the previous Labour Government. Of course, if we had the full powers of independence and full borrowing powers, we could do even more.

I move amendment S4M-05653.2, to leave out from “notes” to end and insert:

“notes that the UK Government has cut the Scottish Government’s capital budget by 26% in real terms over the UK spending review period and that the previous UK administration was planning an even tougher cash-terms cut of 43% in UK public sector net investment; welcomes the progress made since publication of the *Infrastructure Investment Plan* in December 2011, with nine major projects now operational and publication of an updated, transparent, pipeline of future Scottish Government investments to assist the construction industry with its forward planning; recognises that, despite the reduction in capital departmental expenditure limits (DEL) from the UK Government, the Scottish Government is on track to invest £3.1 billion this year, using innovative means to supplement capital budgets, including through the Non-Profit Distributing (NPD) programme and switching resource to capital; believes that time invested now in preparing NPD and hub projects for the market leads to improved value for money, and welcomes the progress on Inverness, Glasgow and Kilmarnock colleges and the M8, M73, and M74 motorway improvements, all of which start construction in 2013-14, along with a range of smaller community health and schools projects.”

14:57

**Richard Baker (North East Scotland) (Lab):** Mr Brown has brought a very important debate to the chamber, given ministers’ repeated comments of how crucial their NPD programme is to their economic strategy for creating jobs and stimulating growth. We have agreed with the Scottish Government that the cut to capital budgets has been too steep and fast and has threatened our economic prospects, but ministers have been quite wrong in their description of the

previous UK Labour Government’s spending plans on infrastructure. We planned to spend more—

**John Swinney:** In the previous UK Government’s final budget in March 2010, public sector net investment was forecast to fall in cash terms from £40 billion in 2010-11 to £23 billion in 2014-15. Under the current UK Government’s plans, that investment would fall from £38 billion to £26 billion. Which part of slash and burn does Mr Baker not associate himself with?

**Richard Baker:** Mr Swinney is making a similar claim to that of George Osborne. According to Channel 4 FactCheck, latest Office of National Statistics figures show that Mr Osborne’s claim to have spent more on infrastructure than Labour planned to spend is wrong. In fact, the coalition has spent £4.7 billion less than Labour said it intended to spend.

However, where we agree with the Conservatives is that Mr Swinney is completely wrong about not only the facts of this debate, but his ramshackle description of NPD and the failure to deliver on what has been called an important programme. If every £100 million of investment in this pipeline is worth 1,400 jobs, how many job opportunities have been lost in the past year because of the delays to these projects at the very time when those jobs are needed most? We have been told that the new NPD scheme would be transformational from the old PFI/PPP schemes. In some ways, it has been; at least under the old scheme, projects were delivered.

There may have been a slip of the tongue by Murdo Fraser in the budget debate the other week, but he got it right when he referred to the “NDP”—the non-delivery profit—programme, because the reality is that, while the projects are delayed, investors are still making a profit. *[Interruption.]*

**The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):** Order, Mr Swinney.

**Richard Baker:** Indeed, the Scottish Futures Trust won an award in the 2012 public-private partnerships awards as the best PPP promoter. I have not seen the shortlist for this year’s awards, but on the evidence for this debate, I imagine that that achievement will not be repeated.

Let us be clear. The culpability is with ministers, who have promised shovel-ready projects again and again, but have created the policy context that has ensured that there has been a lack of focus on their delivery. The key issue now is that ministers must act to ensure that there are no further delays to those crucial projects.

I am sure that, throughout the debate, members across the chamber will talk about projects in their own areas. North East Scotland members have

received an excellent briefing from Aberdeen and Grampian Chamber of Commerce on the acute need for progress to be made on the AWPR now that the legal challenge is over, and on other projects, including the Haudagain roundabout, which ministers have dithered over for far too long. It is also vital that ministers can demonstrate that they can deliver through NPD the necessary funds for those projects, particularly in light of the experience of Borders rail. A funding partner could not be found for that NPD proposal.

Our amendment also points to the specific issue of the lack of progress in the schools programme, in which, last year, £119 million was meant to be spent, but the final spending tally was zero. We want to know what dialogue there has been with local authorities on the impact that that has had on local educational goals.

**Nicola Sturgeon:** Does Richard Baker not know that the schools for the future programme is governed by a national programme board, which includes representatives from local government; that that board meets quarterly; and that progress on the programme is discussed in that forum? Did he not know that when he lodged his amendment?

**Richard Baker:** Will the cabinet secretary therefore tell us the result of that dialogue and what the impact on local educational goals has been of the Scottish Government's complete failure to deliver its programme of spending on schools through NPD?

Earlier, the cabinet secretary talked about the transparency of the Scottish Government. We have lodged many questions on and asked for many details of the reasons for the delays in each project, and those requests have been blanked every single time. The idea that the Government has been transparent on the issue is simply laughable.

We need to understand why there has been a systemic failure in the delivery of the projects and what specific issues there have been so that we can better understand how they will be resolved. It is because we agree that the programme is crucial and important to boosting our economy that we need ministers to ensure that the mistakes are not repeated. I hope that they can reassure us on those concerns, but at this point our concerns very much remain. We are not persuaded that ministers are taking the necessary action to ensure that the projects move forward as they should. We will not support the Scottish Government's amendment, but we will support the motion.

I move amendment S4M-05653.1, to insert at end:

“, and calls on the Scottish Government to detail what discussions it has had with local authorities and communities about the impact of the delay of key capital

projects, including schools, given that the projected £119 million investment for 2012-13 has been revised to zero.”

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Speeches should be up to four minutes, please. We are very tight for time.

15:03

**John Mason (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP):** I think that most of us would agree that capital spending is an extremely good thing and that spending on housing in particular has many benefits beyond the building of houses. Such spending helps jobs, provides better-quality homes, less fuel poverty and better health and education opportunities. However, the reality is that we still have to work within certain constraints, not the least of which is the lack of available funds because of mistakes that have been made down south. We do not have the borrowing powers, but even if we did have them, we must require value for money. We still have to pay back the money that we borrow.

We must be clear that the NPD model is different from the traditional funding model and causes extra complications. In the traditional model, funds can be moved around. If one project is going a bit slower, money can be moved to a project that can go a bit quicker. There have been examples of that in recent years. Money that was made available for the sleeper programme was temporarily moved into Scottish Water and switched back later. We do not have that flexibility with NPD. If a project is being held up and cannot move forward as quickly as we would like it to, that means that it will be slowed down and the funding cannot be switched elsewhere.

However, we must remember that we want value for money. There is a temptation for some to say, “Well, we just want to spend money even if it's not producing what we need.” A good example of that has been the Edinburgh to Glasgow rail improvement project. The plan was to increase capacity by increasing the number of coaches from four trains an hour with six coaches—that is, 24 coaches—to six trains an hour with six coaches, which would cost £1,000 million. However, the Jacobs report then showed us that for £650 million we could increase capacity to 32 coaches an hour—that is, four trains with eight coaches each. I understand that that is still being explored, but it is an example of how we should use money better. Spending £1,000 million is not always better than spending £650 million, if we spend the latter amount wisely.

All the different funding methods must ultimately be paid for. Models such as PFI and PPP were so attractive because the borrowing did not appear on the balance sheet. However, it was still expensive borrowing, which has to be paid back.

As has been said, one reason why we are suffering financially now is that we have to spend so much on PFI repayments.

The Finance Committee has been looking at preventative spending, to which I think all parties are signed up. In that regard, we are looking at what we get out of the system rather than just the amount of money or effort that we put in. At a local level, I am positive about the Scottish Government's investment in the east end of Glasgow, which I think everybody agrees is one of the needier parts of Scotland. In particular, there are projects around the Commonwealth games, some of which have already been completed, such as the Emirates arena, while others are being built—for example, Tollcross pool, the hockey centre and the games village, which of course will become social rented housing after the games.

I very much welcome the recent announcement of £16 million through Clyde Gateway for a further office development on the Clyde, which will have the benefit of bringing more investment in to the area. In the past, we have seen many superficial improvements in Glasgow; we want real improvements now. I am delighted that the George Square plans have been dropped and I hope that something better will happen there.

Westminster should have spent more to counteract the recession and I welcome the Scottish Government's capital expenditure, whether through traditional funding or NPD. I urge the Government to stick to its guns and ensure that the money is spent properly and wisely.

15:07

**Margaret McCulloch (Central Scotland) (Lab):** For the avoidance of doubt, I make it clear that I will vote for the Labour amendment.

Often when we debate capital spend in the chamber, we find ourselves discussing the mismatch between what the Government would like to spend its money on and what it can realistically budget for. However, that is not all that we are discussing today, because the Scottish budget is under severe pressure in both resource departmental expenditure limit and capital. The austerity measures imposed by the UK Treasury are excessive and are sucking the life out of the Scottish and UK economies. Most parties in the chamber, though not all, believe that the chancellor has got it wrong, that it is time for another fiscal stimulus and that a renewed push for growth is long overdue. There was a welcome boost for capital projects from the autumn statement, but public spending on capital remains diminished. Therefore, if the Scottish Government wants to meet its ambitions for infrastructure, it will have to look beyond public budgets.

Frankly, the Scottish Government finds itself in the same position as previous Administrations in Holyrood and at Westminster, or as so many of our local authorities during the Thatcher era, because it must leverage private sector investment into public works if it is to have the slightest chance of realising its ambitions. That is precisely why NPD, just like all the other public-private partnerships that we have known over the years, is so critical.

If I can communicate anything to members today, it will be to stress the urgency of the need for capital investment and job creation in the economy, and the on-going importance of the NPD pipeline. Be in no doubt that the business community will have been watching the infrastructure investment plan and the NPD pipeline, and that some parts of it will be listening to the minister's remarks today. I am afraid that what we have heard in the chamber will not have reassured the business community or construction firms that Scottish ministers understand the urgency of the calls for investment, or that they are developing the shovel-ready pipeline that we have been promised. I do not think that we have heard a single convincing reason for the NPD pipeline delivering so little, given that we were promised so much.

I started by saying that today's debate is about more than the mismatch between what the Government wants to do and what it can do within its budget; it is about the mismatch between what the Scottish Government can budget for and what is actually being spent and delivered. We were promised that £353 million would be invested in NPD projects in 2012-13, but the figure turned out to be £20 million. We were told that £686 million would be invested in NPD projects in 2013-14, but the recent budget confirmed that plans have been scaled back to £338 million.

When the Finance Committee asked for an explanation for that reduction, it was told that it was taking longer than anticipated to develop projects and proceed to procurement. When will the proposed procurement reform bill become an act? The Scottish economy does not have a great deal to gain from taking projects out of development hell just to pass them into a protracted and cumbersome public procurement framework. I remind members that Michael Levack, from the Scottish Building Federation, told the Finance Committee that too many capital projects are

"stuck in the constipated public sector procurement system".—[*Official Report, Finance Committee*, 26 September 2012; c 1618.]

If the procurement reform bill is to make a substantial difference to Scottish businesses it must be introduced in the Parliament without

further delay, so that we can legislate to unclog the system.

15:11

**Richard Lyle (Central Scotland) (SNP):** The Tory motion is a tale of two parties—the Scottish Conservatives against not the Scottish National Party but the UK Conservatives. There are different views on capital projects in Scotland and England.

In Scotland, the Tories complain that we are not spending enough or are failing to spend money that has been set aside. Everyone but the Tories knows that procurement can take time. Placing or setting up a contract takes time and there can be slippage or delay due to legal challenges. I know from a previous life how long it takes for contracts to come to fruition.

When money is set aside for a particular purpose it cannot be spent twice, although Tory and Labour members think that that can be done and often suggest that. If money were moved to another project, I am sure that Opposition parties would demand to know why it was being spent elsewhere. They cannot have their cake and eat it.

In Scotland, the SNP has ensured that capital investment programmes are on course to spend £3.1 billion and support more than 40,000 jobs. The SNP has consistently called for increased capital investment from Westminster following unprecedented cuts to our capital budget. Through the cabinet secretary we have switched £700 million from resource to the capital budget, to support capital investment.

Why have the Scottish Tories failed at every turn to support our calls for increased capital investment? Will the Tories admit that the austerity agenda is not working and that the Westminster coalition cut capital spending too far and too fast, as we have said all along?

London mayor Mr Boris Johnson called on the Treasury and the Bank of England to end their relentless focus on austerity and boost investment in new homes and infrastructure. Johnson said that it was time to

“junk the rhetoric of austerity”

and instead take steps to boost confidence and spending. Lib Dem leader and Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg, too, has admitted that the coalition cut capital spending too far and too fast.

The Scottish Tories would do well to acknowledge that their Westminster Tory colleagues, in partnership with the Lib Dems, have cut Scotland’s capital budget. The SNP and the Scottish Government campaigned solidly for two years for the reversal of the cuts. The Scottish

Tories claim to understand the importance of capital spending, so why do they refuse to support our calls for a boost to the capital budget?

Projects that are planned in Scotland include NHS Lothian’s Royal hospital for sick kids and redevelopment of the Royal Edinburgh hospital, the Borders railway, the Forth replacement crossing, the Parliament House redevelopment and the Wester Hailes healthy living centre. In Glasgow, planned projects include City of Glasgow College, the M8, M73 and M74 improvements and the M8 Baillieston to Newhouse scheme, in my region, which I welcome and which is in procurement. There is also the Edinburgh to Glasgow rail improvement programme.

Projects in construction include the new South Glasgow hospitals and laboratory and Glasgow School of Art. There is also the modernisation of Glasgow’s subway. I could go on and on.

In England, the Tories have scrapped or suspended projects worth £10.5 billion. Michael Gove cut building for schools in six local authorities and was taken to court, where the judge said that the failure was

“so unfair as to amount to an abuse of power”.

Leaked Treasury documents revealed that George Osborne has anticipated that tighter spending will lead to 1.3 million jobs being lost over the years.

If members are looking for a top gloomy fact with which to impress their friends, they could do worse than point out that the squeeze in public finances in 2012-13 is larger than in either of the first two years of the coalition. I support the SNP amendment.

15:15

**Willie Rennie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD):** I once had fears, when I entered this Parliament, that the SNP masses on the back benches would never hold their ministers to account. After that contribution, my fears can be laid to rest. There is no doubt that Richard Lyle put John Swinney and Nicola Sturgeon right up on the rack. They are now scrutinised; they now fear their back benchers, who are doing the job that I feared they would never do. I commend Richard Lyle for his contribution.

However, I feel a little bit sorry for Nicola Sturgeon these days.

**Sandra White (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP):** Oh!

**Willie Rennie:** I know; I never thought that members would hear that from me. Her particular job was handed on by Alex Neil, who I do not see in the chamber this afternoon—at least John

Swinney has the ability and nerve to turn up and answer for the decisions that he has made.

I have a bit of advice for Nicola Sturgeon, because there seems to be a bit of a trend. If the boys offer her a new job in the near future, I would think twice before accepting it. The independence campaign is another indication perhaps of a job that I am sure that Nicola Sturgeon would rather not have accepted.

I am sure that the Government would accept that, in the past, it has said that it could be tremendously proud of being on time and on budget. I do not think we will hear that any more, even from Richard Lyle. Only the SNP could claim success out of failure by saying that it now takes pride in simply reprofiling a programme on time.

This Government is an expert on every other Government, but never on itself. That is certainly an indication—it may not be the first—that this Government is too focused on its obsession with independence to focus on the issues that really matter, which are about creating jobs and opportunities.

**Jim Eadie:** Will the member give way?

**Willie Rennie:** Not just now.

All the issues in this afternoon's debate are devolved, but all we hear about from the ministers is what is happening somewhere else: "Let's blame somewhere else." Well, the UK Government never forced the Scottish Government to make a cock-up of its NPDP programme.

**Jim Eadie:** Will the member give way?

**Willie Rennie:** No, not just now.

John Swinney has lectured us in previous debates for being ignorant and not recognising that capital project programmes are very difficult to deliver. He said:

"Anybody who tries to suggest anything different is not confronting the reality of some of the circumstances".—*[Official Report, 20 December 2012; c 15071.]*

I presume that he recognised that reality back in 2010, when he boasted about the massive programme, about which Alex Neil had previously said:

"These projects will energise our economy and deliver a legacy of infrastructure assets."

I presume that the SNP knew that at the time. I presume that it had confronted reality back in 2010. However, suddenly now anyone who suggests that it has not managed the programme properly is not confronting reality. The SNP needs to confront reality and admit its mistakes. To say that it has been transparent is very far from reality.

**John Swinney:** How did he get all this information? I thought that it was a secret.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Order.

**Willie Rennie:** What we face here is a promise that the SNP would deliver £353 million. It has delivered £20 million. As Gavin Brown rightly said, the SNP said that £100 million would deliver 1,400 jobs. We have £20 million out of £353 million, so I estimate that the SNP has failed to deliver 4,500 jobs—that is the impact of the SNP's mishandling. The SNP should reflect on its own abilities rather than criticise anyone.

15:19

**Stuart McMillan (West Scotland) (SNP):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in the debate. The issue is important not only for members but to the Scottish public, as we can see if we look at the wide extent of capital projects from broadband improvements, to national health service buildings, schools and transport infrastructure. As well as creating jobs in the economy now, those projects create a better, stronger infrastructure for Scotland's future and lay the foundations for long-term success.

I note that the Conservative motion seems to accept the Scottish Government's figure of 1,400 jobs being created from every £100 million of capital investment. If that is the case, perhaps the Scottish Conservatives can highlight it to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and encourage the coalition to change its policies to support the economy rather than attempting to hamper it.

Perhaps Gavin Brown could also confirm whether he, like David Mundell MP, believes that Scotland was extinguished after the treaty of union. It seems strange to discuss the capital expenditure of a country that, in the eyes of the Tories, has been extinguished and has ceased to be—a country that is no more. Perhaps they took their lines from Monty Python. It is another strange situation from the Scottish Conservatives.

Yet again, we are discussing a Conservative motion on Scotland's—or North Britain's—capital projects. It is a motion from a party that, not content with having the double cross on its emblem, is foisting the bedroom tax upon Scotland. Where will all the one-bedroom properties come from before 1 April? Where is the Conservatives' capital plan for new public sector house building?

During the recent budget debate, we heard more rhetoric from the Labour Party with little reasoning and little suggestion of where the money would come from to build the one-bedroom properties before 1 April. Today's debate seems to

highlight that the Tories are of the same mind. "Better together," they say.

The updated infrastructure investment plan demonstrates exactly how the Scottish Government has invested, and will invest, in capital projects that will benefit communities throughout Scotland despite the 26 per cent cuts in its capital budgets. Various projects have already been delivered in my West Scotland region. The Renfrew and Barrhead health centres have been completed, as have the Paisley rail corridor improvements, and the first of two hybrid ferries has been launched at Ferguson Shipbuilders Ltd in Port Glasgow. Those are a few examples of investment that the Scottish Government has already made.

Infrastructure investment is fundamental to delivering sustainable economic growth by supporting jobs through the construction phase and then, once the infrastructure is in use, enabling businesses to grow.

When we consider the role of the NPD model, it is important to remind ourselves of where we came from: the disastrous PFI schemes that were initially developed by the Conservatives and taken to the extreme by Labour. In local government alone, PFI debts have reached the staggering figure of more than £13 billion—more than the annual funding allocation to local councils. In Inverclyde, we see schools to the capital value of £80 million costing £312 million, while in neighbouring Renfrewshire schools with a capital value of £110 million have been transformed into a debt of £538 million.

Even Labour MPs such as Margaret Hodge are now realising their mistake, stating:

"The irony is that we privatised the buildings but nationalised the debts. It's crazy."

Is that sentiment shared by the Tories' not-so-secret weapon in Scotland—their friends in the Scottish Labour Party—or is Scottish Labour too busy providing the human shield for the Tories, who are determined to keep Scotland constrained within its current powers? Judging by John Swinney's intervention on Richard Baker earlier, that certainly still seems to be the case.

With a yes vote in 2014 and the full powers of independence, we could do much more. We would not have to rely on the block grants from London, which are being cut. I certainly hope that, in 2014, the people of Scotland will vote yes to make the infrastructure programme in Scotland a damn sight better than it is now.

15:23

**Alex Johnstone (North East Scotland) (Con):**  
As the cabinet secretary pointed out in her

opening speech, earlier this month the Scottish Government published a so-called progress report on a range of infrastructure projects along with a wish list of new proposals for the coming decade. The timescales of numerous schemes have slipped since last year, while others are coming in tens of millions of pounds over budget. In the Government's updated programme pipeline, a range of initiatives were unveiled with no indication of when they will be delivered or how they will ever be paid for.

I will look at some of the projects that are in the document. The Aberdeen western peripheral route, which was previously estimated to cost as little as £295 million, is now estimated to cost more than £650 million. The A90 upgrade between Balmedie and Tipperty, which was formerly projected to cost between £53 million and £63 million, is now forecast to cost £92 million. Improvements to the M8, the M73 and the M74 are now estimated to cost £415 million, compared with a £280 million estimate last year.

Those figures were announced after weeks of scrutiny from the Scottish Conservatives over why the Government had failed to deliver £480 million of NPD construction projects in the past two years. Alex Salmond boasted that he would spend £350 million in the current financial year, but just £20 million has been spent. In the previous year, he boasted that he would spend £150 million, but nothing was spent. When Ruth Davidson challenged him in the chamber to list the projects that NPD had achieved, he gave us a list of 20 projects, not one of which had been delivered.

The Government's figures suggest that the failure to deliver the £480 million of construction projects could already have cost Scotland tens of thousands of jobs. What was produced was not a progress report but a lack of progress report. We were given a list of schemes that are running over budget or behind schedule, followed by a new list of projects, with no detail on where the money would come from. The nationalist Government might think that announcing the new projects will act as a bribe to voters ahead of the separation referendum in 2014, but the Scottish people can see right through that.

It is bad enough that the Government has failed spectacularly on delivering its NPD schemes and has spent only £20 million of the nearly £500 million that was promised. Now we see a list of other projects that are running the same way.

We have heard time and again in the debate that the Government has suffered from capital reductions that have been passed on from the south, but we must take the opportunity to compare those capital cuts with the Scottish Government's behaviour in relation to its own

capital projects and its failure to deliver through NPD.

**The Minister for Transport and Veterans (Keith Brown):** Will Alex Johnstone take an intervention?

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Alex Johnstone is in his last minute.

**Alex Johnstone:** The repeated argument that organising such things takes time is wearing extremely thin. When only £20 million has been spent in the past two years, we have come to the point when we must address the Government's failures.

The SNP complains about cuts in capital funding, but it is failing to deliver at its own level. The NPD projects have not been delivered, and we need an explanation from the Government for why its policy has failed miserably.

15:28

**Lewis Macdonald (North East Scotland) (Lab):** Investment in capital projects matters everywhere, and nowhere more than in Aberdeen and the north-east. Aberdeen is the most successful city of its size anywhere in the UK and it is currently the best place in Britain in which to find a job. In the next financial year, Aberdeen City Council will become the first council ever to raise more in business rates than it gets in Government grants.

Aberdeen and the north-east are best placed to lead the country on the road to recovery and growth, but weaknesses in the area's infrastructure still constrain its economic potential. It is more than 10 years since Jack McConnell announced the devolved Government's support for the western peripheral route, at an Aberdeen and Grampian Chamber of Commerce conference in January 2003. It is very nearly six years since the SNP was elected and became responsible for delivering that project.

To date, little has been delivered on the ground. Preliminary work has finally got under way, in the current financial year, largely because Aberdeen City Council and Aberdeenshire Council could meet the up-front costs. Despite the long lead-in to getting started, the AWPR is still largely missing from the Scottish Government's spending plans for the next financial year.

A business community that is frustrated by years of delay is—understandably—anxious to see evidence of investment coming forward, especially given that NPD is an unproven funding mechanism for infrastructure projects of such a scale. When Aberdeen and Grampian Chamber of Commerce surveyed its members during north-east business week last year, 87 per cent

identified the AWPR as a key infrastructure investment that would drive growth. That is why the chamber of commerce is calling this week for

“publication of the full business case for the AWPR, in the interests of transparency, to ensure that the full funding package is in place.”

I ask the Scottish Government to agree today to publication of the detailed business case for the AWPR and a full timetable for delivery of the Balmedie to Tippetty and airport sections of the project in particular.

I also agree with the chamber of commerce in its call for “urgent progress” to be made on delivering improvements to the Haudagain roundabout. I ask for a clear commitment today to a date on which that work will begin.

Labour's amendment rightly highlights community engagement in the delivery of capital projects. On 20 December, the third Don crossing was raised in the chamber, and Nicola Sturgeon agreed with me that councils should always take local opinion into account. She said:

“Such considerations are first and foremost for local communities, balancing the needs of the economy and regeneration with the interests of individual communities.”—[*Official Report*, 20 December 2012; c 15022.]

If almost everyone in Aberdeen is for the AWPR and improvements to the Haudagain, almost everyone in Tillydrone is against a third Don crossing being built in that community.

**Keith Brown:** The member might be aware, although he does not seem to be, that there was a legal case against the starting of the AWPR. Can he tell us what Labour would have done differently to bring that forward?

**Lewis Macdonald:** Perhaps I might not have offered that the Scottish Government would pay the legal costs of the objector on one occasion, and perhaps I might have—[*Interruption.*]

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Order.

**Lewis Macdonald:** Perhaps I might have taken a different approach to the planning inquiry. It is interesting that Mr Swinney in particular is so extremely sensitive to criticism of the delay in the project, which has happened on the Government's watch.

**Alex Johnstone:** Will the member take an intervention?

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The member is in his final minute.

**Lewis Macdonald:** In spite of the objections of so many people to the building of a third Don crossing in Tillydrone, a majority of councillors, including members of the SNP, voted to build it regardless. Nicola Sturgeon's comments on the

importance of local opinion were noted at a public meeting in Tillydrone last week and I agreed to pass on an invitation from the local community for her to come to Aberdeen to hear people's views. I hope that she will take up that invitation and that she will convey the views of local people to others in her party.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I regret that you must close, Mr Macdonald.

**Lewis Macdonald:** In that way, Nicola Sturgeon will hear for herself what local people really think about spending priorities, and she will perhaps conclude that those projects that have public support—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** You must close.

**Lewis Macdonald:** —are the ones that should be delivered without further delay.

15:32

**Kenneth Gibson (Cunninghame North) (SNP):** I must say that I was taken aback by the Tories' temerity in bringing to the chamber a debate on capital spending at the same time as their Westminster colleagues are cutting this Parliament's capital budget by 26 per cent in real terms. However, without a trace of irony, Conservative members have today attacked the Scottish Government's record on infrastructure development and capital projects. It really is quite unbelievable. Considering that the SNP is the only party in the Parliament to have recognised the importance of maintaining capital budgets in growing the economy out of recession and that it has made real efforts to boost capital spending, the Tory hypocrisy and that of their Lib Dem lapdogs is frankly staggering.

Of course, while it is easy to point the finger of blame at the Tories, who, for ideological reasons, seem to enjoy cutting Government spending, we must remember that we had the misfortune to have an inept Westminster Labour Government whose chancellor promised cuts that were "deeper and tougher" than those of Margaret Thatcher. Alistair Darling, who has now been reborn as the public face of the let's hold Scotland back campaign, and his colleagues are clearly complicit in the economic mire that the UK is in today. The irony of the Labour and Tory bitter together partners criticising the Scottish Government on capital spending will not be lost.

Gavin Brown questions the success of the NPD model and rejects explanations as to why there has been some delay in delivery. However, at the Finance Committee's meeting on 16 January, Mr Brown was offered a comprehensive explanation by both Barry White and Peter Reekie of the

Scottish Futures Trust, who went into some detail on some of the difficulties that have been encountered and how things have been improved in recent months.

At that meeting, Mr White explained, and I quote—

**Gavin Brown:** Will the member take an intervention?

**Kenneth Gibson:** Can I at least quote Mr White first, before I give active consideration to whether or not I will take an intervention?

Mr White explained:

"It has always been understood that NPD financing is different in nature to capital financing and follows the progress of a project. An example is the Aberdeen western peripheral route"—

about which we have heard much this afternoon—

"which went through a lengthy legal process. In capital financing, if a project is held up in a legal process, the funding can be switched to and spent on other projects; however, in NPD financing, the money is allocated to a specific project and is not interchangeable in that kind of way."—[*Official Report, Finance Committee*, 16 January 2013; c 2043.]

Mr White also explained that often lengthy procurement processes—which are being significantly shortened, incidentally, to just under 18 months on average—can impact on delivery timetables. He pointed to the example that the need to renegotiate PFI contracts at the Royal hospital for sick children in Edinburgh led to significant delays.

**Gavin Brown:** The member says that procurement is significantly shorter than expected. Can he explain why construction on the ground has not happened?

**Kenneth Gibson:** Mr White said that procurement is being significantly shortened. Incidentally, he also said that the money to be spent through NPD would be £200 million more in the financial year 2014-15 than was originally estimated—the Tories seem to have missed that out in their deliberations.

Of course, if we look at the alternative methods pursued by both the Tory and Labour Governments to supplement capital spending—Tory PFI and its rebranded new Labour twin, PPP—we see that those failed policies hung a millstone in the form of billions of pounds of debt around the necks of NHS boards, local authorities and future generations of taxpayers.

In recent years, North Ayrshire Council—until last year it was under Labour control, but it is now SNP, I am pleased to say—built four secondary schools with a capital value of £83 million. However, due to the PFI/PPP model that was pursued, taxpayers will fork out £400 million over



the next 30 years. That profligacy meant that last year North Ayrshire Council spent £11 million on PFI payments—a figure that will rise year on year to £16.6 million in 2037. It is the equivalent of someone buying a modest £83,000 flat and then paying a horrendously expensive rent of £1,111 a month for 30 years. I say “rent” because the property would not even be their own after those 30 years.

Given their shameful records, it beggars belief that the Tories and Labour criticise the NPD model—a model in which profits are capped and surpluses are directed to the public sector.

This Government has shown its commitment to boosting capital spending and has long been ahead of the curve in recognising its importance to growing the economy and creating jobs.

15:36

**Elaine Murray (Dumfriesshire) (Lab):** This has been a useful debate in illuminating the failure of the Scottish Government to deliver on its promises to invest in Scotland’s infrastructure through its much trumpeted Scottish Futures Trust.

The SNP Government deploys two principal arguments. The first, of course, is that everything bad that happens is Westminster’s fault. The current UK Government has been doing many things that I do not like—that is one of the reasons why I will be campaigning for a change in Government in 2015. However, I do not think that we can put every terrible disaster at Westminster’s door.

The second argument that is deployed by SNP Government is that assertion trumps evidence, because if it says something, it must be true, however contrary the evidence. If it says that it has delivered projects, it has, even if those projects are as invisible as the emperor’s new clothes.

To cut through the guff about the recession, the SNP manifesto in 2007 declared that the SNP would propose a new system of infrastructure funding as an alternative to PFI/PPP and that it would introduce a not-for-profit Scottish Futures Trust that would provide lower-cost borrowing opportunities.

Eventually, after much prevarication, which resulted in the infrastructure pipeline virtually drying up, the SNP came forward with NPD. According to Mark Hellowell of the University of Edinburgh, NPD has long-term costs that are “similar” to those of the classic PFI model and

“makes PFI a bit more politically acceptable without changing any of the economics”.

The other slow-moving delivery vehicle—hubco—applies the design, build, finance and manage model that is used in the majority of PPP

projects, where the public sector partner has certainty on costs across the cycle and the private sector partner assumes the risks. What was so novel and so difficult about NPD to make it so delayed?

We have heard already that only £20 million of community health projects will be delivered this financial year and that in the next financial year, project delivery is reduced to 40 per cent of what it was before. It was in fact the Scottish Futures Trust that gave us that information, not the Scottish Government, despite the Government’s assertion about transparency.

When Gavin Brown questioned the First Minister on that dismal delivery record at First Minister’s questions on 31 January, we were again treated to an assertion—the First Minister reeled off 13 projects and bundles that he claimed were being delivered. I have checked the SFT’s most recent pipeline projections and the earliest that any of those will be delivered is 2014, which rather questions the definition of delivery. If I have a parcel delivered, it comes into my possession when it falls through my letterbox and I pick it up, not when the sender goes off to procure a stamp.

The Deputy First Minister mentioned Dumfries and Galloway hospital. That project has not even developed a business case yet, never mind got planning permission.

The Deputy First Minister also claimed earlier this month that the Government was going to deliver 67 schools through the NPD programme. However, its pipeline includes a number of school mergers that require consultation under its own Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010. That includes the Crichton 15-plus school in Dumfries, which is still under consultation. That school is controversial and it might not ever happen, but the Deputy First Minister has asserted that it will be delivered despite the fact that the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning has assured me that public opinion will be seriously considered.

Yet again, we hear assertion and bluster when we want delivery, not a load of warm words.

15:40

**The Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth (John Swinney):** This afternoon we have learned about the subtle difference between Dr Elaine Murray and Richard Baker. At least Dr Elaine Murray thinks of her own jokes to share with Parliament, while Richard Baker repeats Murdo Fraser’s and Gavin Brown’s, to give them full and proper credit for the whole story. It is most revealing that the bitter together campaign has reached the stage of interchanging speeches between Richard Baker

and Gavin Brown to try to reinforce their cheery contribution to the debate.

I will shed some light on more of the similarities in the positions that have been taken by the Conservative Party and the Labour Party today. I return to capital expenditure because that is where the debate really starts on the key issue that needs to be resolved.

As I said to Mr Baker in my intervention, the previous UK Government's final budget in March 2010 forecast that public sector net investment would fall in cash terms from £40 billion in 2010-11 to £23 billion by 2014-15. That is confirmation that the Labour Party planned to apply a significant reduction in capital DEL expenditure to the public sector in general, and the Scottish Government would have felt the consequences of that reduction.

The current UK Government's plans will see public sector net investment fall from £38 billion in 2010-11 to £26 billion in 2014-15. There we see the similarity in the budget approaches taken by the Labour Party and the Conservatives. The Labour Party is in no position to complain about the approach of the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats to capital expenditure because it was the Labour Party that had the gem of the idea that the right way to tackle the financial difficulties that the country faces was to lay into capital expenditure budgets, although it now tries to recoil from its past.

On the scale and substance of capital budgets, Mr Brown has made a great deal of the timetable for NPD and the importance of undertaking that work. I point out to him that if the Scottish Government's capital budget had remained constant at 2010-11 levels, an additional £2.5 billion of capital expenditure would have been available to us to be deployed in the delivery of particular capital projects. To use the rhetoric of the motion that Mr Brown has put forward today, that could have supported 35,000 jobs in Scotland—8,750 jobs each year between 2010-11 and 2014-15. Before Mr Brown lectures anyone about the impact on employment, our starting point must be the UK Government's decisions to reduce capital expenditure in the fashion that it has done.

**Gavin Brown:** How many jobs would have been supported if NPD had been delivered according to the programme?

**John Swinney:** Before Mr Brown gives lessons on capital expenditure, I make the point that the process of capital challenge that we now face started and stopped with the actions first of the Labour Party and then of the Conservative Party, which has carried them on in government.

In her speech, the Deputy First Minister listed the preparatory stages that we have to go through to ensure that projects are well founded. Why does that matter? During the process of preparing the schools programme, for example, our initial estimate was that we would get 55 schools for the budget resources that we had available to us. However, because careful design work has ensured that we do not duplicate effort in similar projects, the current projection is that we can deliver 67 schools for a budget that we originally thought would deliver 55 schools. That is exactly the point that my colleague Mr Mason made.

Somehow, the argument being made in Parliament today is that we should not go through that process. It is argued that we should not be constantly searching to make the money go further and have a greater impact by delivering more improved schools. According to the Conservative Party, we should not be interested in delivering increased value for money for the taxpayer. That is a ludicrous position for even the Conservative Party—including Mr Johnstone—to occupy.

**Alex Johnstone:** Surely the cabinet secretary realises that that is not what we are saying. He appears to be justifying the idea that permanent procrastination will deliver something; it has delivered nothing and will deliver nothing.

**John Swinney:** Mr Johnstone spent most of his speech complaining about the fact that we are spending too much money, so he is hardly in a position to ask us to act in that fashion.

Much of the debate has been about transparency. However, lots of numbers and other bits of information have been floating around in the debate. Where did this lot get the information from? The information has been provided by the Government, by the SFT and by our websites. If Mr Macdonald wants to know when the AWPR is scheduled to start and to be delivered, he should check the Scottish Government's website for the project—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** You should be drawing to a close now, please.

**John Swinney:** That is where all the information is. If Mr Macdonald could do his own research rather than have it handed to him on a plate, he might actually be more effective than he has been today—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Will you close please, Mr Swinney?

**John Swinney:** And if he will forgive me—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Thank you very much, Mr Swinney. That is perfect.

Mr Brown, you have eight minutes.

15:46

**Gavin Brown:** What a place for Mr Swinney to finish. He claimed that the Scottish Government is transparent. Most people think that transparency involves giving information freely and helping people to reach their own decisions. In Mr Swinney's view, even though it took months for us to get anything from the Government, even though its first excuse turned out to be palpably untrue and its second and third excuses also turned out to be untrue, and even though we still do not have the full details months down the line, the Scottish Government is transparent.

We have heard some fantastic contributions, I have to say, from the SNP today

"in terms of the debate".

**John Swinney:** That is a Labour line. Labour and the Tories are swapping lines now.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Order.

**Gavin Brown:** Presiding Officer, the cabinet secretary really should not generate more excitement than he can comfortably contain.

Richard Lyle must be congratulated on making an entire four-minute speech without even passing by the subject of NPD. That record was beaten only by Nicola Sturgeon, who managed four and a half minutes. I have to confess that I got slightly lost during Stuart McMillan's speech, but I was comforted by the fact that he, too, appeared to be lost during it.

Then we had the inimitable Kenneth Gibson, who said with a straight face that the Finance Committee was given a "comprehensive explanation" as to why the projects were delayed. His "comprehensive explanation" involved the Aberdeen western peripheral route, even though speaker after speaker today has gently pointed out that money was never intended to be spent on that project until 2013-14. The AWPR provides no explanation at all—not even a penny's worth of explanation—for the failure in 2011-12 and 2012-13.

Kenneth Gibson also made the bizarre statement that, under the NPD model, procurement is significantly shorter. That might have sounded good as a soundbite, but it is slightly more tricky to explain why, if the procurement process is significantly shorter under the new system, nothing has happened on the ground. He finished off by saying that the Scottish Government is ahead of the curve in creating jobs and growing the economy—all through NPD—without even realising that nothing has happened in its first two years.

We heard particularly disappointing speeches from ministers today. We asked them for some

fairly straightforward stuff at the beginning of the debate. We asked them at least to acknowledge that the results are a bit disappointing, given what has happened on the ground. However, not a single minister or Government representative has admitted that the performance has been disappointing.

We have not had the real reasons why things have been slowed down. We have not heard anything from the Government to suggest that lessons have been learned. We got the usual rant about how it is all Westminster's fault.

**John Swinney:** Well, it is.

**Gavin Brown:** So predictable.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Could we have a bit of courtesy, please?

**Gavin Brown:** In an intervention, Willie Rennie asked a simple question about how much of the failure to deliver on the NPD programme can be blamed on Westminster. The answer to that is nil. The entire NPD programme is devolved, so there is nobody to blame for the failure to deliver on it except the Scottish Government.

**Keith Brown:** Gavin Brown expresses his disappointment with the pace of NPD projects. How does he feel about the west coast main line project that the UK Government has tried to procure for Scotland?

**Gavin Brown:** That is more desperate stuff from Keith Brown. He ignores everything that has been said so far and fails completely to talk about the NPD programme, which the entire debate is about. He tries to throw in anything at all to take away the spotlight that is being shone on his Government.

Nicola Sturgeon said that things have not been delayed at all and that it is simply a matter of "reprofiling". The whole project has been reprofiled—that is a good one to use in any future debate. We heard about transparency. It is not a delay of years; it is just that we have had extra "time taken" in the programme as a whole. Once again, we had nothing but blame thrown at Westminster, despite the fact that the NPD programme is entirely at the behest of the Scottish Government.

We thought that, in John Swinney's closing speech, we might have some explanation of or detail on what has actually happened, but he spent the opening few minutes of his speech talking about what he thought were similarities between the Conservative Party and the Labour Party. I wish that he would get as interested in the NPD programme as he is in talking about other parties, because then we might make some progress.

Mr Swinney also put forward the absurd proposition that the Conservative Party does not think that preparation is important. It is all down to the preparation stages. In November 2010, when he introduced the NPD pipeline and boasted about the £2.5 billion, did he seriously not realise that there would have to be preparation for the construction projects? At that point, he had been in government for three years. He is a smart chap so, surely to goodness, he was pretty aware that some preparation would need to be done on NPD projects to avoid duplication and ensure that the projects function.

We are no further forward at all on community health. A total of £84 million was meant to be spent on community health this year, but it is not being spent, and we do not know why. Around £65 million was supposed to be spent on colleges, but we have not been given a single reason from anybody in the Government as to why not a penny of that investment has happened this year.

**Keith Brown:** What about the west coast main line?

**Gavin Brown:** The west coast main line is not in the NPD programme. As a transport minister, I thought that the member might have been aware of that, but never mind.

In relation to schools, £119 million was supposed to be spent this year, but nil is being spent. We have not had a single reason or justification for that. On roads, £27 million was supposed to be spent, but not a penny will be spent. We do not have a reason for that.

We made some straightforward requests at the start of the debate. The Government should publish the high-level list for 2011-12, just for the sake of completeness and so that we can see what was not delivered in that programme. The Government should explain clearly to the Parliament—perhaps after the debate in a press release or perhaps by publishing a paper—why nothing was delivered in 2011-12, why we are getting only £20 million in 2012-13 and why the figure in 2013-14 is about half of what it was supposed to be. Please can the Government give us a cast-iron assurance that the latest, much lower, projections will be delivered, so that the figure will not be less than £20 million in 2012-13 and not lower than the Government currently says in 2013-14?

## New Medicines

### The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):

The next item of business is a debate on motion S4M-05664, in the name of Jackson Carlaw, on health.

15:55

**Jackson Carlaw (West Scotland) (Con):** The Conservatives have framed the motion with a view to making qualitative progress on the subject of cancer in this afternoon's debate. In that spirit, we will support the Labour amendment and, if the Scottish National Party amendment is supported at decision time, we will support the amended motion. Why? Because no party here has a monopoly of concern on the subject of cancer. Why are we here as politicians? We are here, sometimes, to embrace big issues and make progress on them on behalf of the people of Scotland. Such was the progress that we made on free personal care. Similarly, such must be the progress that the Parliament now makes on the treatment and the delivery of the treatment of cancer.

I acknowledge that there is commitment throughout the chamber. A quick look at motions that are available for members to support will show a motion from John Pentland on the Little Princess Trust; a motion from Jackie Baillie on international childhood cancer day; a motion from Stuart McMillan on the Ellen MacArthur Cancer Trust sailing hub; a motion from Colin Keir on nico35 and fundraising for various cancer charities; a motion from Kevin Stewart on CLAN Cancer Support; a motion from Siobhan McMahon on NHS Lanarkshire's cervical screening award; and a motion from Jackie Baillie on cervical cancer prevention week. Every side of the chamber has members who are committed to advancing the progress that the Parliament can make on the treatment of cancer.

The majority of my colleagues have supported Sandra White's motion on the early detection of breast cancer. I hope all members support the motion. We all have experience of family, friends and colleagues who are facing or who have faced the ordeal of cancer and who, individually, have inspired us in the way in which they face that ordeal and go about their lives as they come to terms with their condition.

As a teenager, before I was ever interested in politics, I would make my way through town on the way home from school and see, underneath the canopy outside Marks and Spencer in Argyle Street, a frail lady of I do not know what age, there in all weathers, shaking a tin on behalf of cancer research. As a young person, it inspired me that

here was somebody who was committed in that way, campaigning for funds for a disease that, at the time, many people refused to talk about in public and for which many of us thought that there would never be a cure.

While Sandra White's motion on breast cancer places the emphasis on early detection, we live in an age of remedy and relief if not yet cure. In 2010, Professor Sir Mike Richards noted that, when it came to making available drugs that had been developed in the previous five years, the UK was 12th out of 14 countries. When it came to making available drugs that had been developed in the previous 10 years, we were 10th out of 14 countries. That led to the introduction in England of the cancer drugs fund, since when some 25,000 people in England have benefited from drugs that are available under that fund.

Those drugs include, famously, and now also available by exception in Scotland, abiraterone for prostate cancer; cetuximab for colorectal, breast, kidney and brain cancer; everolimus for kidney, neck and oesophageal cancer; lapatinib for breast cancer, rituximab for non-Hodgkin lymphoma; sorafenib for kidney cancer; bendamustine for non-Hodgkin; fulvestrant and eribulin for breast cancer; and ipilimumab—which I will say more about later—for melanoma and skin cancers. Those are the top 10 of 23 treatments for cancer that are available in England but not yet available in Scotland.

The only point that I will make this afternoon that may be regarded as politically partisan is that there is sometimes suspicion on our side that the reason why the Scottish Government did not introduce a fund for cancer drugs was that the initiative initially came from a Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition Government elsewhere. It is unfortunate if that is the impression that has been created, even if it is not the reality or the truth.

**Mark McDonald (North East Scotland) (SNP):** Will the member take an intervention?

**Jackson Carlaw:** I will in due course.

It is not a choice between detection and making drugs available—those are two halves of the approach that the Parliament should ensure is made on behalf of people.

**Mark McDonald:** I know that Mr Carlaw was making a fleeting political point, but I will quote to him what Breakthrough Cancer Scotland said:

“Breakthrough would suggest that rather than introducing a Cancer Drugs Fund in Scotland at this stage, when it is likely to have limited impact before the implementation of VBP”—

value-based pricing—

“in 2014, a thorough review of the effectiveness of current drug access system in Scotland is undertaken.”

That review is under way.

Melanoma Action Support Scotland stated that it does not want

“a cancer drugs fund; treatment is required for other life limiting diseases too”,

and MacMillan Cancer Support stated:

“we do not support the introduction of a cancer drugs fund in Scotland”

**Jackson Carlaw:** The member has made his point.

Many of the quotes used by Mark McDonald are from papers that were issued at the commencement of the cancer drugs fund in the expectation that something better would follow in Scotland in the interim. However, we have not made progress in the interim. In consequence, some 25,000 people in England have had access to treatments for cancer that have not been available in Scotland. By calculation, some 2,500 people in Scotland have been denied access to life-saving treatments.

Oncologists made clear the consequences to the Health and Sport Committee during its inquiry. They said:

“If the situation remains with regard to poorer access to new medicines, it will negatively impact on this aspiration, due to a drift in oncologists from within Scotland conducting less innovative research. In addition, due to Scotland in many situations no longer treating patients with the standard of care used in other parts of the world, Scotland may not be able to take the lead or take part in global clinical research studies”.

We cannot afford to allow Scotland to be marginalised in the future development and treatment of cancer.

I pay tribute to the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing. He has commissioned the Routledge and Swainson reviews and, in consequence of the Health and Sport Committee inquiry, he is, to some extent, seeking to escape from the electric policy chair—if I can call it that—of previous Government policy.

We recognise that, from next year, potential value-based pricing will change the emphasis and allow an assessment of the progress of a drug to be calculated. It will put the boot on the other foot and place the emphasis on the pharmaceutical companies to make these drugs available.

Nanette Milne will talk about Tina McGeever and Mike Gray. I would like, by illustration, to talk about Ken Macintosh, who hosted a dinner on behalf of Mascot Melanoma Action Support Scotland. At the event we heard from Girish Gupta, NHS Lanarkshire, and from Tim Crook, consultant medical oncologist at the University of Dundee. We also heard from Paula McIntyre, whose husband, Scott, died last year. He was

given access to ipilimumab through a clinical trial—the drug gave him six additional months of life.

In Joan McAlpine's article in last week's *Daily Record*, she summarised that as:

"New drugs are often of negligible benefit—they prolong life for just a few weeks or months—and only then in particular patients."

**Joan McAlpine (South Scotland) (SNP):** Will the member take an intervention?

**Jackson Carlaw:** No—I want to make the point.

I am not someone who gets overly emotional in politics—I have been around long enough to know that the hard knocks come and they must be accepted, although my children tell me that I cannot get through "ET" or the climax of "The King and I" without blubbing. Nonetheless, it would have taken a hard heart not to recognise that the six additional months that were afforded to Scott McIntyre and his family—in which he had a quality of life that allowed his family to prepare for the end that finally came—were not just to be casually dismissed but were of enormous value to him and his family.

It is essential that the Government—now that it has introduced the rare conditions medicines fund, the principle has been established—recognises that it is time to make progress on addressing the deficiency that exists in the SMC assessment process of affording access to drugs.

I do not care, frankly, whether it is now called a cancer drugs fund in Scotland—it may be called an innovation fund; it may be called a chief scientist's fund. What is required before we get to value-based pricing—and on the back of the reviews that are taking place and following the introduction of the rare conditions medicines fund—is a recognition that cancer is the one condition that we are not serving the people of Scotland effectively with. We need a fund that allows the gap to be plugged between the two. One small step for cancer; one giant leap for cancer sufferers.

I move,

That the Parliament recognises the need to facilitate access to new medicines that are not routinely available or have not been approved by the Scottish Medicines Consortium (SMC); notes that the current arrangements potentially deny NHS patients in Scotland access to some life-enhancing and life-extending drugs that are available to NHS patients in England, particularly for the treatment of cancer; accepts that, while the routine approval of individual drugs is rightly a matter for the SMC, it is equally the case that it is a decision for ministers to allocate appropriate alternative funding for medicines that are not routinely available in Scotland; notes concern at the slow uptake of new medicines in Scotland; believes that such problems need to be addressed to promote Scotland as a centre for medical innovation and research to benefit

patients in the future, and calls on the Scottish Government to come forward with funding to afford access to new medicines in Scotland for cancer patients and others.

16:05

**The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing (Alex Neil):** This is a difficult and very sensitive subject. I think that we all recognise that making decisions about which medicines to provide for national health service patients in Scotland—or, indeed, anywhere else—is highly complex and sensitive. That is particularly the case when decisions are made about medicines to treat chronic or life-limiting conditions. Therefore, it is vital that such decisions are taken by people who have the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to do so—in other words, by clinicians, not politicians.

**Jim Eadie (Edinburgh Southern) (SNP):** Does the cabinet secretary recognise that public trust and confidence go to the heart of the debate, and that the public have a right to expect that if their clinician believes that they would benefit from a medicine in the course of their treatment, that medicine should be made available? Does he agree that, ultimately, that will be the test on which the review of the individual patient treatment request process will be judged?

**Alex Neil:** I will deal with some of those points later in my speech.

Thousands of medicines in various doses and formulations are available to clinicians in the UK. In Scotland, around 15,000 medicines can be prescribed by our doctors for various conditions. The Scottish Medicines Consortium appraises around 60 new medicines each year and publishes advice for NHS boards on their clinical effectiveness and their cost effectiveness. A significant number of those medicines are described as "me too" medicines, which means that they are one of many that are available to treat a particular condition.

The SMC was given the important task of providing national advice for NHS boards in Scotland on which medicines offer the clinical outcomes that clinicians require and represent value for money. In providing such advice, the SMC recognises that when a new medicine is one of many that are available to treat a particular condition, local clinicians are best placed to decide whether that newly launched medicine should be added to the formulary list of medicines that are available for routine prescription for the patient population, or whether there is a preference for prescribing those medicines that they have experience of using, and for which the safety profile is known and trusted.

When an NHS board chooses not to add a new SMC-accepted medicine to its formulary, clinicians may still seek NHS board agreement to prescribe it for individual patients through an extremely straightforward non-formulary request. When the SMC does not recommend a new medicine, NHS boards are not expected to routinely prescribe it, but NHS clinicians can pursue access to such medicines on a case-by-case basis for individual patients when they believe that they can provide a robust clinical case to support it. Those are local clinical decisions, which are based on the clinical circumstances of each patient.

I have listened to concerns that some clinicians and patient groups have raised about differences between the availability of medicines—cancer medicines in particular since the Department of Health launched the cancer drugs fund in England—in Scotland and their availability in England. Although I can fully understand those concerns, it is important to note that comparisons between the medicines that are available in England and those that are available in Scotland are not always valid. Indeed, there are some medicines that have been approved for use in Scotland that have not been approved in England.

Lists of medicines do not tell the whole story about available treatment for cancer or improvements in cancer care. Some improvements are the result of earlier diagnosis or developments in technologies other than medicines. The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, which is the equivalent down south of the SMC, looks at a limited list of new medicines, but the SMC looks at all new medicines. That means that there are SMC-approved medicines available in Scotland that are not available in England. For example, imatinib, which is used for the treatment of certain gastrointestinal tumours, has been accepted for restricted use by the SMC in Scotland but has not been recommended by NICE. Another example is mercaptopurine, which is used for the treatment of certain leukaemias. Although it has been accepted by the SMC, there is no NICE advice for it. That can lead to significant variation in the use of the medicine in the NHS in England, never mind between Scotland and England. The appraisal of new medicines is dynamic, with new and updated advice published every month north and south of the border.

Scotland's decision not to introduce a cancer drugs fund reflects our policy position that ring fencing funding for a single disease area effectively diverts resources away from other conditions, including those that are severe or life limiting. For the record, I point out that the fact that it was proposed by a Tory Government had nothing to do with our policy decision in Scotland.

In providing advice to the Public Petitions Committee in the Scottish Parliament just over a year ago—and well after the introduction of the cancer drugs fund in England—key cancer charities including Breakthrough Breast Cancer, Macmillan Cancer Support Scotland and Myeloma UK recognised that a cancer drugs fund was not a necessary policy measure in Scotland. The view is also shared by the Welsh Government.

That said, I remain committed to considering any way in which we can genuinely improve access to clinically and cost effective medicines that might improve outcomes for patients in Scotland. That is why I have asked Professors Routledge and Scott to oversee a review of how new medicines are introduced in the NHS in Scotland from national appraisal by the SMC through to local NHS board decision making, including IPTRs. I recognise the concerns that have been expressed about how the IPTR process is working and the review—and, no doubt, the review by the Health and Sport Committee—will want to address them.

Finally, the substantial amount of money that is needed to create a separate cancer drugs fund will have to come from elsewhere in the health budget, and those making this proposal must tell us where that money will come from and how much they want to put into the fund so that we know what the policy choices are. It is a difficult decision that politicians are going to have to face up to, but I hope that across the chamber we can at least recognise that, although we might express different points of view on this subject, we should do so in a tone that is appropriate for the patients who are looking on.

I move amendment S4M-05654.2, to leave out from “potentially” to end and insert:

“for all aspects of access to new medicines are subject to an ongoing review; welcomes the introduction of the £21 million Rare Conditions Medicines Fund as an interim measure in response to advice by Professor Charles Swainson, who is undertaking the review of individual patient treatment request processes; accepts that routine approval of individual drugs is rightly a matter for the SMC and that, should the review highlight areas where these processes can be improved, these should be enacted quickly, and believes that the actual benefit to the patient and their quality of life must be the key consideration in determining the use of any new treatment or medicine and that the voices of patients and clinical experts must be heard in the assessment process.”

16:12

**Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab):** I welcome the opportunity to debate access to new medicines in the NHS and the tone of the speeches made by Jackson Carlaw and the cabinet secretary. I also welcome the new medicines review that the cabinet secretary has initiated.

It is right that we consider how the SMC operates. Although its work is highly regarded, it is nevertheless operating under certain constraints as a result of the criteria that the Scottish Government has set. Equally, it is right that we review IPTRs. Clinicians and patients have made it clear to us that those are an obstacle to patients getting the medicines that they need and that the approach varies across Scotland, and we must consider those comments.

Like the SNP, Labour did not support the cancer drugs fund, not because it was proposed by the Tories but partly because we genuinely believed that other equally serious conditions also needed improved access to medicine and that an emphasis on early treatment and a preventative approach led to better outcomes. The operation of the cancer drugs fund in England has also led to a bit of a postcode lottery in places, which is not, I believe, desirable.

That said, the current IPTR system is no longer acceptable. Clinician after clinician came before the Parliament's Health and Sport Committee to criticise it—and they were very brave to do so. They were being placed in the invidious position of recommending patients who they knew would benefit from the drug required in the knowledge that their chances of securing agreement from the health board were very slim.

Let me point members to the words of Dr Stephen Harrow, who is a consultant oncologist at the Beatson. He told the committee that he works in a deprived area in the west of Scotland and that he has to tell patients that there are more drugs that are not available than drugs that they can access.

It took the shocking case of Iain Morrison, which was highlighted in the chamber, to prompt action. He is a man with bowel cancer who had to pay £1,700 a fortnight for the drugs that help to prolong his life. The NHS charged him VAT and an administration fee for the privilege. Thankfully, he now has access to the drugs, but I understand that that took more than one request and the assistance of his constituency MSP.

We heard the case of Anne Fisher, who is a mother of three from Greenock who has cancer. She cannot get access here to drugs that would be available if she lived in England. That simply cannot be right by any measure.

There is also the case of a constituent of mine, whom I shall call Mrs Smith, although that is not her real name. In 2007, Mrs Smith was diagnosed with bowel cancer. Her daughter and her husband contacted my office in 2012 after she had had two IPTRs and appeals rejected. As a result of tests that experts carried out, we know that she would benefit from a 12-week course of cetuximab. Her

third IPTR last October was also unsuccessful. In another health board area, she would have been given the treatment.

I say to the cabinet secretary that that simply cannot go on. Whatever the outcome of the review, the cabinet secretary must ensure that, at the very least, there is not that appalling postcode lottery in Scotland. Access to medicines must improve, and there must be consistency of application across all the 14 health boards in Scotland.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer (Elaine Smith):** You are in your last minute.

**Jackie Baillie:** Fourteen different ways of doing things is no longer acceptable.

Let me turn to the orphan drugs fund. That is very welcome, but it must not just be a sticking plaster. Clarity is needed on how it will be accessed, what conditions will apply and how it will be funded beyond April next year. Indeed, concerns have been raised by many, including the *Daily Record*, which reported that, if every eligible cystic fibrosis sufferer in Scotland were to be prescribed Kalydeco, that would cost £14.5 million. Kalydeco is just one of a number of orphan medicines. We need to be clear about how access will be decided.

I was reflecting on the previous, rather robust and sometimes humorous debate about capital budgets. That made me think that the cabinet secretary has no obstacle to doing something. The issue is not Westminster's fault; it is the responsibility of all of us. I know that the cabinet secretary, unlike his predecessor, has moved quickly to set up the review. As people across Scotland are waiting for life-saving treatments, can he move equally quickly to set up new arrangements that will work in their interests?

I move amendment S4M-05654.1, to insert at end:

“; welcomes the New Medicine Review, which will consider the processes that facilitate access to new medicines, and the fund for orphan drugs that was announced in January 2013; notes serious concerns regarding the system of individual patient treatment requests, and calls on the Scottish Government to ensure that the views of clinicians are central to determining issues of access to medicines.”

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** The debate is extremely tight, and we have already lost a member from it. I ask members to take only their four minutes.

16:18

**Aileen McLeod (South Scotland) (SNP):** I welcome the opportunity to debate a very serious and sensitive issue, particularly as a member of



the Health and Sport Committee, as the issue forms part of our current work plan.

I welcome the Scottish Government's £21 million rare conditions medicines fund, which is a response to the interim recommendations from Professor Charles Swainson, who is leading the review of the individual patient treatment request system. I hope that that review, along with the work that Professor Philip Routledge and Professor Bill Scott are doing on the new medicines approval process of the SMC and the implementation of SMC advice by health boards, will help to improve access to medicines in Scotland and ensure that the system is as flexible and responsive as it can and should be. The review is on-going, of course, and we await the final report to the Government in the spring. I note the cabinet secretary's undertaking to take forward the recommendations. The Government therefore is listening and has listened to the concerns that have been raised by some of our clinicians and patients on access to new medicines.

As the Conservative Party's motion also refers to the need

"to promote Scotland as a centre for medical innovation and research",

I want to reflect on the Scottish Government's efforts in that area. If we consider, for example, its statement of intent for innovation in health, which was launched last June, we will see that it is clear that it is promoting innovation and excellence through the NHS, including new medicines, and that that is very much linked to biosciences and the employment and sustainable growth that we all hope that that sector will continue to generate.

There are projects such as the Edinburgh BioQuarter and the partnership between BioCity Scotland at Newhouse in Lanarkshire and the University of Dundee, which has attracted the biggest-ever investment of its kind in Scotland. European investment of £100 million for a drug discovery project suggests to me that Scotland's life sciences sector, supported as it is by our world-class universities and their research capability, has every opportunity to grow and flourish.

I also want to touch on the issue of the cancer drugs fund. I recognise of course that it is a very sensitive matter and one that confronts policy makers and the medical profession in all publicly funded health systems. The difficulty in accepting the principle of a special fund for cancer drugs is that we as policy makers implicitly assert that cancer is somehow more significant than other serious long-term or life-threatening conditions. I do not believe that that is our task or that by so doing we would serve the wider interests of all those who rely on our national health service.

**Jackson Carlaw:** I understand the point that the member is making, but she has just referred to the £21 million that has been made available for the rare conditions medicine fund. Has that not, in fact, established the principle of committing funding to rare conditions, which now exclude cancer?

**Aileen McLeod:** I speak as somebody who has worn both hats: one as a policy maker and one as a cancer victim and survivor. I am therefore acutely aware of how cancer sufferers and their families feel. However, what I want to do is help prevent people from getting to the stage where they need cancer drugs. That is why the Scottish Government's £30 million for the detect cancer early programme is so important.

The Scottish Government is taking the issue of access to new medicines extremely seriously and is reviewing the processes involved in a detailed and comprehensive manner. Ministers have already indicated and demonstrated their willingness to act on interim recommendations and allocate significant funding. All of us in the chamber are extremely concerned that people with the clinical need to access new medicines can and should do so. The Scottish Government is no less committed to achieving that aim and it will do so while protecting the fundamental principles of universal provision that underlie our NHS. I support the Government's amendment.

16:22

**Duncan McNeil (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab):** I am sure that we will hear a lot in the debate about the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, the Scottish Medicines Consortium, individual patient treatment requests, quality-adjusted life years—QALY—costs, modifiers, area drug and therapeutic committees, value-based pricing, new duties and so on. If anybody is confused after hearing that list, they will know why we need a review into what is a complex set of arrangements that is supposedly designed to ensure that people get access to the medicines that they require when they face serious circumstances.

I will not say too much about the Health and Sport Committee's point of view on the issue, because we have not come to a view on it, so I will be careful in that regard. However, I am very proud that we have been able to help push the issue along.

I would argue that pushing it along was required. The then Cabinet Secretary for Health, Wellbeing and Cities Strategy said in the chamber on 29 September 2011 that she would give "further consideration" to the role of area drug and therapeutic committees and that she would need

to look at that issue and that of individual patient treatment requests to inform the Government's point of view. Indeed, I was in correspondence with the cabinet secretary at that time and was told in January 2012 that the chief medical officer for Scotland and the chief pharmaceutical officer for Scotland had convened a clinical group that would focus on ensuring timeous consideration of SMC processes and would look at individual patient treatment requests. It has therefore taken us a wee while.

It would be remiss of me not to recognise the important role played by the people who campaigned to get access to medicines not just for themselves and who were seriously denigrated in a recent article in the *Daily Record*—one of them is a constituent of mine. They have done a good job in bringing the issue to the Parliament and have campaigned not just for themselves but against an unjust system that they found difficult to understand and that denied them life-changing medicines.

**Joan McAlpine:** I think that the member was referring to my article in the *Daily Record* and I thank him for taking an intervention from me, which Mr Carlaw did not have the guts to do.

The article in the *Daily Record* was well balanced and considered the sensitivities of the issue. The drug that concerned Mr McNeil's constituent was one for which NICE in England gave consent only after the pharmaceutical company gave a discount, which is not available in Scotland. Does the member agree that there is an issue—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Please be brief.

**Joan McAlpine:** Does the member agree that there is an issue to do with pharmaceutical companies holding the health service to ransom—

**Duncan McNeil:** The member will speak in the debate. I hope that I will be given additional time.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I am afraid that this is a very short debate.

**Duncan McNeil:** I accept that the premise of Ms McAlpine's article was that politicians should not be involved in the process at all. However, we set the parameters and we provide the money, so we have a legitimate role in the process, which I have described.

We have debated the issue, but we have delayed and dragged our feet in dealing with a process that is acknowledged to be failing people.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** You must conclude, Mr McNeil.

**Duncan McNeil:** That is why the cabinet secretary instigated a review of the process.

It matters that we lost precious time. That time was not as precious for us as it was for Anne Fisher, whose access to a particular medicine has been determined through procedures that are being reviewed and which the Parliament has found to be not fit for purpose. It is time that we reviewed Anne Fisher's case.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I advise members that we might have to lose another speaker from the debate. Members must take interventions in their own time.

16:26

**Bob Doris (Glasgow) (SNP):** I welcome the debate, although I cannot accept the Conservative motion. I will explain to Jackson Carlaw why that is the case.

Mr Carlaw will not share this view, but I think that the Conservatives are creating the perception that drugs that are not routinely approved by the SMC should pretty much always be approved by another method. All drugs are not routinely approved, whether through method A, method B or method C. That has never happened in Scotland or anywhere in the UK. I say gently to Mr Carlaw that he is creating a false perception that all new drugs will be made available one way or another. That is not the case.

There is also a false perception about individual patient treatment requests. It is thought that any patient who is not prescribed a drug can be encouraged to fill out an IPTR form, even when there is little hope of the drug being approved.

**Dr Richard Simpson (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab):** That is the clinician's decision.

**Bob Doris:** I hear Mr Simpson speaking from a sedentary position. I point out to him that there is a patchwork approach to IPTRs across health board areas. There must be a reason for the lack of consistency across the country.

Mr Carlaw namechecked cancer, but to single out cancer for special treatment is to set a dangerous precedent. The outgoing chair of NICE, Sir Michael Rawlins, said in the context of the cancer drugs fund:

"There are other rotten diseases apart from cancer. To limit it to cancer has always made me uncomfortable".

The incoming chair of NICE, Professor Haslam, said:

"there are other conditions that are as serious as cancer and we should not discriminate against those because they do not have as frightening a name."

We have to be careful. We must take cancer incredibly seriously; we must also ensure that other serious and life-threatening conditions are not regarded as second class. An equitable

approach must be taken. That is a difficult job and it is a job for the SMC rather than politicians. Politicians should get the process right and then ask the SMC to make its judgments based on that process.

Not just the outgoing and incoming chairs of NICE but Prostate Cancer UK, Breakthrough Breast Cancer, Myeloma UK, Macmillan Cancer Support and others support appropriate treatment while rejecting the idea of special treatment for cancer in the form of a cancer drugs fund.

Difficult as the decisions are, the SMC must make them and when it does so it must consider not just cancer but heart disease, multiple sclerosis, cystic fibrosis and other conditions—the list goes on and on. The SMC has the unenviable task of comparing such conditions and working out from the best evidence what drug has the best impact for patients and is cost effective. That is a huge challenge for the SMC, which is a world leader in the process. I am sure that the review will improve the process.

I also want to talk a little about funding. Funding of cancer drugs cannot be talked about in a vacuum.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** You have 30 seconds left.

**Bob Doris:** The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing, Alex Neil, launched the bowel cancer detection hotline just the other day. I will give the number: 0800 0121 833. I encourage all men over 50 to call that hotline and get themselves screened. *[Interruption.]* No, Jackie Baillie, I am not over 50, but I am almost there.

Detect cancer early initiatives cost money. If Mr Carlaw wants to spend money in one place, he has to take it from another place and we have to get the balance right. I believe that we have the balance right, but the process can be improved. I wish that we could talk more about issues with IPTRs and rare conditions—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Mr Doris, you must finish.

**Bob Doris:** It has been identified that rare conditions are not suitably dealt with under IPTRs—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I am afraid that you must finish now.

**Bob Doris:** The review will deal with that.

16:30

**Nanette Milne (North East Scotland) (Con):** I was a member of the Public Petitions Committee in 2008 when Mike Gray from my region presented a petition to Parliament while suffering from

terminal bowel cancer, which was being treated by the non-formulary drug cetuximab.

Mr Gray had initially paid for that drug himself after his consultant's request for it under the exceptional prescribing procedure had been turned down by NHS Grampian. He had found the procedure obscure and difficult to navigate, and in his state of health that was extremely stressful and upsetting. He brought the petition to Parliament to try to ensure that a better process would be put in place for future patients, so that they would not have to undergo the traumas that he experienced.

In the end, Mr Gray was allowed his cetuximab under the NHS, and, indeed, he was reimbursed for the significant costs that he had previously faced up to. Sadly he did not live to see the results of his petition, but his wife, Tina McGeever, worked tirelessly alongside the committee to secure the new IPTR procedure, which was put in place by the then health secretary to make it easier for patients to access modern non-formulary cancer drugs that had been recommended by their clinicians as being likely to extend and to benefit their quality of life.

Everyone was hopeful that future cancer patients would experience a simplified, transparent procedure across Scotland that would allow fair access to modern cancer medicines when their clinicians felt that they were justified. However, despite three CMO guidance documents issued to health boards in as many years, there is as yet no significant evidence to suggest an improvement in access or even a significantly reduced level of inequality across health boards in the implementation of the IPTR process. I know that Tina McGeever and many of us here were very concerned to learn that Christine Grahame's constituent, Ian Morrison, is currently having a very similar experience to Mike Gray and is having to fund cetuximab treatment himself. The review of the IPTR process that the cabinet secretary has set up is very welcome.

In the meantime, a fund such as the cancer drugs fund, which was established in England but refused in Scotland on the grounds that it would be discriminatory against non-cancer patients, could have helped nearly 2,500 Scottish patients so far. Although we welcome the rare conditions medicines fund, it will clearly not benefit patients such as Ian Morrison, and it is awful to think that patients unfortunate enough to develop their cancer in Scotland are not getting some of the new drugs that are now available in England and elsewhere.

Moreover, as oncologists who gave evidence recently to the Health and Sport Committee pointed out, because patients here do not have access to the medicines, they will not get the next-generation state-of-the-art drugs when they

undergo clinical trial, because the new drugs will be judged against those that are currently not approved or available in Scotland but regarded as standard therapies elsewhere in the UK.

That is already leading to some difficulty in recruiting expert staff in our hospitals, and it could result in a drift of experience from Scotland.

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

**Nanette Milne:** If that happens, we could soon lose our position as a leader in cutting edge medical research.

No one disagrees that new drugs require assessment or that the SMC does that with a high degree of expertise and professionalism, but current assessment methods have been shown to disadvantage some disease areas. I hope that the Routledge review will result in further evolution of current methods to allow a wider assessment of a medicine's value.

The cancer drugs fund in England and the proposed rare conditions medicines fund in Scotland are intended to bridge the gap until value-based pricing is introduced next year. However, we must remember that the new pricing mechanism will apply only to drugs that come on stream after its introduction. Cancer patients who need currently available non-formulary drugs will still lose out unless some form of funding is put in place for them to gain access to those medicines.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I am afraid that you must finish.

**Nanette Milne:** I fully endorse the motion in Jackson Carlaw's name and the Labour amendment.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I am sorry, but I can give the next two back-bench speakers only three and a half minutes each.

16:35

**Jayne Baxter (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab):** I declare an interest as a survivor of cancer who takes cancer medication every day.

It was a life-changing event for me to get a cancer diagnosis, experience the fear and loneliness that went with it, and depend totally on our wonderful national health service. Early detection, prompt and skilful treatment, and aftercare from Maggie's Centres enabled me to get on with my life and be here today. I count myself lucky, but I now take nothing for granted.

Having had that experience, I cannot begin to imagine how it must feel for somebody to be told that they have cancer but will not get help because of anomalies in the system, whether because of

money or where they live. I know that choices must be made, but we could at least allow cancer patients to retain their self-respect and not be reduced to lobbying and campaigning for the chance that was freely offered to me.

It is clear from the debate so far that we must have a robust, fair and transparent system for access to medicines in our health system. The evidence to the Health and Sport Committee's continuing inquiry has provided a crucial insight into the issues faced not only by patients and their representative organisations but by the healthcare professionals who are trying to work within the bounds of a complex system. I thank the committee for its continuing work on the matter.

The individual patient treatment request system comes up time and again in the debate on access to medicines that are not routinely available. It seems that the number of IPT requests that are made each year is relatively low. Anecdotal evidence also indicates that the level of submissions to, and patient participation in, the IPTR system varies across health boards in Scotland. That may, of course, be down to a variety of factors, including the cumbersome nature of the process and the time required for each application. It certainly feeds into existing uncertainty about the system's fairness, with patients being left feeling that they are in a postcode lottery.

In many cases, the reason why a patient is not offered a certain medicine or treatment is complex. However, for those who have been diagnosed with a rare or complicated illness, it is often the end of a long, difficult process and, by the point of diagnosis, many simply wish to begin treatment. For them then to discover that a series of barriers—whether real or perceived—lies in the way of access to a drug that could assist them is potentially devastating news. Although there is an appeals process, it is another matter whether the patient or their consultant will want to go through it.

We recognise the need for effective community engagement in the delivery of local health services, but we must also recognise the need for effective engagement with patients at a higher decision-making level in matters such as access to new medicines.

Among the campaigners and health professionals who recently gave evidence to the Health and Sport Committee, there appeared to be a level of confusion about different health boards' interpretation of the current system for accessing medicines. That is despite the Scottish Government and the chief medical officer in Scotland publishing good-practice guidance on the framework for, and consideration of, IPTRs. If, as the motion from the Conservatives suggests, we

move to introduce new funding, it must be done in a way that does not exacerbate the current postcode lottery but puts fairness of access for patients at its heart.

16:38

**Mark McDonald (North East Scotland) (SNP):**

The subject is emotive and, on emotive subjects, it is really important that we ensure that the words that we use are always carefully chosen. We must be careful about using the term “life-saving” when many of the medications about which we are talking are life-extending, rather than life-saving, medicines. We must be very careful when we use such terms in the chamber.

I refer to the author Dr Ben Goldacre, who writes the “Bad Science” column for *The Guardian* and has also written a book called “Bad Pharma: How drug companies mislead doctors and harm patients”. In that book, he says:

“Sometimes ... a deceptively simple explanation for a complex phenomenon can be very powerful; it can prime the reader to accept a specific treatment, but it can also change our whole cultural understanding of a disease.”

To illustrate that point, he examines the media coverage about herceptin. Much of that coverage took place before the drug had even been submitted to NICE and any of the clinical data was in the public domain. However, there was already a concerted media campaign for NICE to approve herceptin.

I will focus some of my speech on that point. While we are talking about the availability of medicines, we must focus on a stark point, which relates to trials and clinical data. A briefing that I have received says:

“The current best estimate is that half of all the clinical trials that have been conducted and completed have never been published in academic journals, and trials with positive results are twice as likely to be published as others. This figure comes from a systematic review conducted in 2010”.

If we are to discuss seriously the availability of medicines, we must do so on the basis of all the available data that relates to the medicines that we are discussing—otherwise, we will fail patients and the public.

The briefing that I have received also says:

“We are not aware of any UK legislation requiring the results of all trials on all drugs in current use to be made available. There is legislation requiring disclosure of adverse events and other monitoring of clinical trials within the UK, and regulation for ‘good clinical practice’ in the conduct of trials, by the MHRA. This legislation does not address biased under-reporting of clinical trials and should not be confused with the issue of missing results.”

I signed up today to the all trials campaign, which calls for the results of all clinical trials to be

published, regardless of what those results are. A huge number of individuals have signed up; I will quote just one, because time is limited. The campaigner Lynn Faulds Wood said:

“good information about drug performance & trials means life or death to many patients but we are frequently not getting it. It is appalling that pharma companies can choose how much to tell us & hide results they don’t like.”

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** You have 30 seconds, Mr McDonald.

**Mark McDonald:** I hope that all members will back the all trials campaign to ensure that, when we discuss the availability of medicines in the Parliament, all the information is available to us.

The position of rare conditions is disanalogous, because the patient cohort for such conditions is so tiny that the likelihood of medicines being affordable is virtually nil. That has been borne out in evidence to the Health and Sport Committee.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** You must conclude.

**Mark McDonald:** The rare conditions fund does not provide an analogy that can be applied to conditions that have a much wider patient cohort.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** I call Dr Richard Simpson, who has a maximum of four minutes.

16:42

**Dr Richard Simpson (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab):** Is it me now?

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Yes, please.

**Dr Simpson:** I am sorry, Presiding Officer—and I have just used up some of my time.

Access to medicines is a difficult area. Of course it is correct that politicians should not be involved in individual decisions—that would be anathema—but it is wrong to say that we as politicians are not involved. As Duncan McNeil said, we set the framework and provide the money. The framework and funding are at the centre of the debate. Joan McAlpine’s article was not helpful in that respect.

**Joan McAlpine:** Will the member take an intervention?

**Dr Simpson:** I will not—I am sorry. Joan McAlpine had a long go before.

There is general support for the Scottish Medicines Consortium, which has not wavered, although people look forward to increased public participation. The fact that all medicines that industry submits—not just those that politicians refer—are reviewed is an important differential

statement made by Scotland, in comparison with what happens in England.

Spending on medicines in the UK is lower than in the rest of Europe. In Scotland, the spending level on innovative medicines used to be the highest among the four countries in the UK, but it is now the lowest. That change is of some importance and I will return to it if I have time.

Jackson Carlaw emphasised the almost universal experience of cancer and the equally universal desire for a cure—or if not a cure, then relief or a remedy. The development of cancer treatment has almost always been incremental. Mark McDonald made a point about treatment not being life-saving, but I say to him that improvements are almost always incremental. When I was a junior doctor, children with leukaemia survived for only a year or two, whereas they now survive with a normal life expectancy. That did not happen in one blinding flash; it happened because a series of drugs was added to, mixed and improved over time.

**Mark McDonald:** Will the member give way?

**Dr Simpson:** I am sorry—I do not have time.

If oncologists tell us that they do not have standard international treatments—the Health and Sport Committee was given that evidence—we really have a problem. We must be sure that medicines are available through one or another system.

Jackson Carlaw reminded us about Scotland's place in clinical research, and Aileen McLeod mentioned the BioQuarter. It is important for our research base that we ensure that innovative medicines that we are involved in trialling are then generally available.

The IPTR system is an important area.

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

**Dr Simpson:** Before I come to that, however, I want to say one thing. The system that we have, whereby the SMC approves something for unrestricted use and 14 separate committees then decide on what happens, is wrong. The chief executive letter says that it must now be done within 90 days. That was a result of pressure in the previous session of Parliament, when we insisted that 18-month delays were unacceptable, but I have to say to the cabinet secretary that the loopholes are still there. Often, the fact that there is not a clinical pathway is used to delay things much further. The system is dysfunctional and it must end. We must ensure that drugs that are approved for unrestricted use are then applied in a much more universal way.

I turn to the IPTR system in my last 30 seconds. It is generally recognised that the system is dysfunctional. Bob Doris said that we need consistency and Jayne Baxter emphasised the importance of fairness. Those are two important points, but there is a catch-22. An IPTR can be applied only to a patient who is different from the trial patients on whom the licence was applied. That is often difficult, if not impossible, for drugs.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Dr Simpson, you really need to close.

**Dr Simpson:** I close on the fact that we have a dysfunctional system. I welcome the review and the new £21 million, but we must have published lists of all those consulted, and the stakeholders must be consulted—

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Dr Simpson, there is no time.

**Dr Simpson:** —before the final decisions are reached.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Thank you.

Cabinet secretary, you should have six minutes. If you can take less, I would be grateful. I have already cut Mr Carlaw's time.

16:46

**Alex Neil:** Thank you, Presiding Officer. Let me use this opportunity to clear up a number of points that have been raised during the debate.

First, on the point about consistency and the need to ensure that we do not have a postcode lottery of differing access to drugs in different areas, I have made it absolutely clear from the day and hour when I set up the Routledge inquiry that a key aim is to make recommendations to ensure that there is absolute consistency in the approach across Scotland so that there is no postcode lottery for access to drugs.

Secondly, I will make a factual point about the rare conditions fund that we set up—the £22 million. I think that it was Jackson Carlaw who said that people with cancer do not have access to the fund. That is not the case; clearly, some cancers are rare conditions, so in those circumstances people would, in principle, have access to the fund's resources.

Thirdly, Jackie Baillie quoted the *Daily Record* on the costs of the fund for cystic fibrosis. Just for the record, I make it clear that we have identified 51 children in Scotland with the Celtic gene who have cystic fibrosis, who would benefit from the drug Kalydeco. The total cost of that is not £14.5 million, but £9 million. I also point out that the £22 million fund is for 13 months only—not for two or three years. Therefore, if every single penny of that £9 million was spent, there would

still be a substantial amount of money left to deal with other situations. I hope that it is useful for Parliament to be made aware of those facts.

Fourthly, to deal with Richard Simpson's final point I make it clear that the report by Professor Routledge should be with me by the end of this calendar month—by the end of February. I do not intend to make final decisions on his recommendations until two things have happened. First, I want to see the Health and Sport Committee's recommendations and so take account of what it has to say on the subject and, secondly, I want to consult on recommendations that are made in the report. I will consult the other parties in Parliament as well as the stakeholder groups.

It is extremely important that we get the decision on the recommendations right. If we rush into a decision and we do not make the right one, we will be back here in a year debating the subject all over again. If the report recommends urgent measures, clearly I would in those circumstances implement them, but I would still do a quick consultation of the appropriate stakeholders and the other parties in Parliament. It is important that Parliament speaks with one voice.

I will stress two other points to do with why we have a difficulty with there being a specific fund for cancer. First, why would we have a fund only to deal with cancer but not with other terminal conditions such as motor neurone disease, MS or muscular dystrophy? We cannot play God and decide that someone who has terminal cancer should be favoured over someone who has terminal muscular dystrophy, MS or motor neurone disease. That is one genuine reason why I am concerned not to repeat the example from down south.

Secondly, medicines are not, in the modern world, always the only or the most effective way to deal with cancer; cancer treatment consists of much more than medicines. For example, over the past three years, the Scottish cancer task force has made available more than £3 million to develop the introduction of new technologies and to drive forward improvement to meet the ambitions of the quality strategy. NHS Scotland is in a strong position and is able to provide patients with new treatments, including intensity modulated radiation therapy. Access to such therapies is as important as access to medicines. This is not just about drugs; it is about other treatments, as well.

On the cancer drugs fund down south, the "Cancer Drugs Fund Bulletin—August 2012", which is the most recent one, shows that in use of the fund there are inconsistent approaches to funding for many medicines in England, and that many patients receive refusals. That situation is

similar to that which we are discussing in relation to the IPTRs.

A study, based on a survey across the United Kingdom, by the centre for health economics and medicines evaluation at Bangor University that was published last year, suggests that the principle of the cancer drugs fund is not supported by the public. The report also found that more than 65 per cent of people did not support paying more for cancer medicines than for other medicines for equally serious health problems. I share that sentiment; that is genuinely—it is nothing to do with party politics—why we have resisted having a cancer drugs fund in Scotland.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Mr Carlaw, I am afraid, as I have already advised you, I can give you only seven minutes.

16:52

**Jackson Carlaw:** I thought that I had only six minutes. I am quite happy to have given up time to facilitate contributions from colleagues.

I begin with a correction; I referred to Sandra White's motion on breast cancer, but it is in fact a motion on bowel cancer. I still encourage all members to support that motion.

I thank all members for how they have contributed to the debate. I feel that it has moved on the discussion on access to cancer medicines from where we were when we last debated the subject in the chamber on a Conservative motion some 18 months ago.

I thank the cabinet secretary for some of his points in his closing speech; he has given some clarity on the rare conditions medicines fund in terms of what he expects the individual cost to be in relation to the particular drug that has been featured. I accept his point that there are cancers whose sufferers will potentially benefit from the fund, too. I also earlier paid tribute to his moving to establish the various inquiries that will be instrumental in bringing about the potential change that many on all sides of the chamber are looking for—Jim Eadie on the SNP side is one of those who hope to see progress being made as a consequence of that.

I also mentioned the Health and Sport Committee inquiry to which Duncan McNeil referred. He and others mentioned Joan McAlpine. I apologise—I was not aware that she was in the chamber earlier. I have never been accused of lacking guts in the chamber before, so I am happy to facilitate an intervention from Ms McAlpine if she would like to make one now.

**Joan McAlpine:** I thank Jackson Carlaw for taking an intervention. I do not expect him to agree with anything that I write in the *Daily Record*, but

perhaps he would like to reflect on comments that were made by Alan Maynard, who is a professor of health economics at the University of York and the leading authority on health economics in the UK. He has described the cancer drugs fund as allowing the pharmaceutical industry to charge very high prices for drugs whose effectiveness has not been proved.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Quickly please, Ms McAlpine.

**Joan McAlpine:** Alan Maynard described the situation as

“‘pork barrel’ politics—bring home the bacon to your supporters in the pharmaceutical industry”.

**Jackson Carlaw:** I saw that comment from Professor Maynard. In fact, we looked into it in a little detail and it was made several months before the institution of the cancer drugs fund in England in 2010. On inquiring, we got a slightly more equivocal response in respect of how things are today.

I understand what Ms McAlpine said in her article, although I will not use the language that she used when she described me as lacking in guts. If she wanted to comment on ipilimumab and its effectiveness and the fact that it gives only a few additional months of life, I would have preferred it if she had managed to come along to that dinner and argue her case in front of the organisations that support the drug and patients who have benefited from it. That is in part where her case should be made—not just in a national newspaper.

Most of the speeches this afternoon were pertinent and to the point. I will not single any member out, except Nanette Milne, Jayne Baxter, Mark McDonald and Richard Simpson. To Bob Doris and the cabinet secretary, I point out that our motion makes no specific mention of a cancer drugs fund; in fact, it talks about cancer sufferers “and others” who have other conditions.

We accept that value pricing will make a difference in a reasonably short space of time, but until that point there is, as a result of the SMC process, unequal access to available cancer medicines that every member in the chamber has hoped all their life to see being made available to alleviate certain cancers. I hope that, in the light of the reviews that have been conducted ahead of value pricing, the Government will be able to make access to those drugs for cancer and other conditions available by exception.

The cabinet secretary asked me how I would fund that. In its recent report, Audit Scotland identified £26 million of waste. Two councils that have blue-bag schemes managed to amass 2 tonnes of unused prescription drugs. Audit

Scotland also tells us that, in the three years 2012 to 2015, medicines that will come off patent or which will become generic will release £316 million in the drugs budget in Scotland, with £26 million being released in the current year from a drugs budget of £1.5 billion. I believe that the funding exists in the same way that £21 million was made available from within those resources for the rare conditions medicine fund.

A new mechanism should be introduced that would, when a new standard of care for cancer or another condition is established outside current Scottish practice, enable a consensus application for funding to be made by Scottish physicians who can provide expert opinion within their clinical field. The Scottish Government could then enter commercial negotiations with the manufacturer to ensure best value, based on the true value that medicines bring to patients. That would ensure that Scottish patients could attain the same standard of care fairly and equitably across the country and would not miss out on the opportunity to benefit from innovative treatments.

**Mark McDonald:** Does Jackson Carlaw accept my earlier point that we cannot legitimately talk about benefit to patients without there being available all the trial data relating to medicines? That is why it is so crucial that all trial data for all medicines be made publicly available.

**Jackson Carlaw:** Mr McDonald made his point well, and I support it. However, we are talking about drugs that are available. In many respects, Scotland is one of the countries in Europe that affords less access than most other nations. We spend less per head on drugs, particularly on cancer drugs, to cure our population. The Government seems to be ready to make that move. Because of the way in which today’s debate has been conducted, and because of what has been said in the Health and Sport Committee, I sense that progress can be made.

On behalf of cancer patients across Scotland, Scottish Conservatives have stood behind them, and other members are also ready to make the commitment, so I hope that the reviews and the cabinet secretary’s leadership will mean that, when next we debate this issue, we will be debating progress in treatment of cancer in Scotland.



## Business Motions

16:59

**The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick):** The next item of business is consideration of business motion S4M-05679, in the name of Joe FitzPatrick, on behalf of the Parliamentary Bureau, setting out a business programme.

*Motion moved,*

That the Parliament agrees the following programme of business—

Tuesday 26 February 2013

2.00 pm Time for Reflection

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

*followed by* Topical Questions (if selected)

*followed by* European and External Relations Committee Debate: The European and External Relations Committee's Report on the EU Priorities of the Committees of the Scottish Parliament

*followed by* Local Government and Regeneration Committee Debate: Public Services Reform: Developing New Ways of Delivering Services

*followed by* Business Motions

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

5.30 pm Decision Time

*followed by* Members' Business

Wednesday 27 February 2013

2.00 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions

2.00 pm Portfolio Questions  
Education and Lifelong Learning

*followed by* Stage 3 Proceedings: Water Resources (Scotland) Bill

*followed by* Business Motions

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

5.00 pm Decision Time

*followed by* Members' Business

Thursday 28 February 2013

11.40 am Parliamentary Bureau Motions

11.40 am General Questions

12.00 pm First Minister's Questions

12.30 pm Members' Business

2.30 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions

2.30 pm Stage 1 Debate: Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Bill

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

5.00 pm Decision Time

Tuesday 5 March 2013

2.00 pm Time for Reflection

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

*followed by* Topical Questions (if selected)

*followed by* Scottish Government Business

*followed by* Business Motions

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

5.00 pm Decision Time

*followed by* Members' Business

Wednesday 6 March 2013

2.00 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions

2.00 pm Portfolio Questions  
Finance, Employment and Sustainable Growth

*followed by* Scottish Government Business

*followed by* Business Motions

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

5.00 pm Decision Time

*followed by* Members' Business

Thursday 7 March 2013

11.40 am Parliamentary Bureau Motions

11.40 am General Questions

12.00 pm First Minister's Questions

12.30 pm Members' Business

2.30 pm Parliamentary Bureau Motions

2.30 pm Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body Question Time

*followed by* Scottish Government Business

*followed by* Parliamentary Bureau Motions

5.00 pm Decision Time—[*Joe FitzPatrick.*]

*Motion agreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** The next item of business is consideration of business motion S4M-05667, in the name of Joe FitzPatrick, on behalf of the Parliamentary Bureau, setting out a stage 2 timetable for the High Hedges (Scotland) Bill.

*Motion moved,*

That the Parliament agrees that consideration of the High Hedges (Scotland) Bill at stage 2 be completed by 8 March 2013.—[*Joe FitzPatrick.*]

*Motion agreed to.*

## Parliamentary Bureau Motion

17:00

**The Presiding Officer (Tricia Marwick):** The next item of business is consideration of a Parliamentary Bureau motion. I ask Joe FitzPatrick to move motion S4M-05666, on the designation of a lead committee.

*Motion moved,*

That the Parliament agrees that the Justice Committee be designated as the lead committee, and that the Health and Sport Committee be designated as a secondary committee, in consideration of the Victims and Witnesses (Scotland) Bill at stage 1.—[*Joe FitzPatrick.*]

**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 seven questions to be put as a result of today's business. The first question is, that amendment S4M-05653.2, in the name of Nicola Sturgeon, which seeks to amend motion S4M-05653, in the name of Gavin Brown, on capital projects, 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)  
 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)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (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)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)  
 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)  
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)  
 Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)  
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)  
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)  
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McDonald, Mark (North East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)  
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (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)  
 Thompson, Dave (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)  
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)  
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)  
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow) (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)  
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Cowdenbeath) (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)  
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)  
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (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)  
 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)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothian) (Con)  
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McTaggart, Anne (Glasgow) (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)  
 Rennie, Willie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)  
 Smith, Drew (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is: For 61, Against 54, Abstentions 0.

*Amendment agreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** The next question is, that amendment S4M-05653.1, in the name of Richard Baker, which seeks to amend motion S4M-05653, in the name of Gavin Brown, on capital projects, as amended, 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)  
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Cowdenbeath) (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)  
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (Lab)  
 Hume, Jim (South Scotland) (LD)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North East Scotland) (Con)  
 Kelly, James (Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 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)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothian) (Con)  
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McTaggart, Anne (Glasgow) (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)  
 Rennie, Willie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)  
 Smith, Drew (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)

#### Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)  
 Adamson, Clare (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (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)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (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)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)  
 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)  
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)  
 Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)  
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)  
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)  
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McDonald, Mark (North East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)  
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (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)  
 Thompson, Dave (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)  
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)  
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)  
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow) (SNP)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is: For 52, Against 63, Abstentions 0.

*Amendment disagreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** The next question is, that amendment S4M-05653, in the name of Gavin Brown, on capital projects, as amended, 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)  
 Baxter, Jayne (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)  
 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)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (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)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)  
 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)  
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)  
 Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)  
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)  
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)  
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McDonald, Mark (North East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)  
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (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)  
 Thompson, Dave (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)  
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)  
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)  
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow) (SNP)

**Against**

Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)  
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)

Baker, Richard (North East Scotland) (Lab)  
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)  
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)  
 Boyack, Sarah (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Brown, Gavin (Lothian) (Con)  
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Cowdenbeath) (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)  
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)  
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (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)  
 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)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothian) (Con)  
 McMahon, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McMahon, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McTaggart, Anne (Glasgow) (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)  
 Rennie, Willie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)  
 Smith, Drew (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is: For 62, Against 53, Abstentions 0.

*Motion, as amended, agreed to,*

That the Parliament notes that the UK Government has cut the Scottish Government's capital budget by 26% in real terms over the UK spending review period and that the previous UK administration was planning an even tougher cash-terms cut of 43% in UK public sector net investment; welcomes the progress made since publication of the Infrastructure Investment Plan in December 2011, with nine major projects now operational and publication of an updated, transparent, pipeline of future Scottish Government investments to assist the construction industry with its forward planning; recognises that, despite the reduction in capital departmental expenditure limits (DEL) from the UK Government, the Scottish Government is on track to invest £3.1 billion this year, using innovative means to supplement capital budgets, including through the Non-Profit Distributing (NPD) programme and switching

resource to capital; believes that time invested now in preparing NPD and hub projects for the market leads to improved value for money, and welcomes the progress on Inverness, Glasgow and Kilmarnock colleges and the M8, M73, and M74 motorway improvements, all of which start construction in 2013-14, along with a range of smaller community health and schools projects.

**The Presiding Officer:** The next question is, that amendment S4M-05654.2, in the name of Alex Neil, which seeks to amend motion S4M-05654, in the name of Jackson Carlaw, on health, 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)  
 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)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (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)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)  
 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)  
 Hume, Jim (South Scotland) (LD)  
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)  
 Ingram, Adam (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)  
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)  
 Keir, Colin (Edinburgh Western) (SNP)  
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)  
 Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)  
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)  
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)  
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)  
 McDonald, Mark (North East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McInnes, Alison (North East Scotland) (LD)  
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)

McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)  
 Rennie, Willie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 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)  
 Thompson, Dave (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)  
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)  
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)  
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow) (SNP)

### Against

McGrigor, Jamie (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Mitchell, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Con)

### Abstentions

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)  
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Cowdenbeath) (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)  
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (Lab)  
 Johnstone, Alex (North East Scotland) (Con)  
 Kelly, James (Rutherglen) (Lab)  
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow Pollok) (Lab)  
 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)  
 McCulloch, Margaret (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McDougall, Margaret (West Scotland) (Lab)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothian) (Con)  
 McMahan, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McMahan, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McTaggart, Anne (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Milne, Nanette (North East 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)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)  
 Smith, Drew (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is: For 67, Against 2, Abstentions 46.

*Amendment agreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** The next question is, that amendment S4M-05654.1, in the name of Jackie Baillie, which seeks to amend motion S4M-05654, in the name of Jackson Carlaw, on health, as amended, 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)  
 Carlaw, Jackson (West Scotland) (Con)  
 Chisholm, Malcolm (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (Lab)  
 Davidson, Ruth (Glasgow) (Con)  
 Dugdale, Kezia (Lothian) (Lab)  
 Eadie, Helen (Cowdenbeath) (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)  
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)  
 Henry, Hugh (Renfrewshire South) (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)  
 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)  
 McLetchie, David (Lothian) (Con)  
 McMahan, Michael (Uddingston and Bellshill) (Lab)  
 McMahan, Siobhan (Central Scotland) (Lab)  
 McNeil, Duncan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (Lab)  
 McTaggart, Anne (Glasgow) (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)  
 Rennie, Willie (Mid Scotland and Fife) (LD)  
 Scanlon, Mary (Highlands and Islands) (Con)  
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)  
 Simpson, Dr Richard (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)  
 Smith, Drew (Glasgow) (Lab)  
 Smith, Elaine (Coatbridge and Chryston) (Lab)  
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)  
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)

**Against**

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)  
 Adamson, Clare (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Allan, Dr Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (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)  
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (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)  
 Ewing, Fergus (Inverness and Nairn) (SNP)  
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)  
 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)  
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)  
 Lyle, Richard (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 MacAskill, Kenny (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)  
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)  
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)  
 MacKenzie, Mike (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)  
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)  
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)  
 Maxwell, Stewart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McDonald, Mark (North East Scotland) (SNP)  
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Aileen (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 McLeod, Fiona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)  
 McMillan, Stuart (West Scotland) (SNP)  
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)  
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (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)  
 Thompson, Dave (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)  
 Urquhart, Jean (Highlands and Islands) (Ind)  
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)  
 White, Sandra (Glasgow Kelvin) (SNP)  
 Wilson, John (Central Scotland) (SNP)  
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow) (SNP)

**The Presiding Officer:** The result of the division is: For 54, Against 61, Abstentions 0.

*Amendment disagreed to.*

**The Presiding Officer:** The next question is that motion S4M-05654, in the name of Jackson Carlaw, on health, as amended, be agreed to.

*Motion, as amended, agreed to,*

That the Parliament recognises the need to facilitate access to new medicines that are not routinely available or have not been approved by the Scottish Medicines Consortium (SMC); notes that the current arrangements for all aspects of access to new medicines are subject to an ongoing review; welcomes the introduction of the £21 million Rare Conditions Medicines Fund as an interim measure in response to advice by Professor Charles Swainson, who is undertaking the review of individual patient treatment request processes; accepts that routine approval of individual drugs is rightly a matter for the SMC and that, should the review highlight areas where these processes can be improved, these should be enacted quickly, and believes that the actual benefit to the patient and their quality of life must be the key consideration in determining the use of any new treatment or medicine and that the voices of patients and clinical experts must be heard in the assessment process.

**The Presiding Officer:** The next question is, that motion S4M-05666, in the name of Joe FitzPatrick, on designation of a lead committee, be agreed to.

*Motion agreed to,*

That the Parliament agrees that the Justice Committee be designated as the lead committee, and that the Health and Sport Committee be designated as a secondary committee, in consideration of the Victims and Witnesses (Scotland) Bill at stage 1.

## Historic Buildings

### The Deputy Presiding Officer (John Scott):

The final item of business today is a members' business debate on motion S4M-05003, in the name of Chic Brodie, on Scotland's historic buildings. The debate will be concluded without any questions being put.

#### *Motion debated,*

That the Parliament recognises what it considers the vital role that historic houses and buildings play in preserving Scotland's rich history; acknowledges the efforts of the Friends of Seafield campaign in Ayrshire, which is attempting to secure the future of Seafield House; believes that Scotland's historic buildings are a fantastic resource for the people of Scotland and will be for future generations, and acknowledges calls for public authorities to do all they can to maintain the condition of important historical buildings.

17:08

**Chic Brodie (South Scotland) (SNP):** It is indeed a privilege to bring this debate to the Parliament. In doing so, I thank the large number of my fellow members of the Scottish Parliament who supported the motion. I pay tribute to the friends of Seafield house, some of whom are here tonight and whose acknowledged motivation and enthusiasm to secure Seafield house's future were easy prompts for me to bring forward this debate. Although I will dwell on Seafield house in Ayr, I am confident that my colleagues who speak tonight will bring their passion and concerns and their understandable parochialism to demonstrate that, across Scotland, historic houses and buildings play a vital role in preserving our rich history and play an active part in our lives today. Indeed, our present and our future are rooted in our past.

Before I expand on that, I say that, in my personal lexicon, there is no such thing as a coincidence. Today, we debate in front of our Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs, who I believe was raised in sight of Seafield house; today is the 100th anniversary of the death of Sir William Arrol, an iconic Scots engineer; and today we watch the progress of a new Forth bridge.

There are many bridges between Scotland's past, present and future; between our icons of the past and their legacies and memories to be enjoyed today and in future. Burns and Scott and their poetry and literature, and Fleming and penicillin, are just a few examples. Tonight, I bring another to the chamber: Sir William Arrol, one of history's greatest civil engineering contractors. I bring his legacies and I appeal for the secure future of his home, Seafield house in Ayr.

I like to think that William Arrol was, early last century, an archetypal Scot: driven, ambitious, and

an unadulterated innovator and entrepreneur. Apparently, he was also a nice man. He was a Liberal unionist but you cannot be perfect in everything. The son of a poor family, at the age of nine he started work as a bobbin maker in a cotton mill in Johnstone. At 14, he became an apprentice blacksmith, rising to the level of foreman in Laidlaw's boiler works in Glasgow. Still he pushed on. Having discovered his love of heavy engineering and bridge building, he created Dalmarnock iron works in 1887. One of his first challenges was building the Caledonian Railway Company bridge over the Clyde at Bothwell. The bridge was built on land and then rolled over the river—a new technique in bridge building, using new tools that Arrol had devised. The next bridge that he built was over the River Clyde at the Broomielaw.

I say this sadly as a Dundonian but, in 1879, the rail bridge over the River Tay collapsed, sending a train crashing into the river and killing 75 people. The event was immortalised in a poem by the great William McGonagall. Although Sir Thomas Bouch designed and built that fateful bridge, because of that event, Sir William Arrol took over responsibility for designing and building a new rail bridge over the Tay while he was working on plans for a new Forth rail bridge. Those iconic structures are still standing today, as is the famous London tower bridge, which he designed and built. To follow were bridges over the Nile, the Hawkesbury bridge in Australia and the Arrol gantry, the largest crane of its type at the time, which was constructed in Belfast to help the construction of three new super liners, one of which was the Titanic.

Not 2 miles from the cottage of our national bard, Robert Burns, lies Seafield house, the home of the aforementioned William Arrol, of whom the provost of Ayr said at his funeral, exactly 100 years ago today:

"Scotland has lost one of her most distinguished sons."

Set in 50 acres of land running down to the seafront at Ayr, the grand lady that is Seafield house stands proud, with her magnificent Italianate tower appointed like a parasol. A grande dame, she was adorned by a magnificent library, a large and beautiful hall, a rich collection of art and so much more. Not only did she look good but she performed well, after Sir William's death, as a hospital for wounded soldiers in the first world war.

In October 1921, she became, appropriately, a maternity and children's hospital. Just as appropriately, from 1944 she served as a renowned paediatric hospital for 47 years before becoming the headquarters of Ayrshire and Arran NHS Board. Despite her beauty and service, she succumbed to fire in 2008. It is time to restore her to her former beauty and service.



Patrick Lorimer, the architectural adviser to the friends of Seafield house said:

“Not only is the building iconic in the light of its original owner it is also a critical and vital element within the historic landscape of this unique part of Ayr; it should and can be rescued.”

Andrew Arrol, one of the two patrons of the friends of Seafield house, said:

“In my view Seafield House can certainly be saved. It is very well built of good durable materials and potentially has many years of life ahead of it.”

I applaud the positive approach of the Ayrshire and Arran NHS Board, Historic Scotland and the council and the determination and positive approach of the friends of Seafield house towards saving and then rebuilding that iconic structure. That would, indeed, be a fitting tribute to our past and a world-renowned Scottish engineer. It would be a bridge to our future; so, too, would naming the new Forth crossing the Arrol bridge.

17:15

**George Adam (Paisley) (SNP):** I thank Chic Brodie for securing the debate and raising issues that relate to Seafield house.

Seafield house was the home of Sir William Arrol who, incidentally, was born in Houston in Renfrewshire. As a nine-year-old, he went to work in a cotton mill, and he worked in mills in Johnstone and—of all places—Paisley.

I want to talk about the historic buildings and Paisley's legacy from industrial times. Paisley is, obviously, Scotland's largest town. During the industrial period, the Clark and Coats families were cotton mill barons. They had a competition to see which family could build the most buildings, which was better and which could give more to the town. Many of their buildings are still standing. The Paisley town hall was, in fact, originally the Clark hall. The Clark family set up a competition to design a hall that they could give to the town. Renfrewshire Council—the previous Scottish National Party Administration of which I was a part—recently invested £1.7 million to ensure that that building was upgraded slightly. More work still needs to be done in such buildings.

The Coats were staunch Baptists and they decided that they would build the largest Baptist church in Europe—they were millionaires and at that time everyone went to church. The Coats memorial church is still the largest Baptist church in Europe. However, the problem is that, as the legacy fund goes down and the Coats family are no longer part of Paisley, only six trustees are looking after that historic building. They can no longer afford building insurance and they have recently had some thefts, including the lead off the

roof, which is something that happens throughout Scotland these days.

The church has about 30 parishioners, whose average age is between 60 and 65. They are talking about an exit strategy and what they should do with the building. There are many buildings throughout the country that are in that position. They are such an important part of our history and heritage. What will our discussion about that be?

Paisley abbey was built 850 years ago for Cluniac monks—it is the only Cluny abbey that is still in one piece. I had the pleasure of addressing the Cluny federation when it came to Paisley. Its members were speaking French and German; I was speaking Paisley. There may have been a slight translation problem. My good friend and colleague Derek Mackay decided that he would trump me by doing his presentation in French. That is an example of the competitive element that is always between us.

The town of Paisley was built around Paisley abbey—there would be no Paisley if that abbey had not been built there 850 years ago. Even the minister in the Church of Scotland has been asking what we should do and what the building's future is. It is difficult for them to look at the abbey as a stand-alone place of worship. During my time as a councillor, the council used it for various conferences and other events because it is right next to the town hall.

We must look at old buildings and find new and different ways of using them. We should retain them as part of our heritage, but we should use them for things that they were not originally intended for. The problem is that the many members of the public who walk by such buildings every single day of their life never go in and see what happens in them, but they are the first to complain should anything happen to them.

We must, in a mature manner, have the debate on historic buildings and decide what we will do with our industrial heritage and our past.

17:19

**Graeme Pearson (South Scotland) (Lab):** I congratulate Chic Brodie on securing the debate, particularly on this date. I say to those members of the public who are in the gallery for the first time that it is not unusual for George Adam to concentrate on Paisley. He never overlooks any chance to mention its name.

One point that George Adam missed out is that Sir William Arrol, who has been referred to throughout the debate, is still a resident of Paisley—he lies in Woodside cemetery in Paisley. I am sure that he would turn in his grave at the

prospect of his beloved home being considered for demolition.

As Chic Brodie said, there is no doubt that Sir William Arrol was a giant of the 19th century. An industrialist and entrepreneur, he began work at nine years of age and went on to be a blacksmith at the mature age of 13. Something that has not been mentioned is that, thereafter, Sir William—like many young people in modern Scotland who attend college and university—went to night class to better himself. He eventually became one of Scotland's great builders and contractors. The Forth rail bridge and the Tay rail bridge are two iconic bridges that are still in the minds of all Scots in the modern Scotland of the 21st century. The Titan crane, which was created by Sir William at a cost of £24,600, is a huge erection that still stands proud on the banks of the Clyde as a memorial to the Clyde's ship-building history.

Why should Seafield house be so important to us? It is an Italianate villa that has a number of original architectural features and a four-storey tower. It not only saw life as a private home, but went on—after Sir William's death—to be a hospital and then the headquarters of a health board. For a man like Sir William to decide to build his house in that fashion says something about the 19th century and tells us where we have come from. The house was built using the labour of many Scottish men and women in the west of Scotland. It stands proud to this day, and it deserves to be invested in for the future.

Seafield house in Ayr is interesting not only because of its design, but because of its role in the local community over time. It has become a significant building that is beloved of the local community. There is no doubt that we all fail to realise the significance of such buildings until we are in danger of losing them. The fact that Seafield house has got into its present state does not say anything about its value for the future.

Scotland's place in the world is to do with its history and the part that it played in creating the world of the future—the world that we now live in. The people of the 19th century left their mark across the globe, and there is no doubt that people from across the globe will want to come and see where that process began. If for no other reason than the place in history that Sir William has and the beauty of the building itself, which Chic Brodie mentioned, the local community needs and deserves our support in ensuring that the house has a future and will be there in another 100 years' time.

17:24

**Graeme Dey (Angus South) (SNP):** Chic Brodie's timing in securing the debate could hardly

have been better. As well as coinciding with the 100th anniversary of the death of Sir William Arrol, it comes just 24 hours after the Parliament hosted an event to celebrate the importance of Scotland's built heritage.

I was delighted to sponsor—on behalf of Scottish Land and Estates and the Historic Houses Association Scotland—last night's gathering, which celebrated the role that our privately owned houses, castles and gardens fulfil in local communities. Those who were present heard of the important part that historic houses play not only in the tourism sector, but in the running of educational and sustainability programmes—87 HHAS members have implemented renewable energy programmes, and a further 92 are planning to embark on such programmes. That is as it should be. After all, our grand historic buildings ought to be at the heart of our communities.

In my constituency lies Glamis castle, which is not only a place of great history and status but a focal point for the people of Angus and beyond. It hosts musical, theatrical and historical events, not to mention the Strathmore highland games, the vehicle extravaganza and the gathering, which after showcasing each of the Angus burghs last year as part of the diamond jubilee celebrations is to be held again this year, albeit without the royal connotations.

Coming from an area that very much appreciates its built heritage, I am concerned by Seafield house's situation and congratulate my colleague Chic Brodie on highlighting its plight. Like so many great buildings, Seafield house has served its community well as an auxiliary hospital for wounded soldiers, a maternity hospital and a sick kids unit before becoming Ayrshire and Arran Health Board's headquarters. It is a tragedy that following the fire of 2008 it lies in its current state, not least because we would surely want some monument to Sir William Arrol, even if, having served as a Liberal MP, he might—as Chic Brodie suggested—have been a little misguided politically.

Upon Sir William Arrol's death in 1913, the provost of Ayr said of him—and I believe that this is the full quotation—

“Scotland has lost one of her most distinguished sons whose memory will be cherished as that of one of the greatest, most modest, most lovable of men.”

Should we not, as the friends of Seafield house are seeking, be cherishing his home? The Tay and Forth bridges stand as testament to Arrol's impact on Scotland and, in another land, the magnificent London Tower bridge bears testimony to the fact that his contribution to the built world extended beyond the borders of our nation. The B-listed

Seafield house is as much part of his life and legacy as those wonderful constructions.

Having acquired the estate in the midst of building the Tay and Forth bridges, Arrol promptly knocked down the house that was already on the site and commissioned the building of Seafield house as we know it. Of course, Sir William did more than commission it. Although the Glasgow architects Clarke and Bell were appointed to design the house, its general features were reputedly designed by the great man himself. It is also reputed to have contained a magnificent library and an extensive art collection as well as providing a first-class setting for musical events. That is all a distant memory, but the shell of the building remains and I offer my best wishes to the friends of Seafield house and their ambitions to restore and make some appropriate use of the building.

We must value and protect our built heritage. Indeed, I was vividly reminded of that last Friday when I returned to my home city of Aberdeen. Heading northwards over Anderson Drive—something I am sad to say I do not do very much these days—I realised that I would have the pleasure of viewing the magnificent granite houses in the Rubislaw den and Queen's Road area. However, I had forgotten that halfway up the hill stands a quite monstrous flatted development that in my view is completely out of place in those surroundings. There is something quite distressing about a beautiful part of a city or town being spoiled by the whims of modern-day planners and builders, and something even more distressing about the loss of wonderful old buildings that need not have been lost.

In restoring and maintaining such constructions, we are also preserving and protecting the skills base required to carry out that work in years to come. In that regard, I praise Historic Scotland's continued commitment to providing modern apprenticeships in stonemasonry.

I again congratulate Chic Brodie on bringing this matter to the Parliament's attention and wish those working to secure a future for Seafield house the very best of fortune.

17:28

**Jamie McGrigor (Highlands and Islands (Con)):** I, too, congratulate Chic Brodie on his very good motion and wish the friends of Seafield house campaign every success for the future in its very worthy cause.

The Scottish Conservatives are very supportive of our historic houses and buildings. We recognise their vital place in preserving Scotland's rich history and culture, and we acknowledge the key part that they play in Scotland's world-class

tourism offering and in attracting numerous visitors to Scotland from elsewhere in the United Kingdom and indeed all over the world.

That is particularly true in my Highlands and Islands region, where many jobs, often in remote communities, are sustained by castles and stately homes that are open to the public. In that respect, it was wonderful to see Inverary castle feature so prominently in the "Downton Abbey" Christmas special. I hope that the programme will give the area a big boost and attract extra visitors to a very special town where the local people and businesses depend on the castle.

Well over a third of our international visitors cite our heritage and culture as the principal reason for coming to Scotland. Blair castle is a must for visitors to Perthshire, and the same can be said of Glamis castle and Scone palace.

Last night, we met members of the Historic Houses Association Scotland at an event sponsored by Graeme Dey. I pay warm tribute to those who are involved in that association for their excellent work. I read with great interest their extremely good, commonsense response to the Scottish Government's land reform review group. HHA Scotland members provide paid employment to around 2,000 people, and around 2,000 more are in employment as a consequence of the letting of business space by the owners. Its members also offer a wide range of educational activities for young people. There are more than 60 educational programmes, and the fact that the bulk of Scotland's built heritage is in independent ownership means that, in most instances, that work does not cost the taxpayer anything.

We are aware of the significant challenges that the managers of historic properties face in preserving them and making them economically viable. Graeme Pearson highlighted that issue. It is a sad fact that, since 1945, more than 200 of Scotland's great houses have been demolished and are thus gone for ever. Central Government and its agencies, local government and the charitable sector must continue to work together and develop ever more innovative solutions that allow us to preserve and, indeed, enhance what we have. Alcohol licensing for historic houses could be applied in a more proportionate way. Perhaps the Government might look at that issue. HHA Scotland is also asking the Scottish Government to promote a low-cost, consistent approach to tourism signs across Scotland to stimulate the local tourism sector.

Another point that should be remembered is that ancient historic buildings are not necessarily suited to some modern draught exclusion and energy efficiency remedies. For example, double glazing would spoil the look of many historic buildings. Broad-brush measures do not

necessarily work; individual solutions must be sought and thought about.

Equally, perhaps fire safety authorities might look more carefully at large historic properties in order to find systems that are affordable and which allow the buildings to continue to accommodate habitation. Obviously, human safety is paramount, but buildings without people are like bodies without souls.

Not all our historic heritage is about castles and fortified houses. There are very fine examples of architecture in our small towns, such as the wee picture house in Campbeltown, the Rothesay pavilion in Bute and the old burgh hall in Dunoon. I apologise to Ayrshire people for mentioning some things in Argyll.

When I travel abroad and meet would-be visitors to Scotland, as I sometimes do, they invariably ask about our built heritage and our exciting, if sometimes bloody, history. Many people abroad go to sleep dreaming of coming to Scotland to see the wonderful treasures, buildings and chattels that we have. We in Scotland must not let them down.

17:32

**Christine Grahame (Midlothian South, Tweeddale and Lauderdale) (SNP):** I congratulate Chic Brodie on the motion. I also congratulate the Seafield house campaigners. However, I am going to be very parochial: I am going to talk about Melrose abbey and Abbotsford house, both of which—luckily for me—are in Melrose in my constituency.

Melrose abbey was built in 1136 and funded by Cistercian monks. Off and on over the decades, it was burned and demolished by the invading English, who were trying to capture Scotland. At one point in its fluctuating fortunes—around 1500—a 100-year reconstruction was completed. People did not move fast in those days. It could be said that it was a perpetually shovel-ready project. Today, even in the ruins, we can appreciate the abbey's grandeur, elegance and design.

Buildings are by people and for people. Melrose abbey also tells the story of Robert the Bruce, whose connection with it goes back to 1326 and one of those rebuilding programmes, courtesy of the English. On his death, Robert the Bruce's heart was sent on a crusade to the holy land with Sir James Douglas. When Sir James was confronted by a large array of Moors, he cast Bruce's heart before him with the cry, "Lead on brave heart". That expression is still occasionally used nowadays, sometimes by me. Later, Bruce's heart was retrieved from the battlefield, and it is interred at Melrose abbey.

I go from a brave heart to the "The Heart of Mid-Lothian"—I think that that is called a link. I am referring to Sir Walter Scott, "Ivanhoe" and the Waverley novels. Scott built his quasi-baronial style home—Abbotsford house—on what was originally known as Clarty land. Now members can see what there is in a name.

Scott indulged his eclectic tastes there—much like myself in my wee terraced property—overlooking his beloved Tweed. Indeed, when he was dying, he had his bed moved into a room with a view of the Tweed so that he could die looking at his beloved river.

I first saw Abbotsford on a frosty January day when the grounds, trimmed hedges and turrets sparkled in the sunshine, and I loved it from that moment. Inside the armoury hallway and up near the rafters are the clan crests. Believe it or not, next to the Scott crest was that of Grahame, with an "e"—the affinity was complete.

Scott's great-great-great granddaughter died in 2004. She was the last of the family to live in what continued to be a family home until her death. Since then, a trust has taken over responsibility for the house, with lottery and Scottish Government funding to restore it. I say to the campaigners in the public gallery that it is a long haul but that they can get there, as has been done with Abbotsford house. In fact, it has been refurbished and will reopen on 4 July—if the queen is invited, so am I.

I have talked about two wonderful historic buildings with stories to tell. When the Borders railway reopens, people will travel from Waverley to Abbotsford at Tweedbank—how appropriate. I might even have a Dandie Dinmont by then.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Thank you very much. To wind up the debate, I call on the Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs, Fiona Hyslop, who is a local Ayr girl.

17:36

**The Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs (Fiona Hyslop):** Thank you very much, Presiding Officer.

I congratulate Chic Brodie on leading what I think has been a very thoughtful and informed debate. Of course, Scotland's historic buildings are an exceptionally important national asset. Our country's image at home and abroad and the way in which we think about Scotland as a historical landscape are based on our wonderful heritage of towns, cities, crofts, castles and country houses. Our historic houses, from the tenements of Edinburgh and Glasgow to the fantastic tower houses and castles of the north-east, are an essential part of that priceless heritage.

The vast majority of those buildings are well cared for and managed by both private and public owners. As Graeme Dey said, many organisations, particularly in the private-ownership sector, contribute so much to Scotland. As private owners, Scotland's people have the main responsibility for looking after our historic environment and they do so very well. Scotland's historic homes are our heritage and, as Christine Grahame so ably set out, the story of our buildings is very much the story of our people.

Seafield house in Ayr is a B-listed building that is the former home of Sir William Arrol, the celebrated builder of the Forth rail bridge. Both George Adam and Graeme Pearson set out his personal history. We are putting forward the Forth rail bridge for nomination as a world heritage site. Of course, we will soon have three crossings for the Forth that will span three centuries. I do not think that any other part of the world will have such an iconic heritage site, once the new Forth crossing is built.

Today is the centenary of the death of Sir William Arrol. His former home, Seafield house, was converted for hospital use. As the Presiding Officer said, I am a local Ayr lass and I used to travel every Saturday morning to play hockey in front of Seafield house at the racecourse. Indeed, I visited my brother when he broke his leg and was a patient in Seafield house, so I am familiar with the building. Of course, it latterly became vacant and suffered fire damage.

I understand that the building's owner, NHS Ayrshire and Arran, has formed a viability group and is looking at all options for the site along with South Ayrshire Council, the Scottish Futures Trust and Historic Scotland. The group will meet again once the consultants' initial work is complete to discuss the way forward.

Along with our key partners in local government, the Scottish Government strongly supports owners and managers of historic buildings through grants, technical advice and statutory regulation to promote and protect our historic buildings for the benefit of all. I recently announced the fifth funding round of our conservation area regeneration scheme, which is run by local authorities. The current round amounts to £10 million to target priority buildings and provide small grants to home owners. Since 2007, £26 million has been awarded across the programme in places such as Elgin, Parkhead Cross in Glasgow, Ayr and Selkirk.

In addition, Historic Scotland's building repair grant scheme has awarded £56 million to historic buildings over the past five years and has levered in a further £271 million to our most outstanding buildings. We have unlocked the potential of our

key historic buildings to deliver for local communities.

Conservation projects that are based around historic buildings benefit communities and can be outstanding architectural projects in their own right. I am thinking about Castlemilk stables, Maryhill burgh halls and, in my constituency, Blackburn house, which is a successful example of how joint working brought investment in heritage-led regeneration. The beautifully restored and converted Blackburn house offers studio, office and gallery space. The friends of Seafield house might want to look at that wonderful community asset, which is run by the Scottish Historic Buildings Trust.

At Linlithgow burgh halls in my constituency, a much-admired local landmark has been recast as a fantastic new community resource, which is part of a heritage set piece that recently tempted Chanel to stage a key fashion show at nearby Linlithgow palace. The historic environment is about the past, but such events demonstrate its potential for generating a dynamic future. Historic buildings are at their best and most secure when they are at the heart of the community.

I urge Jamie McGrigor in particular to visit the recently restored Dalkeith tolbooth and have a look at its appropriate but effective double-glazing.

We should be proud of our positive track record in Scotland on reuse and conversion of our historic buildings. As George Adam said, we should get used to seeing industrial buildings and hospitals converted to residential or business use and thereby remaining part of our landscape and heritage. Our urban designers have shown what can be done and how towns and cities can be re-energised by new projects in historic settings. The Parliament's incorporation of the A-listed Queensberry house in the context of the Holyrood north master plan is testament to that.

There are, quite rightly, concerns about historic buildings that lie unused or derelict. Some buildings are awaiting conversion but a small percentage are not currently well cared for. The reasons for that vary, but a building's poor condition is often all too obvious and has a negative effect on community investment.

To meet the challenge and highlight historic properties that were under threat, the buildings at risk register for Scotland was set up in 1990. The aim was to target buildings for repair, restoration or reuse. The register is run on Historic Scotland's behalf by the Royal Commission for Ancient and Historic Monuments for Scotland. The new body that will be created when the two organisations merge will continue that function.

In addition, in April 2011 a buildings at risk initiative was set up to bring together key

stakeholders over three years, to tackle Scotland's most endangered historic buildings. Historic Scotland has targeted A-listed buildings at risk, to deal with the most important examples of our heritage and to show how such activity addresses wider issues.

Through the national performance framework, we are committed to reducing the percentage of A-listed buildings that are at risk. In 2009, 8.7 per cent of A-listed buildings were at risk, compared with 8.2 per cent in 2011. That steady improvement is continuing; figures were released yesterday that show that the proportion is down to 8 per cent.

Our strategy in the area has two main themes: the targeting of deliverable projects around existing buildings at risk; and the development of effective estate management strategies, in partnership with larger landowners. We will address the on-going redundancy rate in buildings, while continuing to deal with existing buildings at risk. We will work closely with landholders, with advice and support from the Scottish Futures Trust, to deal with issues that can lead to a building becoming at risk, through preventative action.

It is in all our interests to think carefully about the historic buildings in our care and to make positive decisions about them. There are many success stories. Of the 277 A-listed entries on the register in 2009, 199 remain at risk but 32 have been saved and a further 26 are in the process of restoration or conversion.

When a derelict historic property is given a new lease of life in a community, we all feel good. Let us not wait until important historic buildings get into a poor state of repair. The key to good management is planning and early action. We will continue to support public authorities to plan for the continued use, strategic disposal or conversion of their historic buildings, which are our precious heritage.

I thank Chic Brodie for lodging the motion so that this important subject could be debated in the Parliament, and I extend my best wishes to the friends of Seafield house.

**The Deputy Presiding Officer:** Many thanks. As a child I had my tonsils removed in Seafield hospital, so I thank everyone who took part in the debate.

*Meeting closed at 17:44.*

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

e-format first available  
ISBN 978-1-78307-392-4

Revised e-format available  
ISBN 978-1-78307-408-2