



OFFICIAL REPORT
AITHISG OIFIGEIL

Meeting of the Parliament

Thursday 27 October 2016

Session 5



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

© Parliamentary copyright. Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body

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

Thursday 27 October 2016

CONTENTS

	Col.
GENERAL QUESTION TIME	1
Trade Representation (Berlin)	1
“Chronic Pain Services in Scotland: Where are we now?”	2
Station Reopenings (Reston and East Linton)	3
Future Trade with the European Union	4
“Scotland’s Digital Future: A Strategy for Scotland”	5
European Union University Research Programmes (Edinburgh).....	6
Tackling Cybercrime	7
Veterans (Support)	8
FIRST MINISTER’S QUESTION TIME	10
Engagements.....	10
ScotRail (Meetings)	13
Cabinet (Meetings)	16
Cabinet (Meetings)	18
European Union (Scotland’s Position).....	22
Teacher Workloads	23
Children in Care (Support).....	25
Nursing	26
MORTUARY FACILITIES (STANDARDS)	29
<i>Motion debated—[Richard Lochhead].</i>	
Richard Lochhead (Moray) (SNP)	29
Douglas Ross (Highlands and Islands) (Con)	32
Colin Smyth (South Scotland) (Lab).....	33
Maree Todd (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)	35
Graham Simpson (Central Scotland) (Con)	36
The Minister for Public Health and Sport (Aileen Campbell).....	37
ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE (EUROPEAN UNION REFERENDUM)	41
<i>Motion moved—[Roseanna Cunningham].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Maurice Golden].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[David Stewart].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Mark Ruskell].</i>	
<i>Amendment moved—[Liam McArthur].</i>	
The Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform (Roseanna Cunningham)...	41
Maurice Golden (West Scotland) (Con)	46
David Stewart (Highlands and Islands) (Lab).....	50
Mark Ruskell (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)	53
Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD).....	57
Kate Forbes (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)	60
Alexander Burnett (Aberdeenshire West) (Con).....	61
Graeme Dey (Angus South) (SNP)	63
Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab)	66
Emma Harper (South Scotland) (SNP)	68
Finlay Carson (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)	70
Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)	73
John Scott (Ayr) (Con).....	75
Angus MacDonald (Falkirk East) (SNP)	77
Gillian Martin (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP).....	80
Liam McArthur	82
Ross Greer (West Scotland) (Green)	85

Claudia Beamish (South Scotland) (Lab)	88
Gordon Lindhurst (Lothian) (Con).....	90
The Minister for UK Negotiations on Scotland's Place in Europe (Michael Russell)	92
DECISION TIME	97

Scottish Parliament

Thursday 27 October 2016

[The Presiding Officer opened the meeting at 11:40]

General Question Time

Trade Representation (Berlin)

1. Ben Macpherson (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP): To ask the Scottish Government whether it will provide an update on how it plans to establish a permanent trade representation in Berlin. (S5O-00261)

The Cabinet Secretary for Economy, Jobs and Fair Work (Keith Brown): As the First Minister announced on 15 October, the Scottish Government will create a permanent presence in Germany by setting up an innovation and investment hub in Berlin. Staff numbers and precise resource requirements, including the hub's specific location, will be determined as soon as possible. Germany has been selected because it is at the heart of the European Union and offers significant opportunities for enhanced collaborative working with Scotland in areas such as manufacturing.

Ben Macpherson: Can the cabinet secretary explain further the ways in which that initiative will build on Scotland's current positive relationship with Germany and other European nations?

Keith Brown: As I highlighted in my first response, Germany is consistently one of our top five export destinations and a critical market for our tourism industry, and it is our third largest inward investor after the US and France. It is at the political heart of Europe, and the Berlin hub will allow Scotland to build on our existing relationships with European partners and—vitally—to increase trade and investment.

Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab): The First Minister's announcement on increasing trade representation in Berlin is welcome. However, can the cabinet secretary tell members whether additional staff will be recruited for that purpose or whether staff will simply be transferred from other responsibilities in Scottish Development International? Is additional money available? If so, how much?

Keith Brown: The First Minister said, in her statement to which Jackie Baillie referred, that there would be a doubling of SDI staff across the board. The hub in Germany will bring together staff from the Scottish Government, VisitScotland

and SDI on the basis that the number of SDI staff will double, which should increase our presence.

We would be happy to do much of that work in any event, but it is increasingly important and urgent because of the forthcoming consequences of the Brexit vote.

Stuart McMillan (Greenock and Inverclyde) (SNP): One of Berlin's successes has been the huge level of investment in the reintegration of the eastern half of the city, including the refurbishment of older housing stock. Will any new trade mission have a remit to consider how such construction activity could benefit Scotland?

Keith Brown: As I mentioned, Berlin is at the heart of the EU and presents significant opportunities for enhanced collaborative working with Scotland in areas such as manufacturing. We will explore potential in the priority areas that are outlined in our trade and investment strategy, including digital technology, which was raised with the First Minister at the national economic forum earlier this week; high-value manufacturing; healthcare; and the low-carbon sector. We are being proactive to ensure that we increase our trade not only to try to make up for what we foresee as the consequences of Brexit but to increase inclusive economic prosperity in Scotland.

“Chronic Pain Services in Scotland: Where are we now?”

2. Joan McAlpine (South Scotland) (SNP): To ask the Scottish Government what progress it is making on implementing the recommendations of the report “Chronic Pain Services in Scotland: Where are we now?”. (S5O-00262)

The Minister for Mental Health (Maureen Watt): The report, which Healthcare Improvement Scotland published in April 2014, made a number of recommendations to national health service boards and the Scottish Government in order to help to plan and drive improvement in pain services throughout Scotland.

In response to the suggested actions for the Scottish Government, we provided support to the national chronic pain improvement group—formerly the national chronic pain steering group—which was tasked with overseeing work to take forward the relevant recommendations. Having addressed all the recommendations, the group came to its natural end in March 2016.

Additionally, to enable each board to establish the service improvement groups to which the report referred, the Scottish Government made available £1.3 million of pump-prime funding from 2012 for a two-year period. The groups considered the recommendations in the report that were directed towards NHS boards.

Joan McAlpine: I welcome the fact that the new residential centre for chronic pain is up and running at Allander house on the Gartnavel campus, but it could perhaps be more widely publicised.

I note that the centre does not cater for children, and that the Royal hospital for children in Glasgow does not offer a residential integrated service on a par with that offered at the Bath centre for pain services. I have a 12-year-old constituent suffering from complex regional pain syndrome who, in the view of her doctors, requires a residential course of integrated treatment, which can be provided only in Bath. Can the minister give me reassurances that, where the clinical need is proven, we will continue to send a small number of cases to Bath for treatment?

Maureen Watt: I thank the member for her additional questions. Regarding the publicity of the national chronic pain management programme, it has been up and running at Gartnavel campus since November 2015. Since then, 121 patients have been referred from across Scotland. The chronic pain community knows about it, and patient satisfaction with the programme has been very high.

As regards the individual constituent who unfortunately suffers from severe chronic pain, I obviously cannot get into patient details but, because a very small cohort of children fall into that category, services will still be available at Bath if necessary.

Station Reopenings (Reston and East Linton)

3. **John Lamont (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con):** To ask the Scottish Government whether it will provide an update on plans to reopen rail stations at Reston and East Linton. (S5O-00263)

The Minister for Transport and the Islands (Humza Yousaf): If the local authorities decide to proceed with the stations, the Scottish Government will fund 50 per cent of the construction cost for each station, as I have already advised, subject, of course, to a suitable business case being provided. The offer of a 50 per cent contribution is significant and is consistent with the percentage of funding contribution offered for all other bids to the Scottish stations fund for new stations. I have informed the councils that I am considering their latest funding offer, but I remind the member and others that the Scottish stations fund is finite and is very competitive, with a number of applications needing to be considered.

John Lamont: There are sources within Transport Scotland that suggest that Transport Scotland does not want the stations to be

reopened. Can the minister reassure me that that is not the case and that, if it is, the political will of the Government and the desirability of reopening the stations will ensure that those views are overridden?

Humza Yousaf: I do not know what sources the member is referring to. I can give it to him directly from the Scottish Government that, of course, if the business case is there and if the councils are committed to it, which I am sure they are, there is no lack or hesitancy from the Scottish Government whatever on the opening of the stations. That is demonstrated by our putting forward a suggested contribution of 50 per cent, which is in line with other station fund bids that have come in.

I am considering the latest offer from the council, and I will give a response in the next few weeks, but the commitment from the Government is absolutely there. When I first convened a meeting on the matter in my new role, I was heartened by the cross-party support for the stations. With a good campaign by local campaigners, cross-party support, commitment from the Government and commitment from the councils, this can happen, but there is still a gap in funding that needs bridged, which I will consider.

Future Trade with the European Union

4. **Colin Beattie (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what the outcome was of the recent ministerial visit to Munich to discuss future trade with the EU. (S5O-00264)

The Minister for Business, Innovation and Energy (Paul Wheelhouse): The Government is clear in its intention to stay at the very heart of Europe, not on its fringes. The First Minister's recent announcement of a four-point plan to boost trade, including a permanent trade representation in Berlin, is testament to that.

Two weeks ago, supported by Scottish Development International and David Scrimgeour of the British-German Business Network, I led a tech mission to Munich involving four Scottish companies: Epipole, MadeBrave, Machines with Vision and Sunamp. The mission was aimed at promoting stronger economic ties between Scotland and Bavaria by exploring areas of shared interest. Under the banner of "Scotland CAN DO", I was accompanied by key partner organisations driving our innovation ecosystem, such as Women's Enterprise Scotland, the Scottish EDGE fund, WeAreTheFuture, MBM Commercial and Freer Consultancy.

My agenda included a very positive meeting with the Deputy Minister-President of Bavaria, Ilse Aigner, who expressed interest in leading a return mission to Scotland next year, and discussions

with the economic ministry and the Munich municipal authority. It also included a visit to the hugely impressive new IBM Watson facility in Munich, a meeting with a board member of BMW, meetings with the Munich Technology Centre and with the Fraunhofer institute to discuss their project on photonics in Glasgow, and with BayWa r.e. renewable energy—the last two being leading German companies, rooted in Bavaria, that have invested in Scotland. Follow-up actions from those meetings are being pursued, including capitalising on the 17 twinning arrangements between towns and cities in Scotland and Bavaria.

Colin Beattie: Does the minister agree that establishing the trade hub in Berlin underscores the Scottish Government's clear commitment to Europe?

Paul Wheelhouse: I certainly do. The mission demonstrates that there remains a lot of goodwill towards Scotland in the EU, specifically in Bavaria, where we have 17 twinning relationships. The establishment of the innovation and investment hub in Berlin shows, as the cabinet secretary outlined in answer to Mr Macpherson, a strong commitment to building on the links between Germany and Scotland and to exploiting the very strong interest in Germany in investing in Scotland and, indeed, our existing economic links. More broadly, the hub will provide a base from which to develop further the German tourism market and to help raise Scotland's profile in Germany.

“Scotland's Digital Future: A Strategy for Scotland”

5. **Adam Tomkins (Glasgow) (Con):** To ask the Scottish Government what plans it has to review the report, “Scotland's Digital Future: A Strategy for Scotland”. (S5O-00265)

The Cabinet Secretary for Finance and the Constitution (Derek Mackay): The Scottish Government's commitment to refresh its existing digital strategy was detailed in the programme for government announcement. The refreshed strategy will set out how we will take forward our digital ambitions under the vision of realising

“Scotland's full potential in a digital world”,

and will demonstrate the role that digital can play in delivering this Government's priorities and ambitions for Scotland.

Adam Tomkins: Information technology employs around 70,000 people in Scotland and contributes about £3 billion to our economy. The Scottish Government's skills investment plan for the sector has identified that there could be up to 11,000 IT job opportunities every year until 2020. However, in recent conversations with business organisations in Glasgow, I have listened to numerous concerns that business is finding it

difficult to fill software jobs. Is the Scottish Government confident that our schools, colleges and universities are producing people with the right skills to fit the needs of business?

Derek Mackay: Mr Tomkins has raised a very fair point. We will cover skills and education, as well as the approach to science, technology, engineering and maths—STEM—subjects, in ensuring that we calibrate all our systems to support both the public and private sectors, and in improving our capability as it relates to digital so that we can release the potential in our country. Of course, we have to make progress on connectivity, but having the right people with the right skills is absolutely critical. We will focus our attention on that when we refresh and publish our forthcoming strategy.

Willie Coffey (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP): How will digital technologies be used to improve the way in which public services are delivered? How could that help to tackle digital exclusion?

Derek Mackay: There is a fantastic opportunity to redesign some of our public services, to focus on the digital-first approach, and to be more effective and efficient. Revenue Scotland is an example of an organisation that has been very efficient in how it has adapted and created systems around a digital-first approach. We want real customer focus, a “once for Scotland” approach and a calibration of our systems to make them effective and efficient in serving the needs of our citizens through taking advantage of the digital opportunities that are before us.

European Union University Research Programmes (Edinburgh)

6. **Gordon MacDonald (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP):** To ask the Scottish Government what the annual value is of European Union research programmes undertaken at universities in the Edinburgh area. (S5O-00266)

The Minister for Further Education, Higher Education and Science (Shirley-Anne Somerville): Our higher education institutions are active partners in a large number of EU research collaborations and have secured significant funding from EU research programmes, as a result. The Scottish Government does not hold information on the financial value of EU research programmes for specific institutions. However, we understand that universities in the Edinburgh area secured over £36 million in 2014-15 from various EU sources, including EU Government, charities, business and other sources.

Gordon MacDonald: The Royal Society's report on the role of the EU in funding United Kingdom research identified that the UK was a net

beneficiary from EU research and development funding to the tune of €3.4 billion in the period to 2013. Under current EU R and D funding, total spending is expected to be €120 billion in the period up to 2020 and it is anticipated that Scotland will win around €120 million a year in grants under the EU's horizon 2020 research programme. However, that might now be under threat following the Brexit vote. What assurances have been given by the UK Government that our universities will be compensated for any loss of research revenue?

Shirley-Anne Somerville: The UK Chancellor of the Exchequer, Philip Hammond, provided a guarantee on 13 August that horizon 2020 research funding that is granted before we leave the EU will be guaranteed by the Treasury after we leave. I welcome the UK Government guarantee on European funding, including horizon 2020 funding, as far as it goes. I say that because it does not take into account the anecdotal feedback that we are already receiving from higher education institutions about collaborations and the Scottish research impact, with people being told to take a step back from research projects. It also does not take into account any of the future framework programmes that will happen in the EU, which we would have continued to receive benefit from, were we to stay in the European Union.

Tackling Cybercrime

7. Alexander Stewart (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con): To ask the Scottish Government what it is doing to tackle cybercrime in light of the challenges faced by Police Scotland. (S5O-00267)

The Minister for Community Safety and Legal Affairs (Annabelle Ewing): The Scottish Government is committed to working with Police Scotland and the Scottish Police Authority to ensure that the police have more specialists including experts in cybercrime and counter-fraud, and that the service has the right mix and numbers of staff for the future. Police Scotland is also developing its cybercrime infrastructure through the creation of a network of state-of-the-art hubs to ensure that knowledge and skills are maintained to a high level.

Alexander Stewart: I thank the minister for her response. Does she agree with the Association of Scottish Police Superintendents that criminals have evolved faster than Police Scotland and are exploiting advances in digital technology so that the internet is arguably the largest enabler of crime in Scotland? What is the Scottish Government doing to tackle that impact?

Annabelle Ewing: We are working together with Police Scotland to ensure that it has the capacity to deal with the ever-increasing challenges that cybercrime presents, and we are

committed to ensuring that it has the necessary resources to do that.

I will make two points on resources. First, Police Scotland is losing about £25 million per annum through VAT clawback by the UK Government. If Alexander Stewart cares about resources for Police Scotland, he might want to get on the phone to his Westminster colleagues to get that money back to Police Scotland, where it belongs.

Secondly, Europol is a key player in tackling cybercrime, and Police Scotland works closely with it on that and other important initiatives, including on child trafficking. I therefore call on the member to get on the phone to his Westminster colleagues also to ensure that the UK Government opts in to the new Europol regulation so that Police Scotland continues to have access to that key resource in tackling cybercrime.

Veterans (Support)

8. Linda Fabiani (East Kilbride) (SNP): To ask the Scottish Government how it supports veterans. (S5O-00268)

The Cabinet Secretary for Economy, Jobs and Fair Work (Keith Brown): The Scottish Government places great importance on veterans and their families. We have established a state-of-the-art national prosthetics service, committed over £5 million from 2015 for world-class specialist mental health services, and provided almost £4 million for housing for veterans. We have appointed a Scottish Veterans Commissioner—the first such position in the United Kingdom.

I have also published a fresh strategy, “Renewing Our Commitments”, setting out priorities on healthcare, housing and jobs, and earlier this month I announced a partnership with Standard Life, bringing our Scottish veterans fund to a total of £600,000 over three years. We want the private sector to treat veterans as an asset in bridging skills gaps, and this week I held a summit with Prince Charles to launch a new employers network.

Linda Fabiani: I am sure that the cabinet secretary, as I do, welcomes the one-stop shop for veterans that has recently been established in Lanarkshire. However, I have had correspondence with veterans who are concerned about established and on-going medical and respite services. Does the cabinet secretary agree that it would be useful for a representative of his Government to meet me and those concerned veterans to discuss their experiences?

Keith Brown: I welcome the new veterans first point Lanarkshire service, which is one of seven new services to be established across the country. It is based on the award-winning veterans first point Lothian model. Veterans first point

Lanarkshire is building an infrastructure of support for veterans within the local community by working in partnership with national and local agencies.

Our commitment to veterans is absolute, as we set out most recently in the document “Renewing Our Commitments”, which was published earlier this year. Veterans should not be disadvantaged as a result of their service, so it is vital that they receive timely access to the services and support that they need wherever and whenever they need them.

Last night, I attended, with the convener of the cross-party group on armed forces and veterans community, the launch by the Forces in Mind Trust of its report, which says:

“Arguably, Scotland has one of the most robust mental health and related health provision for veterans in the UK”.

However, it also points out, as Linda Fabiani has done, that we have to improve services. In that respect, I am more than happy to arrange a meeting with officials from the Scottish Government and the veterans whom she mentioned.

First Minister’s Question Time

12:00

Engagements

1. Ruth Davidson (Edinburgh Central) (Con): I congratulate the Presiding Officer on his recent appointment to Her Majesty’s Privy Council.

To ask the First Minister what engagements she has planned for the rest of the day. (S5F-00361)

The First Minister (Nicola Sturgeon): Engagements to take forward the Government’s programme for Scotland.

Ruth Davidson: It is clear that the Scottish national health service is in crisis. Audit Scotland said that there is “no evidence” of a clear long-term plan from the Government to put the NHS in order. The First Minister has been in charge of the Scottish NHS for nearly 10 years. Can she claim today to have such a plan?

The First Minister: Presiding Officer,

“Over the last decade, there have been improvements in the way health services are delivered and reductions in the time that patients need to wait for hospital ... treatment. There have also been improvements in overall health, life expectancy, patient safety and survival rates for a number of conditions, such as heart disease.”

Those are not my words; that is the first paragraph of the Audit Scotland report that was published today. Context is important.

Notwithstanding all that, the NHS faces challenges. It faces rising demand, principally from an ageing population. The challenges are in no way unique to Scotland. They are common to health systems around the world, which is a point that the Auditor General for Scotland made on the radio this morning. She also said that Scotland’s performance stands up well against that of the rest of the UK. In the light of those challenges—in the light of that rise in demand—we are ensuring record levels of funding and will increase funding by more than the rate of inflation over the course of this parliamentary session. Those challenges are why we have ensured that, as Audit Scotland said,

“staff levels are at the highest level ever”.

Those challenges are why we are not just investing in the health service but reforming it, through integration of health and social care, shifting resources into social care and primary care and expanding elective capacity for routine operations.

There is nothing unique about the challenges that are faced by the health service in Scotland,

but the Government is focused on meeting them and we will continue to do that.

Ruth Davidson: The First Minister is the only person in Scotland reading today's papers who thinks that her Government deserves a pat on the back for its performance on healthcare.

The reason why I asked my specific question, which the First Minister ducked, was that the Audit Scotland report that I quoted from was not from today. It was the one that came out in 2007, when the SNP first came to power. Nearly 10 years on, Audit Scotland reports with the exact same warning that it gave then about the lack of a clear plan and the failure of this Government to get a grip, which has inevitable costs: waiting time targets being missed, doctors and nurses under ever-greater pressure and health boards on the brink.

The Royal College of Nursing asks today:

"How many ... reports will be published by Audit Scotland before action is taken?"

That is a fair question, so what is the answer?

The First Minister: I am very happy to compare the situation in the health service today with the situation in the health service in 2007, when this Government took office. There is now more than £3 billion more investment in the health service than there was when we took office. There are 11,000 more medical professionals, nurses and other healthcare professionals working in our health service, which is why Audit Scotland today says that staffing levels are at an all-time high.

Of course there are challenges around waiting times in our health service, but let us look at the position when we took office. Back then, just 85 per cent of in-patients were seen within 18 weeks; today, more than 90 per cent of in-patients are seen within 12 weeks. The NHS is performing better against a tougher target.

Let us look at out-patients. When we took office, 70 per cent of out-patients were seen within 12 weeks; today, more than 85 per cent of out-patients are seen within 12 weeks.

The performance of our accident and emergency departments is 8 per cent higher than that of accident and emergency departments in England, where the Tories are in government.

Yes, there are challenges in our health service. That is why we have our vision 2020 strategy; why we have put in place our new clinical strategy; why we are planning increased investment in the health service; why we are determined to shift the balance of care into community, social and primary care; and why we will continue to focus on ensuring that we improve the health service so

that it continues to have what it has today: high patient satisfaction levels.

Ruth Davidson: So, on my first question, there is no answer to the charges levelled by Audit Scotland and, on my second question, there is no answer to the charges levelled by the RCN and Scotland's nurses.

We need to spell things out for what they are, and that is the failure of the Government to get to grips with our NHS. It is an outrage. Health boards are having to make huge savings in order to break even, to take out loans to keep going and to put off essential repairs to hospital buildings, yet we have also learned today that, because of the Government's failure to manage staffing, there has been a 47 per cent increase in agency nursing and midwifery staff and—staggeringly—that individual agency doctors are being paid more than £400,000 each to provide cover for periods of less than a year. All that is happening while patient care suffers from cuts and hospital buildings are left to crumble. I call that a scandal. What does the First Minister call it?

The First Minister: Health service funding is higher than it was when we took office; the number of people working in our health service is higher than it was when we took office; and waiting times are lower than they were when we took office.

The hypocrisy of Ruth Davidson is staggering. She talks about the financial performance of health boards in Scotland; that is, of course, challenging, but health boards in Scotland met all their financial targets, as narrated by Audit Scotland today. In the same year that Audit Scotland looked at, the NHS in England had a deficit of £2.5 billion, which was three times its deficit in the previous year. Agency spend for nurses is 0.4 per cent of the total budget, and that spend per head of population is less than a third of what it is in England, where the Tories run the health service.

The point that I am making is this: our NHS faces challenges, but those challenges are not unique to Scotland. They are being faced by health systems across the world. As the Auditor General herself said this morning, when it comes to facing up to the challenges, Scotland is performing well compared with other parts of the UK, and we will continue to focus on making sure that we do that.

Ruth Davidson: The point is this: although there have been some improvements in some areas over the past 10 years—

Members: Oh!

Ruth Davidson: —which are welcome as far as they go, there is a big question about reforms that

would give our NHS a sustainable future and allow health boards to budget for the long term. Successive Scottish National Party ministers, including this First Minister when she was in the role, have ducked the big challenges. When the SNP came to power, we had the opportunity to avoid that, but now we have an unavoidable crisis on our hands because the Government has preferred sticking-plaster solutions and, as we have heard today, a strategy of no clear framework, no milestones and no costings.

Audit Scotland and the Royal College of Nursing are recommending today that health boards be given more flexibility to plan by having three-year rolling budgets instead of annual financial targets. We will back that. Will the First Minister?

The First Minister: That last question was a case of not waving, but drowning, with the grudging acceptance that there have been some improvements. There have been lots of improvements in the NHS in Scotland, unlike in England, where her party is in charge.

We will continue to focus on that. That is why we have integrated health and social care, why we have put in place a new national clinical strategy and why we have a range of work to improve population health. All that adds up to delivering our 2020 strategy and our broader strategy to 2030. Of course, Ruth Davidson should know that work is under way to combine all that work into a single delivery framework, which will be published before the end of this year.

I do not deny the challenges in our health service. There are challenges faced by health services right across the world, but the performance of our health service is good. Those who work in it deserve our thanks, and the Government will continue to work hard to support them.

ScotRail (Meetings)

2. **Kezia Dugdale (Lothian) (Lab):** To ask the First Minister when she last met ScotRail. (S5F-00392)

The First Minister (Nicola Sturgeon): Scottish Government ministers meet ScotRail regularly. The Minister for Transport and the Islands did so most recently last week.

Kezia Dugdale: We discovered today that ScotRail is not the only thing that is going off the rails under the Government. The independent experts at Audit Scotland gave our national health service under the Scottish National Party a check-up, and the results of a decade of SNP control produced a grim diagnosis. Funding is not keeping pace with increasing demand and patient need. Only one of eight key targets has been met. A

workforce crisis that has been brewing for years is getting worse.

Those problems did not appear overnight—they are the legacy of a decade of the SNP controlling our NHS. The First Minister was the health secretary for the best part of those 10 years. Does she accept full responsibility for the problems that it now faces?

The First Minister: Yes—as First Minister, I accept full responsibility for what happens in the health service. I also accept responsibility for the fact that the health service budget is £3 billion higher than it was when we took office, for the fact that there are 11,000 more staff working in our health service than there were when we took office and for the fact that, whether we look at in-patient waiting times or out-patient waiting times, those times are lower today than they were when the Government took office. I accept responsibility for all that and more.

I accept responsibility for the manifesto commitment that we made in the recent election, whereby we said that, over this parliamentary session, we would build on the increases that we had already made and increase the health budget by £500 million more than inflation. Kezia Dugdale has a cheek to talk about funding in our health service when she authored a manifesto that promised the lowest funding increase to the health service of any party that contested the election. Perhaps she should put her own house in order.

Kezia Dugdale: The First Minister can read out every statistic that she likes from her big book of excuses, but there is a human cost to a decade of SNP mismanagement. We can just ask the patients. One patient who is not satisfied is James Neilson from Fauldhouse. He was a miner who had worked down the pit his whole life. He has a blocked artery in his leg. He wanted to be in the public gallery today but, when I spoke to him this morning, he was in too much pain to leave the house. He has been told that he will have to wait seven months for an appointment. That is a seven-month wait not for treatment but for an appointment.

We have heard the First Minister reel off a lot of statistics. Will she explain to Mr Neilson why, under her Government, he has to wait seven months to see a consultant?

The First Minister: I absolutely agree with Kezia Dugdale that behind all the statistics that all of us cite on the health service lie human beings. I am happy to ask the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport to look into Mr Neilson's case, but I will not comment on it today without having all the details; it would not be reasonable for me to do so.

I repeat the point that I made earlier. As long as one patient in our health service is waiting too

long, that is one too many. I will be the first to say that and to say that we have more work to do. However, I look back at the situation that existed when we took office. I repeat that, at that time, 70 per cent of out-patients were seen within the target of 12 weeks. Today, the figure is 85 per cent. That is not good enough, but it means that we are performing well and that the health service is performing better than it was when we took office.

I say again that we have a great deal to be proud of in the way in which our health service operates and the services that it delivers. That is why there is record patient satisfaction in our health service. Of course, there is much work still to do, which is why the Government is focused on doing it.

Kezia Dugdale: Mr Neilson does not want to know what was happening 10 years ago; he wants to know when he will see a doctor.

The First Minister might not want to listen to me on the NHS and she might want to disregard Mr Neilson's case, but she cannot ignore what NHS staff are saying. One in four general practitioner surgeries are short of staff and nine out of 10 nurses say that their workload is getting worse.

This summer, the First Minister set up a listening exercise, but she is not listening to patients, doctors and nurses. She should stop living in denial. When will she wake up to the NHS crisis that started on her watch?

The First Minister: The problem for Opposition leaders is that they forget that people are sitting at home and watching our exchanges, so those people will know that I did not disregard the case of Mr Neilson and that I said that I would be happy to look into it. If Kezia Dugdale wants to pass me his details, I will do so.

People also know the facts that underpin all this. I am not standing here and saying that everything is perfect in our health service, and I am not saying that there is not more work to be done. I am pointing to the progress that has been made and on which we are determined to build.

Kezia Dugdale talked about nurses. Our nurses do a fantastic job in the health service; they work incredibly hard and in difficult circumstances. However, there are 2,000 more nurses in our health service now than there were when the Government took office.

There are more staff, there is a larger budget and waiting times are lower. Progress has been made, but much work still has to be done. That is why the Government is not just investing in our health service but determined to undertake reforms in our health service, to make sure that it is fit for today and for the future.

Cabinet (Meetings)

3. Patrick Harvie (Glasgow) (Green): To ask the First Minister when the Cabinet will next meet. (S5F-00381)

The First Minister (Nicola Sturgeon): On Tuesday.

Patrick Harvie: The Scottish Government is due some credit for its work on climate justice, which, in its own words, aims to

"secure global justice for the many victims of climate change who are usually forgotten".

The Government says that

"that does not exclude people in our own communities. This is not simply an international issue."—[*Official Report*, 1 March 2012; c 6769.]

However, that principle does not seem to apply to the people who live under the flight paths at Heathrow. A third runway would create 250,000 extra flights a year, which would cause a massive increase in emissions and be the single biggest threat to the whole United Kingdom meeting its climate change targets. It would leave thousands of people's homes too noisy and polluted to live in, and unknown tens of thousands more would be left to suffer the damaging health effects.

I can only imagine the outrage—I would join it—from the Scottish Government and its colleagues at Westminster if the UK Government inflicted that kind of damage on so many lives in Glasgow, Inverness or Dundee in exchange for alleged economic self-interest, but Scottish National Party members will now troop through the voting lobbies to bail out a Tory Prime Minister who stood for election saying, "No ifs, no buts—no third runway." What is the point of a principle such as climate justice when it is surrendered so easily?

The First Minister: I will let the Prime Minister explain her position. The decision on another runway in London—whether it be at Heathrow or anywhere else—is for the UK Government, not the Scottish Government. In welcoming the announcement that was made this week, we recognise that there are many hurdles still to be overcome for the decision about Heathrow.

In reaching our judgment—the work was led by Keith Brown, who is our economy secretary—the Scottish Government looked carefully at which option would deliver the greatest benefits to Scotland's economy and connectivity. If we look at connectivity, we see that 40 per cent of long-haul visitors to Scotland connect through Heathrow, compared with just 4 per cent who come through Gatwick. We are working hard with our airports to increase direct flights, but hub connectivity remains important to Scotland.

On the economy, there is the potential for significant construction spend in Scotland and thousands of jobs. In the shorter term, there is the potential for a supply-chain hub at Prestwick, which will have an extremely important impact on the economy and on jobs. There will be a £10 million route development fund. A reduction in passenger charges will start in January, which will make services between Scotland and Heathrow much more viable, and there is to be a new marketing campaign.

Those are the reasons on which our decision was based. Patrick Harvie rightly raises the issues of climate change and emissions. The UK Government will have to answer questions and satisfy people with its answers to those questions.

The Scottish Government has shown global leadership by including domestic and international aviation in our emissions reduction targets. Where Scottish Government policies or policies that we support would increase aviation emissions, we have to work harder to reduce emissions in other areas to meet our overall targets. The Government has a strong record on climate change and meeting our emissions reduction targets and we will continue to show leadership on that.

Patrick Harvie: The argument about connections to more destinations would make sense if those connections were going to be instead of more short-haul aviation, but the Scottish Government's approach shows that it wants more of both. As for the job creation figures, they are entirely spurious. We begin with the airports commission's figures of 59,000 by 2030 and then 75,000 by 2050, and then we move on to Heathrow's pie-in-the-sky estimate of 180,000. That is about as believable as the job projection figures for Donald Trump's golf course. Surely we are not going to fall for that, are we? What were the Heathrow bosses putting in the drinks at the Scottish National Party conference?

The Heathrow deal and the Scottish Government's policy on cutting air passenger duty seek to reduce aviation fares, although aviation already enjoys a privileged position as the only transport mode that pays no tax on its fuel. Public transport remains overpriced, unreliable and run for private profit. Rail fares from Glasgow or Edinburgh are often three times the price of flying to London. Surely the First Minister must accept that it is time to focus on the affordable, sustainable and low-carbon transport that people actually need in their daily lives instead of boosting the most environmentally destructive, unhealthy and unsustainable transport mode.

The First Minister: I totally respect Patrick Harvie's position but, when we come to take decisions—the Heathrow decision is not the Scottish Government's decision, although we have

made a judgment about which option best suits Scotland's economic and connectivity interest—they are not always either/or decisions between all the things that he talks about. We have to strike the right balance. Of course it is extremely important that we have good-quality affordable and accessible public transport in Scotland and to connect Scotland to other parts of the United Kingdom and other parts of Europe, but so too is making sure that we have the air links that allow our economy to grow and boost the connectivity that our economy often depends on. We have to balance such decisions.

Around all that is our moral obligation to meet our climate change targets and to reduce emissions. I simply say that the Scottish Government's record on that is very strong and good, although I am not complacent about that. Unlike many other Governments, we include emissions from aviation. We have met our target years ahead of schedule and we are already working on increasing the target and ensuring that we have the policies in place to meet it.

There will always be difficult decisions to make and difficult balances to strike, but the objectives of meeting our climate change targets and ensuring that we have the necessary infrastructure to enable our economy to grow and support jobs are not mutually exclusive; they are things that Governments have to consider in the round.

Cabinet (Meetings)

4. Willie Rennie (North East Fife) (LD): To ask the First Minister what issues will be discussed at the next meeting of the Cabinet. (S5F-00358)

The First Minister (Nicola Sturgeon): Matters of importance to the people of Scotland.

Willie Rennie: The Audit Scotland report on our national health service is a horror show. The Government said that it would eradicate bed blocking by now, but thousands of people are still stuck in hospital; it said that it would meet all the targets, but it missed seven out of eight; and it said that it would recruit enough general practitioners, but the shortage has got worse. The Royal College of Nursing is right to ask:

"How many more reports will be published by Audit Scotland before action is taken?"

Does the condition of the NHS give the First Minister sleepless nights?

The First Minister: The NHS is always uppermost in my mind, day and night, because one of the most important responsibilities of any Government is to ensure that we have a health service delivering for patients who need it. As I have already said in response to earlier questions, we have a health service that is performing well in

difficult circumstances. There have been significant improvements over the time that the Government has been in office, but the health service faces significant challenges, in common with health services across the world.

Willie Rennie mentioned delayed discharge in particular. The number of bed days lost to delays has actually reduced in the last year, so there is progress, although there is much more work to be done. Similarly, on primary care, we have recently made clear our commitment to shift resources from acute care into primary care so that, by the end of this session of Parliament, for the first time ever, half of the total health budget will be spent not in acute hospitals but in the community. That is a really important commitment and one that is right.

We have work to do—I am the first to admit that—but compared with health services in all other parts of the UK, our health service is performing well. It is facing up to those challenges and this Government's job is to support it to do so.

I say one last thing to Willie Rennie. I mentioned earlier that our health budget has increased by £3 billion since we took office. In many of those years, that was against a backdrop of a Conservative-Liberal coalition at Westminster that was reducing Scotland's overall budget by 5 per cent in real terms. Willie Rennie should reflect on that before he stands up and talks about funding for the health service.

Willie Rennie: The First Minister blames everyone else for the past 10 years. It is about time that she accepted responsibility for her own responsibilities.

Workforce planning is the way to get valued staff with the right skills in the right place, but the Auditor General is very critical of the Government's workforce planning. The Royal College of General Practitioners says that there will now be more than 800 GPs short. The health service has only five-yearly workforce plans, but it takes seven years to train a doctor. Is it not a tragedy that it takes nine years to educate an SNP Government to take that seriously?

The First Minister: Of course, that completely ignores the fact that there are more doctors working in our health service today than there were nine years ago. There are more staff overall working in our health service than there were nine years ago when we took office. We will continue to make sure that our health service is adequately resourced.

On planning, as I said earlier, we are implementing our new national clinical strategy. Together with integrated health and social care and our work in population health, that is how we will deliver our 2020 vision; work is under way to

bring together all those strands into an integrated delivery framework that will inform our workforce plan and our investment decisions to make sure that those strategies can be implemented.

I know that I repeat myself, but it is worth saying again: our health service is making progress and performing well but—in common with other health services—it faces real challenges. That is why the Government has promised and has already delivered record investment and a record number of staff. Waiting times are lower than when we took office. However, we take nothing for granted and we continue to work hard with the health service to make sure that we build on that progress.

The Presiding Officer (Ken Macintosh): There are a number of supplementary questions.

Kenneth Gibson (Cunninghame North) (SNP): The First Minister will be aware that Associated British Ports is attempting to entice the lifeline Arran ferry service from Ardrossan to Troon with the loss of at least 165 Ardrossan jobs, despite the fact that the existing service is the most direct, shortest, fastest and cheapest route for passengers, cars, buses and hauliers. Will the First Minister confirm that Ardrossan harbour remains the Scottish Government's first choice Ayrshire port to serve Arran? When can we expect a decision to ensure that the new £47 million ferry that is currently being built in Port Glasgow to serve Arran will sail from Ardrossan harbour?

The First Minister: The Government is committed to providing the best possible service for Arran, including works at Brodick harbour as well as the new ferry that Kenneth Gibson refers to. A task force led by the Minister for Transport and the Islands has been set up to look at Ardrossan in the first instance, although no options are off the table. Any consideration will take into account the local social and economic benefits, the impact on public spending and, principally, the needs of ferry users. I assure Kenneth Gibson that no decisions have been made and we will continue to engage closely with all stakeholders to analyse the options.

Jackie Baillie (Dumbarton) (Lab): The Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport stated on radio this morning that the Opposition is standing in the way of service change. The irony of that statement is not lost on members. On the assumption that the First Minister takes responsibility for service closures, will she name the health services that she believes should close? Do they include the children's ward at the Royal Alexandra hospital? Has she already decided to close the Vale of Leven maternity unit? Do the promises that were made to my community by the First Minister and the health secretary before the election count for absolutely nothing after the election?

The First Minister: All the services that Jackie Baillie refers to are undergoing due process—that is the right and proper way to proceed and that due process will continue. I take no lessons from Labour when it comes to protecting local health services.

We have talked a lot today about the situation in the health service when this Government took office. When this Government took office, Monklands and Ayr hospitals' accident and emergency services were on the brink of closure, and they were saved by this Government.

Generally speaking, a moment of truth is coming for Opposition members. They are all quite happy to talk the language of shifting the balance of care from acute health services into the community. We will soon see whether they are prepared to back that rhetoric with action when it comes to supporting the implementation of our clinical strategy. I think that we all have a suspicion about how they will behave in those circumstances.

Gillian Martin (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP): Scottish National Party pressure at Westminster has prompted the United Kingdom Government to review its two-child limit and rape clause for benefit payments. Will the First Minister join me in urging people to respond to the consultation and leave the Tories in no doubt that their pernicious policy should be scrapped?

The First Minister: The rape clause policy is disgusting and immoral and should never have seen the light of day in the first place. I pay tribute to Alison Thewliss, who represents part of my constituency in the House of Commons. She has been steadfast in her determination to fight the clause.

This week's announcement of a consultation is welcome, but it is too early to declare victory. I encourage people to respond to the consultation and I call on the UK Government without further delay to drop a policy that forces women, in certain circumstances when they want to access tax credits, to prove that they have been raped. I cannot think of anything more disgraceful than that.

Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab): Over the past 30 years, the Blackburn local employment scheme in West Lothian has helped more than 3,000 young people, including many who have been in care, into employment. The scheme's future is extremely uncertain, due to the inflexible way in which Skills Development Scotland grants are managed.

I have twice written to the Cabinet Secretary for Economy, Jobs and Fair Work to seek a meeting to try to find a solution, but both times my request was refused. Developing the young workforce is supposed to be a priority for the Government. Will

the First Minister instruct the cabinet secretary to meet me and representatives from BLES, so that we can find a way forward for an essential service?

The First Minister: I am happy to ask the cabinet secretary to meet the member. I am not familiar with the service that he mentioned, but I know that services like it do a fantastic job in local communities. The member makes a reasonable point, and the cabinet secretary will arrange to meet him to discuss it in more detail.

European Union (Scotland's Position)

5. Joan McAlpine (South Scotland) (SNP): To ask the First Minister whether she will provide an update on discussions with the United Kingdom Government on protecting Scotland's position within the EU. (S5F-00374)

The First Minister (Nicola Sturgeon): As Mike Russell said in his statement to the Parliament yesterday, he and I attended the joint ministerial committee at Downing Street on Monday. He also met David Davis and David Mundell last week.

On Monday, we again set out our determination to protect Scotland's place in the single market. Despite a full and frank exchange of views around the table, we learned nothing more about the UK Government's approach to the EU negotiations than we already knew when we went into the meeting, which was, to put it mildly, frustrating.

However, we now have an agreement that a detailed work programme will be developed for the JMC sub-committee, which will be integrated into the wider process, so that devolved Administrations can influence key Cabinet sub-committee decisions. The Scottish Government will continue to focus on protecting Scotland's economic and social interests, which have been put at risk by the Brexit decision.

Joan McAlpine: Expert research shows that Brexit threatens up to 80,000 jobs in Scotland and could cost the economy more than £11 billion a year by 2030. Thanks to the Goldman Sachs tapes, we now know that Theresa May privately agrees with such forecasts. Publicly, she says that Brexit means Brexit; privately, she says that Brexit means disaster. In the discussion on Monday, did the Prime Minister offer the First Minister an explanation for why she is now happy to be led by the wishes of hard-right Brexiteers instead of economic and common sense?

The First Minister: No, she did not, but I suspect that the truth is that the Prime Minister does not have a plan for Brexit, so the hard-right Brexiteers are able to impose their own agenda.

When we met this week, the Prime Minister was unwilling—or, I suspect, unable—to answer even

the most simple and obvious questions. Brexit might mean Brexit, but the Prime Minister could not tell us exactly what that platitude means in practice.

The only new information that we got on Monday was that the UK Government has set up what it calls a hotline to David Davis. I can share with the chamber today that Michael Russell's office called that hotline this week just before midday on Tuesday. It took until after 6 pm yesterday to actually get David Davis on the hotline. That took 36 hours, so there is now a telephone line that we can call, but currently it is not very hot.

Adam Tomkins (Glasgow) (Con): When is the First Minister going to understand that securing the best possible Brexit deal for Scotland requires ministerial collaboration and co-operation with the UK Government, not hostility and threats?

In his statement to Parliament yesterday, Mike Russell was unable to identify even a single positive contribution that the Scottish Government has made to the JMC Brexit process. All we heard was moaning about the United Kingdom. Can the First Minister do any better today?

The First Minister: Of course, what the Scottish Tories want the Scottish Government to do is, I suppose, what they have done—not collaborate, but capitulate. That is not what we are prepared to do. I think that collaboration is essential. I just wish that the UK Government would start collaborating with us; 36 hours to get through on a hotline does not strike me as very constructive collaboration.

I have been clear about my priorities. First, I want to work right across the UK and across the political spectrum to avert a hard Brexit for all of the UK because I think that it would be a disaster. If that is not possible, we will make proposals to avoid a hard Brexit for Scotland to keep us in the single market, even if the rest of the UK chooses to leave.

When we make those proposals, it will be interesting to see what the Conservatives' response will be. Of course, in the referendum campaign, Ruth Davidson was very clear—and she was clear in the days after the referendum—that she thought that Scotland should stay in the single market and that the UK should stay in the single market. The proof of the pudding will be whether the Scottish Conservatives are prepared to back proposals that are in the Scottish interest or whether they continue to capitulate to their bosses at Westminster.

Teacher Workloads

6. Maurice Corry (West Scotland) (Con): To ask the First Minister, further to the decision by the Scottish Secondary Teachers Association to take

industrial action, what steps the Scottish Government has taken to resolve the issue of teacher workloads. (S5F-00397)

The First Minister (Nicola Sturgeon): The Scottish Government's education delivery plan, which was published in June, made clear our commitment to tackle bureaucracy and to address excessive teacher workload. We work with teachers, parents and other partners in education, both nationally and locally, to take concrete steps to address workload issues. Those include the recent announcement of the removal of unit assessments in the national qualifications. The removal of those assessments is part of a package of measures designed to address unnecessary bureaucracy and to liberate teachers to focus on what they do best—teaching young people.

Maurice Corry: I thank the First Minister for that answer.

Members on the Conservative benches share the view that strike action is not appropriate. Nonetheless, there remains a serious issue with teacher workloads. The Scottish Government's own figures show that between 2008 and 2015, there was an 11 per cent decrease in the number of secondary school teachers in Scotland, representing a loss of some 3,008 staff. In particular, since 2007, more than 100 science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers a year have been cut, with 187 fewer computing teachers, 410 fewer mathematics teachers, and 105 fewer chemistry teachers. That is clearly having a strong impact on teacher workloads in key subjects. In light of those statistics, what action is the Scottish Government taking to stem and reverse that trend?

The First Minister: As the member will be aware, in the past couple of years, the Scottish Government has provided funding to local authorities to maintain teacher numbers. We encourage local authorities to continue to maintain those numbers to make sure that we have the right number of teachers in our schools to teach young people.

Workload is an important issue. It is why, since his appointment as education secretary, John Swinney has spent so much time and effort on working with teachers to try to address their legitimate concerns. The changes to the national 5, higher and advanced higher qualifications that were announced by the Deputy First Minister are part of a package of measures that are designed to address unnecessary bureaucracy and to take away from teachers workload that was felt not to be necessary and not to contribute to their job of teaching young people.

As a whole, the plans that we have in place—making sure that funding is getting to the areas of greatest need, bringing new transparency to school performance, our governance review, and making sure that power and responsibility lie where they should, which is as close to or in schools and as far as possible with headteachers—are all about a determination to ensure that teachers are able to do what they do best, and that the contribution of teachers and teaching helps us to raise the standards in education and close the attainment gap. We are absolutely focused on that and will continue to be so.

Children in Care (Support)

7. Fulton MacGregor (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP): To ask the First Minister how the Scottish Government will seek to improve systems supporting children in care. (S5F-00396)

The First Minister (Nicola Sturgeon): On 15 October, I announced an independent root-and-branch review of the care system. The review, which will be the first of its kind anywhere in the world, will be taken forward in partnership with young people who have experience of care. It will look at the legislation, the practice, the ethos and the culture of the system. It is vital that we listen to young people's experience of being looked after. I am absolutely committed to using what they tell us to help to change the care system, to put love at its heart, and to make their lives better.

Fulton MacGregor: I am delighted by the First Minister's commitment to a review. What other action is the Scottish Government taking to support care-experienced young people to have the best opportunities in life?

The First Minister: We have taken action to modernise our children's hearing system, to review secure care, to establish our youth justice improvement boards, to support kinship carers, to review learning and development opportunities for foster carers and residential work, and to support families who are on the edge of care. Those are just some of the things that we have already done; the list could go on. Improvements are being made: school exclusions, for example, are down and more young people are in permanent, rather than in temporary, placements.

When we look at the statistics for young people who experience care, none of us can be satisfied that we are yet doing enough, because those statistics are absolutely horrifying. When I speak to young people who are in care or who have been in care, as I have been doing a lot recently, they give me the simple message that the system works well to stop things happening to them. It should do that to some extent—we must have in place safeguards. However, the system does not

always operate to make things happen for them. We need a system that ensures that, where young people cannot live with their own families, for whatever reason, and the state becomes their corporate parent, we give them a sense of family, a sense of belonging and a sense of love, and that the whole system operates to make sure that they can reach their full potential. That is what I am determined to do, but the Government cannot do it alone and Parliament cannot do it alone. We will succeed only if the review is driven by the experiences of young people in care. That is what will make the review unique.

Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD): I welcome very much what the First Minister had to say, but I urge her to look in particular at access to higher education, which is an area where those with care experience are glaringly underrepresented. Will she look specifically at the support that is available to those with care experience to ensure that the maximum opportunity is provided for them to gain the benefit of a university education?

The First Minister: Yes, I will give that commitment. Indeed, we have already announced certain changes to help to make sure that that commitment can be delivered.

I have mentioned statistics: a horrifying statistic is that only 6 per cent of care-experienced young people go to university. We have therefore accepted the commission on widening access's recommendation to ensure not only guaranteed places at university for care-experienced young people who have the grades, but full grants for those care-experienced young people going to university. That is a concrete example of the progress that we are making. We have to do much more, and we have to do it in partnership with the people who are the experts—those who are in care or who have experienced care.

I have been moved beyond belief by some of the conversations that I have had with care-experienced young people in the past few months. I have no doubt that, if we come together—not just as a Parliament, but as a country—and put those young people at the heart of what we are trying to do, we can do something really special that in years to come we can all look back on with pride.

Nursing

8. Miles Briggs (Lothian) (Con): To ask the First Minister what the Scottish Government's position is on the statement from the Royal College of Nursing that nursing in Scotland is facing "a perfect storm". (S5F-00367)

The First Minister (Nicola Sturgeon): We appreciate the dedication of our nurses, midwives and, indeed, all our national health service staff,

and we recognise the pressures that they face. Under this Government, there are now more than 2,100 extra qualified nurses and midwives, which is a rise of more than 5 per cent since we took office. We are, of course, not complacent, so this year we will again increase the number of trainee nurses and midwives—a fourth successive rise. We will also spend £450,000 to enable former nurses and midwives to retrain and return to the profession.

Miles Briggs used the phrase “perfect storm”, which I accept is that of the RCN. A situation in the future in which people from other countries who work in our health service are prevented from doing so will add to the challenges that our health service faces. We value our health service staff: we must ensure that we value all of them, regardless of where they were born.

Miles Briggs: With the First Minister today taking responsibility for the health service, does she believe that she made a mistake as the then Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing in cutting the number of student work placements in Scotland? Why has it taken her Government 10 years to introduce a national health service workforce plan?

The First Minister: Workforce plans are in place in health boards and, as I have just said, the number of qualified nurses and midwives in our health service is higher today than it was when we took office. That suggests that the policies of this Government have been right—but we have more work to do. That is why, as I said earlier, we are determined to do that work and to focus on the challenges. We will work with our NHS staff to ensure that we meet the challenges.

Anas Sarwar: On a point of order, Presiding Officer. This morning, Labour requested an emergency question on the publication by Audit Scotland of the worst report since devolution on the state of the NHS, with only one out of eight standards having been met. The reason for the refusal of an emergency question, as I understand it, is that on Thursdays we have an opportunity to hold the Government to account through First Minister’s question time. However, emergency questions are the opportunity for Parliament to hold the relevant minister to account and standing orders are clear that emergency questions can be asked on any sitting day, including Thursdays.

It cannot be right that the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport hides behind the First Minister. Is she simply out of her depth? The report is a damning indictment of the health secretary and she should come to Parliament to address—*[Interruption.]*

The Presiding Officer: One second, Mr Sarwar. I ask members to let Mr Sarwar speak, please.

Anas Sarwar: The tone from Scottish National Party members tells us how much they respect the NHS and its hardworking workforce.

Presiding Officer, can you tell us whether you have been advised that the health secretary had given any indication—*[Interruption.]*

The Presiding Officer: I am sorry, Mr Sarwar, but I cannot hear the point of order. Will members please let him speak?

Anas Sarwar: Is it not amazing that we hear everybody’s voice on the issue apart from Shona Robison’s? When will Parliament hear a statement from the health secretary about how she has allowed our NHS to decline?

The Presiding Officer: The member has made a point, but it is not a point of order. The member is perfectly capable of speaking to his business manager and raising the issue through the business manager at the Parliamentary Bureau meeting on Tuesday morning.

That concludes First Minister’s question time.

Mortuary Facilities (Standards)

The Deputy Presiding Officer (Linda Fabiani): The final item of business this morning is a members' business debate on motion S5M-01390, in the name of Richard Lochhead, on the standard of mortuaries. The debate will be concluded without any question being put.

Motion debated,

That the Parliament commends the relatives of the late Frank Whyte from Findhorn, who was recently lost in a tragic boating accident, who are seeking to improve the standard of mortuaries after their distressing experience of what they considered were poor quality facilities; recognises that, due to the efforts of Mrs Maryan Whyte, her daughters and wider family, changes have been made in Moray, and that these changes have been welcomed by the family; wishes them success in their campaign for mortuary facilities to be inspected to ensure that they meet an appropriate standard for bereaved families and are sensitive to their needs, as well as ensuring dignity for the deceased, so that people do not experience additional stress during the formal identification of a loved one, and further notes that the Whyte family can be contacted by others affected by these issues by emailing mortuaryformoray@gmail.com.

12:49

Richard Lochhead (Moray) (SNP): I start by thanking members from all parties for signing the motion that we are debating.

In May this year, Frank Whyte, a much-loved husband, father and grandfather, lost his life in a tragic boating accident in the approaches to the beautiful Findhorn Bay, where he spent much of his time sailing. The warm public tributes paid to him illustrate that Mr Whyte was a much-loved and popular member of the Findhorn community. Maryan Whyte and her granddaughter, Isla, are in the gallery today. I know that I speak for all of Parliament in reiterating our heartfelt condolences to them and their family.

The day after being informed of Mr Whyte's tragic and sudden death, Mrs Whyte and members of her family were taken to formally identify his body at the mortuary at the former Spynie hospital in Elgin, used by Police Scotland. What the family experienced there appalled them and made an already harrowing experience much, much worse. The process was insensitive to the needs of bereaved families. Mrs Whyte said:

"Just two steps for us to be inside that awful place and there was my husband, just lying, wrapped in a blanket and throw, on a trolley. No warning of what we were entering. No place, no time for composure—just there he was."

The facilities were run down and inadequate. Mr Whyte's daughter, Natalie, said:

"Spynie can only be described as a derelict collection of buildings sitting on waste ground, overgrown with weeds and in a dismal state of repair. I suffer from MS and was

walking with the aid of a stick that day but there was nowhere for me to sit and rest. I ended up sitting on the ground outside. It was extremely distressing."

His other daughter, Sharon, said:

"It looked like a disused outbuilding we were being taken to—not somewhere our loved one would be. There was no opportunity to say goodbye to Dad, so our last image of seeing him is in a little-used, unkempt building in urgent need of replacement."

The whole experience was traumatic for a recently bereaved family and failed adequately to respect the dignity of their loved one. I know that the minister will want to get to the bottom of how this was allowed to happen, because I am sure that we can all agree that what the Whyte family were put through is wholly unacceptable.

Mrs Whyte tells me that after reading an unrelated news article about the general run-down state of the former hospital—and knowing what she had been put through—she decided to act, so the family decided to speak out. As soon as they conveyed to the authorities in Moray their experience, the national health service, Moray Council and Police Scotland all agreed that that was unacceptable. NHS Grampian apologised. As a result, Spynie is no longer used for family viewing. Dr Gray's hospital in Elgin is being used on a temporary basis and Mrs Whyte is now working with the mortuary for Moray planning group on longer-term solutions.

I should say at this point that Mrs Whyte found it very difficult to identify who was ultimately responsible for Spynie mortuary. Likewise, I was struck by the opaque lines of responsibility. In the case of Spynie, we had to speak to Moray Council, the NHS and Police Scotland. I therefore urge the minister to address that confusion so that the public, and the rest of us, clearly understand who is in charge of police and hospital mortuary facilities.

There is absolutely no doubt that many families have gone through the same experience as the Whyte family. I have had other constituents who have since told me that they were similarly affected by their visit to Spynie mortuary. However, it is down to the determination of the Whyte family to do something about that that action is now being taken.

The Whyte family is also aware that there is a similar situation in other parts of Scotland. They do not want any other family—anywhere—to go through what they went through. That is the message from this debate and that is why Mrs Whyte and her daughters, Sharon and Natalie, were very grateful to the more than a dozen MSPs from across the parties who took time to speak to them when they visited Parliament earlier this month.

What came to light in Moray is now a national issue and the Whyte family's campaign is attracting support from the public and from professionals. I am very grateful to Stewart Fleming, professor of cellular and molecular pathology and also a director of the Centre for Forensic and Legal Medicine at the University of Dundee. He contacted me and the Whyte family to support their campaign.

Professor Fleming has responsibility for death investigations in Tayside, Fife and Forth Valley and has overseen the building of new mortuaries in Dundee, Kirkcaldy and Larbert. He has produced a list of standards required for the deceased, the bereaved and the professionals. I do not have time to go through them, but I want to refer to the statement that he provided. He says:

"I support fully the campaign for an improvement in standards of mortuary provision across Scotland. A mortuary should continue the delivery of the highest possible quality of care for the people of Scotland even after death. It should ensure dignity and respect for the deceased, comfort and support for bereaved relatives and friends and be a suitable working environment for professionals involved in the care of the deceased and the investigation of death."

He goes on to say:

"Unfortunately there is considerable variation in the quality of mortuary provision across the country. While there are examples of excellent provision there are a considerable number of mortuaries requiring significant improvement."

As we can see, the Whyte family's experience in Moray highlights a national issue. I welcome the minister's recent words of comfort for the family and her recent meeting with them, and I thank her for listening to their case and promising to act. It is also welcome that ministers have instructed the national health service Scottish property advisory group to look into these issues.

As well as having to grieve following the loss of a loved one, the family felt that it was necessary to campaign, and they continue to urge people to contact them via www.mortuaryformoray.com. My constituents have found themselves in the spotlight, giving media interviews and visiting Parliament, but none of us should forget what they have been through in these past few months, which only strengthens our admiration and respect for them. They wish to ensure that there is dignity for the deceased and that people do not endure additional distress during the formal identification of a loved one.

The Whyte family's campaign has achieved so much so far in bringing about changes in Moray, but they now want to ensure that all mortuaries in Scotland are inspected and that steps are taken where necessary to ensure that all mortuaries meet an agreed set of 21st century standards for the facilities and the identification process that are

monitored and complied with, in line with what we would expect in a compassionate society.

I look forward to hearing the minister respond to the issues that I have raised and to her joining me and other members on all sides of the chamber in paying tribute to the Whyte family's tenacity and determination to ensure that no other bereaved family goes through what they went through at Spynie mortuary.

12:56

Douglas Ross (Highlands and Islands) (Con):

I congratulate Richard Lochhead on bringing the debate to the chamber, and I agree wholeheartedly with 100 per cent of his speech. I welcome Maryan Whyte, and her granddaughter Isla Robertson from Forres academy, to Parliament today. It is the second time that the family have been down here in recent weeks. Through their personal tragedy and the experience that they have undergone, the strength that they have shown in trying to better the facilities in mortuaries throughout Scotland is highly commendable.

I met Maryan Whyte last Friday in Elgin, exactly five months to the day since Frank tragically died. I will read out a couple of words about him from the press coverage following his death: he was a

"beloved boatbuilder"

and

"a jovial character, who liked ... a good yarn.

The family understandably miss Frank, but we hope that their campaign since his death will lead to improvements so that other families do not have to experience the same issues to which Richard Lochhead referred.

I will not reiterate everything that Richard Lochhead said about the experience that the family—Maryan, Sharon and Natalie—went through, but Spynie mortuary could not, in 2016, be considered to be fit for purpose. The facility was built in 1933 and closed by the NHS 12 years ago, so why did the local authority, the police force and the NHS think that it was right in this day and age to continue to use it as a mortuary?

Things have changed and the situation has moved on quickly since the incident five months ago, and there are now temporary measures in place for viewing at Dr Gray's hospital. However, the storage of bodies continues at Spynie, and I have serious concerns about the security of the facility. That issue has been raised locally in the press, and we need to ensure that security at Spynie is improved.

In addition, we need to not rely on the temporary replacement at Dr Gray's but to look for a long-

term replacement, because Dr Gray's is not ideal. Bodies must be moved across the car park to the viewing gallery on the other side of the campus, and that is not suitable for anyone. We must ensure that a better process is put in place.

I would like the minister to explain in summing up where—as Richard Lochhead asked—the responsibility lies. Is it with the NHS, the police or the local authority? Should we have an overarching governing body for all the mortuaries in Scotland to ensure that, if there is an issue, people know that they can go to the NHS, police or the local authority? At the moment there is too much confusion on that very emotive and personal issue, and we need further information on it.

I also wish to know why there is no inspectorate of mortuary facilities. If there was, Spynie would never have been used. It took a personal tragedy and a campaigning family to bring about change, instead of the concerns that clearly existed about Spynie being addressed by someone going in and checking the facilities. There are very good examples of mortuaries across Scotland, but there are very bad examples. Moray has been highlighted as a bad example, but it is not alone. We need to do more to inspect facilities to ensure that this is not allowed to happen again.

Maryan asked me to ensure that I mentioned the website and Richard Lochhead has done that already. The email address to which the family want information sent is mortuaryformoray@gmail.com. They want to hear from more families across Scotland to ensure that we get this right across the country.

Richard Lochhead quoted Professor Stewart Fleming and I will finish by reiterating this quote from him:

“A mortuary should ensure dignity and respect for the deceased, comfort and support for bereaved relatives and friends and be a suitable working environment for professionals involved in the care of the deceased and the investigation of death.”

In light of the Whyte family's experiences following their personal tragedy, we can only hope that that standard, written by Professor Fleming, can be replicated across Scotland, so that the family's campaign will have made a big difference not only in Moray but throughout our country. I commend them for everything that they have done.

13:01

Colin Smyth (South Scotland) (Lab): On behalf of the Labour team, I commend Richard Lochhead for bringing this matter to the Parliament's attention through his motion and the debate. I also express my condolences to Mr Whyte's family, who are in the public gallery, for

their loss and the undue distress that they faced as a result of the condition of Spynie mortuary. Nobody should have to go through such an experience, and I praise the family for the work that they have undertaken at such a distressing time to try and secure changes to mortuary standards so that other families do not suffer a similar harrowing experience in the future.

Since becoming a member of the Parliament, I have had the privilege of working closely with healthcare and social care professionals who dedicate their working lives to ensuring the comfort and dignity of those they care for. Compassion does not stop at the end of somebody's life. Mortuaries and post-mortem facilities serve a practical function but, for some, they are the last place where they see their loved ones. As such, they hold a unique place in a person's grieving process. It is therefore imperative that the condition of mortuaries is such that the dignity of the deceased is upheld and the distress that families face is minimised. That was not the case for the Whyte family.

If anything positive can come from the Whyte family's experience—which, as Mrs Whyte told the BBC, also seems to be the experience of families in other parts of Scotland—it is the fact that this story has brought to our attention the shocking fact that there is no specific inspection regime and there are no guidelines for inspections of mortuaries in Scotland.

As members will be aware, under the Public Health etc (Scotland) Act 2008, mortuaries can be provided by local authorities or health boards, or by a combination of the two. The standards for the management of hospital post-mortem examinations include standards for hospital staff supporting bereaved families. Specifically, the relevant standard states that the staff working at the facility must ensure that

“The deceased, and people who have been bereaved, are treated with dignity and respect, and in accordance with their wishes.”

Although such standards are welcome, they appear to be specific only to hospital post-mortems, and not mortuary provision across the board. That needs to change. We need to have standards for all mortuaries on treating the deceased and their families with dignity. Standards must also take into account factors such as the faith, cultural values and beliefs of both the deceased and the bereaved.

Scottish health planning note 20 provides particular guidance on the elements that should be considered in the building of mortuaries. Simple considerations such as ambient lighting and thoughtful decoration of waiting areas are suggested, and such additions to all mortuaries would be welcome. The problem at the moment,

as highlighted by the Whyte family, is that such standards are not enforceable in existing mortuaries, as inspection procedures do not exist. That cannot continue.

I welcome the proposals from NHS Grampian for improving Spynie mortuary, but such improvements should not have to come on the back of the unacceptable personal experiences of those who have lost loved ones. Facilities that are fit for purpose must be the norm, and minimum standards have to be put in place and properly enforced. I therefore welcome Richard Lochhead's motion and echo the Whyte family's calls for regular inspections of mortuaries in every part of Scotland to ensure that minimum standards are enforced.

I finish with Mrs Whyte's comments, which I read on the BBC website. She said:

"Families who are suffering in difficult and often tragic circumstances should be shown much more compassion than what we found ... It is vital that at such a difficult time, families should have access to a mortuary that is fit for purpose where families can feel comforted and where the deceased are treated with dignity and respect."

I could not agree more, and Mr Lochhead and the Whyte family will have the full support of Labour in seeking to achieve just that.

13:05

Maree Todd (Highlands and Islands) (SNP):

This is undoubtedly one of the rare occasions in politics when all of us, from all parties in the chamber, can unite in common cause. We can unite in thanking Richard Lochhead, the constituency MSP for Moray, for securing the debate and for helping constituents to bring this badly neglected issue to the Parliament's attention. We can also unite in thanking Mrs Whyte and her daughters, and their wider family, for their efforts to improve the standard of mortuaries not just in Moray but throughout Scotland.

Despite the fact that death is an inevitable part of life, the death of someone whom we love is one of the toughest experiences that we ever go through, and sudden or unexpected death is particularly distressing. In the midst of normal everyday life, with no hint of warning, the worst possible thing happens and our world is turned upside down. The shock causes strong physical and emotional responses. It can be quite literally gut-wrenching, and it can feel unreal—it can be really hard to take in what is happening. However, despite that fog in our brains, we create vivid memories at the time that become central to our experience of bereavement.

I think that we can all agree that the experience of sudden or unexpected death is traumatic

enough, and that the experience of making a formal identification should not add to the trauma. If the service is sensitive to the family's needs at that traumatic time, it can help turn the tide of profound grief and make the ordeal liveable; it might even create some positive memories. I cannot be the only person who was shocked to hear about the poor-quality facilities that Mrs Whyte and her family faced at Spynie mortuary after her husband Frank died in an accident earlier this year.

All of us expect mortuaries to have certain minimum standards. All of us expect mortuaries to be maintained to a standard that demonstrates care, dignity and respect. All of us expect mortuaries to be sensitive to the needs of families and loved ones, and to provide comfort. All of us expect mortuaries to provide families and loved ones with a place to recover and compose themselves before they face the outside world again. All of us expect, at the very least, mortuaries to have toilet facilities. It is disappointing that the facilities at Spynie mortuary in Moray fell so far short our expectations. However, it is really pleasing that action has already been taken by NHS Grampian to remedy the situation.

I admire the Whyte family for campaigning on the issue, and I was pleased to have the opportunity to tell them so when I met them with Richard Lochhead in Parliament last month. To face their situation and to come through it with a determination to ensure that other families will not have to face similar situations is a credit to them. That determination to turn a desperate experience into a positive change is truly inspirational. The knowledge that they have already effected change locally and nationally must bring some comfort and is a fitting legacy for an undoubtedly much-loved husband, father and grandfather.

13:09

Graham Simpson (Central Scotland) (Con): I, too, thank Richard Lochhead for bringing the issue to Parliament.

Few of us feel comfortable when dealing with the practical aspects of saying a final farewell to our loved ones, so it is important to have professional help at that sad time. We expect the process of preparing for burial or cremation to be dignified and to be undertaken with great care and respect—and in most cases that is what happens. We do not expect our loved ones to be subjected to a setting that is reminiscent of a shed in a backyard. However, that was the experience of Maryan Whyte after her husband Frank died in a sailing accident in May.

Frank was taken to Spynie mortuary in Elgin, where Maryan—whom I also had the pleasure of meeting when she came into the Parliament recently—found him lying not in comfort and security but in dampness and squalor. Frank lay on a trolley in the middle of a darkened room, the only things covering him being a blanket and a throw. Maryan described the environment as being “unkempt”, “run down” and akin to “an old garage”. It is beyond belief that her husband should have been left in a room that appeared abandoned and unmaintained. No wonder she described herself as feeling “desolate”.

The bereaved are already in great pain following their loss and it is appalling that that pain should be compounded unnecessarily by neglect from those in authority, who should know better. We constantly fight for the basic rights of the living, but we are surely entitled to dignity in death, too. That is not what the Whyte family encountered in Elgin. Every mortuary should have basic necessities in order to effectively comfort, console and care for the grieving. However, it would be wrong to assume that that is the picture that is seen throughout Scotland—the truth is that we simply do not know.

This awful case has shone a light on the issue and, as others have said, it is incumbent on the Government to instigate a review of mortuaries and their condition throughout the country. Let us find out what the picture is nationwide and then have a plan to rectify any failings that we find.

It is essential for mortuaries to provide high standards of care and an adequate setting in order to meet the needs of us all. If mortuaries underperform or fail to do what is expected of them, it is up to the Government to act and promote better standards. I rather like the idea of having an overarching body to deal with mortuaries. A nationwide inspection of mortuaries will not only highlight areas for improvement but evidence the hard work and commitment of professionals who are getting it right. Good practice must be highlighted, shared and celebrated. Ultimately, improvements in practice can only benefit the most important people at their worst time—the deceased and their grieving loved ones.

Maryan and her family have been brave to bring their campaign here. It is not easy for people to put themselves in the spotlight and I thank them for doing so. Their experience may help others, and it is up to us to make sure that that is what happens.

13:12

The Minister for Public Health and Sport (Aileen Campbell): I, too, am grateful to Richard

Lochhead for lodging his motion, and I am grateful for the chance to respond on the Scottish Government's behalf. I am also grateful for the contributions of all the members who took part in the debate. They spoke with a great deal of compassion.

I know that everyone here is and was shocked by the Whyte family's description of what they went through. That is how I felt when I heard about it from Richard Lochhead's correspondence and the media. In Richard Lochhead's words, the Whyte family's experience was “wholly unacceptable”.

It is hard to even begin to imagine how upsetting it must be to deal with the loss of a loved one in such tragic and unexpected circumstances as those that Mrs Whyte found herself facing. To have then been asked to visit the mortuary at Spynie hospital, which was obviously in such a poor and inappropriate condition, was completely unacceptable, and it compounded the family's upset, trauma and pain.

I pass on my sincerest condolences to Mrs Whyte and her family, who are in the public gallery, and say how sorry I was to hear of their experience. I have met the family and conveyed that privately, but I very much welcome the opportunity to do so today in public. I appreciate the strength that the family have shown in discussing their concerns with me. That cannot have been easy, but their desire to make a difference shows remarkable courage and is a true inspiration.

The Scottish Government issues guidance on mortuary facilities to all NHS boards and fully expects them to apply it. The guidance sets out the clear requirement that viewings should take place in appropriately serene, calming and dignified surroundings. It is clear that the guidance was not adhered to in the Whytes' case. That is troubling and deeply concerning and it leads to many questions.

Before coming to those questions, I should say that I am aware that NHS Grampian has been in regular contact with the Whyte family in recent weeks and months, and it has taken steps to ensure that what happened to Mrs Whyte and her family will not happen to anyone else in the Grampian area. The health board has reassured me that, from this point onwards, all viewings will take place in more appropriate surroundings at Dr Gray's hospital, and it will not ask any family to visit Spynie mortuary again. I will endeavour to ensure that security of provision, which Douglas Ross raised, is carefully looked at.

It is positive that the health board has taken action in this case, but the Whyte family's experience raises certain questions, as I

mentioned. One is the extent to which health boards across Scotland are complying with the requirements that we have set out clearly. As an immediate first step on hearing of the Whytes' experience, I wrote to ask all health boards to assure me that they are complying with the current guidance on mortuary provision. I further asked that, if they could not do that, they give me a detailed plan on how they will rectify that as a matter of urgency.

My officials and I will take care to scrutinise the responses that we receive from the health boards, and we will press the boards to ensure that facilities are brought up to standard in any case where they fall short. It will absolutely be a requirement that boards do that as quickly as they can, and there will be no excuses.

I have instructed officials to begin a thorough review of the present guidance to ensure that it is fully up to date, is sufficiently detailed and leaves nothing to doubt. Once the review is completed, the renewed guidance will be issued to each health board chief executive.

Richard Lochhead: I welcome the review. I suggest that the minister finds a way to involve Maryan Whyte and Professor Fleming in that work as it moves forward.

Aileen Campbell: Absolutely. I was going to mention Professor Fleming, whom I understand my officials have contacted, and we will continue to engage with Richard Lochhead, the Whyte family and anyone who has expertise in this incredibly important issue.

It is worth noting that the questions that the case raises go beyond matters of NHS health board compliance. Other organisations that use mortuary facilities are responsible for their operation and upkeep; they include large and diverse organisations such as the police, every local authority in Scotland and, of course, the private sector. The diversity of organisations that are involved causes great complexity.

It is worth considering that the issue is not just the fabric, fixtures and fittings of the mortuary facilities; we also need to ensure that family members who are required to visit mortuaries are treated with thought, care and compassion by appropriately trained staff. It is because of the complexities that a cross-Government approach is required to review and understand the landscape of provision, identify areas of action and ensure that organisations that use mortuary facilities do so with a duty of care at the forefront of their minds. I do not want families to go through any further suffering, and I will use the Whyte family's experience to inform positive change and bring the clarity that Richard Lochhead mentioned in his opening remarks.

For that reason, I have begun working with other ministers to investigate mortuary provision in its entirety across Scotland, to fully understand the concerns of Mr Lochhead and the Whyte family, agree a way forward and take action. I will work in conjunction with ministers and Scottish Government officials to make progress on the matter as quickly as possible, because of its importance. I will be happy to report back to Mr Lochhead and the Whyte family as that work continues. Professor Fleming's input will be crucial.

I offer again my deepest sympathy to Mrs Whyte and her family. I am grateful for their efforts, along with those of Mr Lochhead, in bringing the matter to our attention at what is a difficult time for them. I sincerely hope that they can take our actions and future actions as a tribute to their tenacity and, in the intense period of grieving that they are going through, take some small comfort from the fact that their efforts have made a lasting difference for everyone across Scotland.

13:19

Meeting suspended.

14:30

On resuming—

Environment and Climate Change (European Union Referendum)

The Deputy Presiding Officer (Christine Grahame): Good afternoon. The next item of business is a debate on motion S5M-02125, in the name of Roseanna Cunningham, on the environment and climate change—European Union referendum.

The Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform (Roseanna Cunningham): It is now four months since the European referendum. The passage of time has not lessened our dismay at the outcome or—so far—provided much clarity about the future.

Today, I will make clear where my priorities lie. I want to maintain the Government's commitment to our environment and to our natural assets; I want to continue to seek the Parliament's support for our ambitions and aims; I want to ensure that our environment is healthy and supports our prosperity; and, above all else, I want to protect Scotland's position as a climate change leader.

We are recognised as a leader in climate change, but we know that there is more to do, which is why setting even more ambitious targets through a new climate change bill and working hard to achieve them is at the heart of the Government's overarching priorities. Where do we seek common cause to achieve those priorities? In aligning ourselves with our European neighbours across the water.

Our membership of the EU has ensured progress on a range of important issues. It has enabled us to apply high standards in vital environmental protections, to the benefit of our most precious natural assets. We cannot afford to take our chances by jumping on to the United Kingdom Brexit bandwagon and turning our back on the EU and all that a continuing relationship offers for our environmental priorities.

We cannot trust the Tories to protect the interests of Scotland's environment. They are the same Tories who have, for example, cut subsidies for renewable energy projects, which has put our low-carbon future at risk. In one grand symbolic gesture that highlights how low climate change sits in the UK Government's list of priorities, one of Theresa May's first actions as Prime Minister was to abolish the previously clear ministerial lead on climate change.

I am happy to say that we can make common cause today with the Labour Party and the Green Party. The Labour amendment highlights one key

area on which we must continue to focus: our marine environment. I thank the Labour Party for raising that issue.

Although I have some issues with the wording of the Green amendment, the Government shares its intent. We agree that the EU and Canada have their own highly developed legal systems and domestic courts that are capable of dealing with any issues that might arise from a trade agreement. We are also mindful that such international trade agreements must be carefully calibrated not only to enhance trade opportunities—especially for Scotland's produce and tourism—but to not undermine our public services or our environment.

Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD): Can the cabinet secretary point to evidence in the 1,400 trade agreements that the EU has signed of the concerns that she has highlighted?

Roseanna Cunningham: I know that concerns have been expressed about parts of the Canadian trade deal—the comprehensive economic and trade agreement—which I understand has just been agreed this afternoon. I am not able to discuss the final details of that agreement as I am not aware of them yet. The important thing is to maintain vigilance about the position, as it is not always at the forefront of people's minds.

It would be far easier for Scotland to influence the substance of such agreements if we had our own seat at the EU table—nobody would argue with that. If anything, the CETA deal serves to highlight our impotence in relying on a half-engaged UK Government to protect our interests rather than protecting them for ourselves. That is another reason why it is vital that we ensure a continuing relationship with the EU and membership of the single market.

The environment plays a key role.

Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab): Will the cabinet secretary take an intervention?

Roseanna Cunningham: Not just now.

Fundamentally, a healthy natural environment is critical to our success as a nation. It underpins our economy, our health, our landscape and our way of life. Scotland trades internationally on our reputation as a clean, green country with wholesome food and drink. We often take that natural environment for granted, but we must all remember that it is one of Scotland's most precious assets.

The threat of Brexit brings those benefits into clearer focus. Although environmental arguments were not at the heart of the EU referendum debate, there is widespread acceptance that the EU has been a catalyst for driving up environmental standards since the UK joined in

1973. We strongly believe that membership of the EU delivers considerable social, economic, environmental and cultural benefits for individuals, businesses and communities across Scotland.

We have much to be proud of in Scotland's environmental record. We have an excellent record on water quality and we are acknowledged to be one of the leaders in delivering comprehensive policies across the landscape to further enhance the water environment. We have built a reputation in Europe as leaders on climate change and on the circular economy, and we fully intend to maintain that position.

EU nature policy and legislation are effective, ambitious, far reaching, robust, consistent and well enforced. Scotland provides the major part of the UK's contribution to Natura 2000, with more than 15 per cent of our land area designated for a wealth of habitats and species. We remain a stronghold for a number of species that are threatened or extinct elsewhere in the EU.

Scotland's first national marine plan was adopted in March 2015 to provide a comprehensive and joined-up policy for protecting and enhancing our marine environment and resources.

We have shown leadership in areas such as natural capital—Scotland was the first country in the world to establish a natural capital asset indicator—and the largest green-space project in Europe is right here in Scotland, with the central Scotland green network receiving some 25 million visits per year.

In 2015, we published Scotland's first separate air quality strategy, which demonstrates our determination to improve air quality. We are also working hard to halt biodiversity loss in Scotland.

Although we cannot be complacent, overall, we can be proud of our successes in seeking to protect our environment. The EU referendum result does not affect our commitment to build on those successes.

It is important to recognise that we are much more aligned to the EU's position on a number of issues, such as climate change, than the UK Government is. The EU referendum result creates unnecessary uncertainty and, to be frank, Brexit would make it more difficult to achieve our ambitions for the environment. It is not that we would lose our ambition but that our ambition would be made harder to achieve.

It is not by chance that we enjoy high environmental standards in the EU. We have been able to develop and maintain our high standards because the EU has created arrangements for trade between partner nations that respect and

promote progress in social and environmental protection.

Scotland has been, and continues to be, an active partner in Europe on the climate and low-carbon agenda. Scotland participates widely in EU research and development programmes and knowledge exchange and it leads on delivering emissions reduction measures and pioneering low-carbon technologies.

Membership of the EU enables us to help to shape the rules, regulations and standards that directly affect our ability to maintain and enhance our environment. It allows us to participate in the meetings and discussions that take place in Brussels. Many of the environmental challenges that we face do not respect national boundaries. Being part of the EU makes it easier to take the collective action that is needed to tackle those environmental challenges.

Bilateral trade deals do not necessarily respect environmental, climate change and sustainable development goals. Whatever the good intentions of Governments, we know that maintaining high standards is difficult without trading arrangements that allow that to happen.

The best way to maintain progress on environmental quality and towards the achievement of climate change targets is within the EU. Let us not forget that that is also what the Scottish people wanted—to remain in the EU. Being in the EU allows us to promote resource efficiency and make genuine moves towards sustainability. With our partners, we believe that there is potential to reform producer responsibility to promote aspects of design that support a more circular economy, such as increased durability or recycled content. We also intend to explore how we could direct more products into higher-value use beyond recycling and into reuse and remanufacture.

What are a couple of the specific threats that are posed by Brexit? I will first speak about climate change. Whatever form of Brexit the UK Government pursues—let us be honest: views on that seem to change daily—we will no longer be part of the EU negotiating bloc on climate change. That risks our international reputation as climate change leaders and our opportunity to contribute to global climate diplomacy. We will lose access to financial support programmes and the ability to influence decisions that will continue to have an impact on Scotland.

Climate change targets are challenging and the best way of achieving them is to continue with collective effort, which is vital for delivering on Paris agreement commitments. The UK's forthcoming exit from the EU is already creating uncertainty about the key building blocks for

achieving targets, including emissions trading and effort sharing. With a UK exit looming, the global community is concerned about risks to the EU's position in global climate negotiations.

Neil Findlay: Each of these Brexit debates degenerates into project fear on steroids. I have grave concerns about some of the things that will happen after Brexit, but will the cabinet secretary turn her mind to some of the opportunities that may arise from it?

Roseanna Cunningham: I would be glad to hear from Mr Findlay what some of those opportunities are, because I know that he voted leave and therefore agrees with the Westminster Government—

Neil Findlay: On a point of order, Presiding Officer. For the record, I voted remain.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: That was not a point of order, but it is now on the record. You will have an opportunity to speak later, Mr Findlay.

Roseanna Cunningham: I am glad to be corrected.

I move on to the specific issue of the research institutes. My portfolio directly supports a number of world-leading research institutes in Scotland that provide cutting-edge advances in agriculture, food and environmental research that have helped to boost our rural economy's performance and enhance our environment. Their research helps to inform policy decisions in Scotland and in the EU—indeed, the EU is a major funder of those institutes and it accounts for around £6 million in funding every year. The funding uncertainty is now considerable.

However, the uncertainty is about more than just funding. EU nationals make up around one in six employees of the research institutes, and their skills and experience are integral to the institutes' success. It is an absolute disgrace that the UK Government has not guaranteed the position of EU citizens in our country—by not doing so, it directly damages Scotland's research future. I plan to meet EU nationals from the research institutes next month, and I reiterate that the 181,000 non-British EU nationals who have chosen to make their home here continue to be welcome.

What are the next steps? The Scottish Government is actively engaged in discussions to protect our natural environment and to progress action to tackle climate change. In July, I convened a stakeholder event at which we explored the potential implications—all of them; I hope that Mr Findlay is listening—of leaving the EU for Scotland's environment. That event was an opportunity to promote collaborative working and to share experiences and concerns about those difficult challenges. I also welcome the

establishment of the environment and climate change round table, which is chaired by Professor Dame Anne Glover. The panel draws on different areas of expertise in academic and environmental organisations to advise the Scottish Government's standing council on Europe.

Those actions, along with the establishment of the standing council on Europe, demonstrate how serious we are about exploring all options to protect Scotland's interests. Given how much we will be affected by leaving the EU, it is essential that Scotland has meaningful discussions with the UK Government in the development of the UK position for the negotiations that are ahead.

The environment has been a key competence of the EU for good reason. Progress on environmental and social goals has developed hand in hand with a single trading market. A level playing field allows higher standards for all, and we have been able to work together to tackle global problems, including climate change.

If we end up in a hard Brexit, our ambitions for Scotland's environment will remain high. We continue to commit to maintaining, protecting and enhancing our environment, and it is crucial that the environment and climate change are part of the consideration of future trade arrangements. The Scottish Government will maintain efforts to secure Scotland's place in the EU, not least to protect our environment, but we will continue to seek to protect the environment regardless of what the outcomes may be.

I move,

That the Parliament agrees that membership of the EU has ensured progress on a wide range of environmental issues in Scotland and continues to underpin vital environmental protection; recognises the importance of the EU in securing collective action and progress on climate change; further recognises that a healthy environment supports prosperity and allows the promotion of Scottish produce and tourism around the world; notes that the value of the natural environment to the people of Scotland must be recognised by the UK Government in any future trade negotiations; welcomes that the Scottish Ministers will pass on in full the EU funding guaranteed by the UK Government so far, which is vital to protecting, maintaining and enhancing the natural environment; believes that Scotland must protect its position as a climate change leader, and calls on the UK Government to ensure that Scotland has a role in the decision-making, as well as full involvement, in all UK negotiations.

14:45

Maurice Golden (West Scotland) (Con): I am disappointed that the Scottish National Party Government wishes constantly to debate portfolio X in relation to Brexit, rather than focusing on maximising the powers that have been devolved and that are fully in the competence of this Parliament. The argument that every problem

facing Scotland is the fault of the UK Government is as weak as it is simplistic.

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

Maurice Golden: I had hoped to get beyond 35 seconds, but I am quite happy to do so, if the member would like.

Stewart Stevenson: The member will be aware that marine fuels M30, M40 and M60 are all permitted to carry sulphur up to a level of 3 per cent, which is nearly 2.5 per cent more than any other kind of fuel. That is one of the most polluting ways to generate energy. Does the Scottish Parliament have power to change that?

Maurice Golden: We will fully cover all those points in the course of the next eight and a half minutes.

Overall, the Government's approach is the politics of grievance. The irony is that, like with a spoilt child, the more powers that have been given to the Scottish Parliament, the louder the moaning and whingeing from the SNP Government gets. I am not accusing the Scottish Government of being a one-trick pony in blaming the UK Government for every single Scottish Government failing; since 24 June, it has a new trick of blaming Brexit as well.

I believe that Brexit will happen, that Brexit means Brexit and that the UK Government will deliver the best package for everyone in the United Kingdom.

Those who believe the Government motion would think that the EU should take credit for every environmental or climate change target delivered in Scotland. Clearly that is not the case. In fact, it does the Scottish Government a disservice. The cabinet secretary said earlier this week in relation to EU directives that

"any responsible Government would be choosing to do these things",

and that EU directives were

"simply a starting off point".

I agree. Why does the motion go against that?

Of course, the EU has had a part to play, but so have the United Nations and many international non-governmental organisations, as well as major international treaties such as the Kyoto protocol and, most recently, the Paris agreement.

It should also be recognised that much of this portfolio already lies within the competence of the Scottish Government and that, on this occasion, it cannot blame its failings on Westminster or Brexit. Going forward, it is simply not acceptable for the Scottish Government to use Brexit as a

smokescreen to hide behind in respect of its performance in this area.

Perhaps the problem is that the Scottish Government does not trust itself to look after the environment without intervention from the European Union. I echo the sentiments of the Scottish Wildlife Trust, RSPB Scotland, the National Trust for Scotland, the Woodland Trust and the Marine Conservation Society that the Scottish Government should not use Brexit as an opportunity to deregulate and weaken environmental targets and legislation.

Ross Greer (West Scotland) (Green): On the point about trust, how much trust should be placed in a UK Government that is supposedly committed to tackling climate change but that recently abolished the Department of Energy and Climate Change?

Maurice Golden: As the member will be aware, I do not speak for the UK Government, but I can say that the UK Government has played a wonderful role in subsidising an amount of renewable energy, which has allowed the Scottish Government to achieve the targets. I would expect some congratulations on that point.

Claudia Beamish (South Scotland) (Lab): Will the member take an intervention?

Maurice Golden: Not at the moment, Claudia, thanks.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Could you please use surnames? Thank you.

Maurice Golden: No problem. I am still getting used to everyone's names, Presiding Officer.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: As I am, but do not use first names.

Maurice Golden: Post Brexit, we should work proactively to maintain and strengthen current legislation, where appropriate, and explore the opportunities to change EU legislation that is not in Scotland's interests.

So why is the SNP hiding behind Brexit? Let us look at its record. For example, the recent biodiversity 2020 progress report shows that work is slipping and targets are being missed. On peatland restoration, 10,000 hectares of peatland has been restored since 2013, but we should be restoring 21,000 hectares annually, so that is a failure. We should be creating 3,000 to 5,000 hectares of new native woodland per year, but the target was not met last year and just 2,314 hectares of native woodland were created—another failure.

The Minister for UK Negotiations on Scotland's Place in Europe (Michael Russell): Will the member take an intervention?

Maurice Golden: Not at this moment in time. I am just doing a list of failures, but I will take an intervention, thereafter, Mr Russell. [*Laughter.*]

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Please sit down, Mr Russell.

Maurice Golden: We need to restore approximately 10,000 hectares of native woodland into satisfactory condition, in partnership with private woodland owners, through deer management plans. No actual achievements for that target are listed—another failure. On safeguarding Scotland's resources, there is a commitment to promote the sustainable design of products, but where is that? It is another failure. The target recycling rate of 50 per cent for 2013 has still not been met and Scotland is the worst performer in Britain—another failure.

I could go on, but I will take an intervention from Mr Russell at this point.

Michael Russell: Can the member tell us whether the UK Government for England has, in fact, met those targets? On woodland creation, for example, its failure is even greater.

Maurice Golden: I refer members to my earlier answer, which is that I am not a spokesperson for the UK Government. This is the Scottish Parliament, with devolved powers to deal with Scotland.

With Brexit, we must take the opportunities that exist and maximise them. For example, we have the opportunity to take back control of our seas and exert control over our 200-mile economic exclusive zone as prescribed in the United Nation's law of the sea convention. We can establish a more effective fisheries management system in our waters that delivers for Scotland's fishing industry and provides environmentally sustainable solutions.

We only have to look across the North Sea to see how non-EU countries are meeting the challenges of climate change and environmental protection. The Norwegians have already made great strides, with their 100,000th electric vehicle registered earlier this year. One in three cars now sold in Norway is electric, which is a situation brought about by the Norwegian Government working hard for it with tax breaks and significant investment in the underlying infrastructure.

Roseanna Cunningham: It is an independent country.

Maurice Golden: Norway did not need—

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Excuse me, Mr Golden. If those on the Government front bench want to make comments, I ask them to intervene and not comment from a sedentary position.

John Scott (Ayr) (Con): Absolutely.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: That also goes for backbenchers, Mr Scott. [*Laughter.*]

Maurice Golden: Norway did not need the EU to establish that goal for it; it did it for itself. The SNP often likes to cite Norway as a model for Scotland to look up to, and here I agree with the SNP. The Scottish Government can seize the opportunity that Brexit gives us to go above and beyond when it comes to the environment.

I call on the Scottish Government to focus on the day job; set aside its obsession with a divisive second independence referendum and the blame game; stop the naval gazing, inverse counterfactual history and the quantum reality postulation; and focus on the job at hand of protecting and enhancing Scotland's environment.

I move amendment S5M-02125.1, to leave out from "ensured progress" to end and insert:

"at times aided progress on a wide range of environmental issues in Scotland and continues to underpin vital environmental protection in certain areas, along with a variety of international organisations and nations; recognises the importance of the EU, the UK and non-EU states in securing collective action and progress on climate change; further recognises that a healthy environment supports prosperity and allows the promotion of Scottish produce and tourism around the world; notes that the value of the natural environment to the people of Scotland will be recognised by the UK Government in any future trade negotiations; welcomes that the Scottish Ministers will pass on, in full, the EU funding guaranteed by the UK Government so far, which is vital to protecting, maintaining and enhancing the natural environment; believes that Scotland must not only lead but also deliver on climate change and recognises the positive impact that being part of the UK has had on climate change in Scotland; calls on the Scottish Government to recognise that much decision-making in this portfolio is already in the competence of the Parliament, and further calls on the Scottish Government to participate fully in a positive manner in all UK negotiations in light of the invitation from the UK Government."

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Thank you, Mr Golden. I call David Stewart to speak to and move amendment S5M-02125.2. I will give you an extra minute, so you have eight minutes, please.

14:54

David Stewart (Highlands and Islands) (Lab): Thank you, Presiding Officer.

The environment is an international issue and, whether we are choking in the smog of Los Angeles or watching acid rain fall in eastern Siberia, climate change recognises no boundaries.

One of the EU's great successes has been the comprehensive suite of laws, directives and treaties that have developed, sustained and protected the environment. The EU is perhaps not the world's environmental watchdog, but it is nevertheless a champion and a leader in making

the large-scale global emissions cuts that are needed to begin tackling climate change.

It is easy to forget that, in the 1970s and 1980s, the UK was known as the dirty man of Europe. We had the highest sulphur dioxide emissions from power stations, causing acid rain across northern Europe, and raw sewage was routinely dumped into the sea. In 1976, for example, only 27 beaches in the UK were deemed to be clean enough for swimming.

The EU has helped to modernise the UK's environmental policies since we joined in 1973. Through the EU, Scotland said farewell—this year—to its last coal-fired power station, and the precautionary principle means that the most harmful pesticides were banned from use on the crops that are most visited by bees—I declare my interest as the species champion for the great yellow bumblebee. European rules have meant that thousands of dangerous chemicals have been removed from everyday products, such as lead from paint, and if the current proposals in the revised waste framework directive are adopted, they have the potential to be transformational for Scotland in relation to litter.

However, I stress that the relationship between the EU and the UK has not been one-way. The UK has helped to shape EU thinking across a number of areas, including wildlife protection and climate change. For example, Europe's water framework directive led to cleaner Scottish water, Europe's landfill directives led to improved Scottish recycling rates and Europe's environmental assessment directives have led to improved Scottish air quality.

Air quality is a key aspect that—of course—affects people the world over. Currently, Scotland is influenced by binding EU legislation, which has a direct implication for our health. The EU air quality directive target was missed by both Scotland and the UK as a whole, which led to the cleaner air for Scotland programme being introduced. However, that came into being only because the EU law could be used as a stick over the UK Government, keeping it accountable and pushing it to improve standards, although I note that the legal limits for nitrogen dioxide are still being broken in several parts of Scotland.

It is incredibly important to note that, once we leave the EU, the fact that Scotland and the UK will have the ability to repeal the legislation does not mean that they should. Not only does Scotland have the desire to stay in the EU, which is an incentive to keep within the current EU expectations of standards; another incentive is to help to improve the health of our population.

What are the consequences of Brexit for the environment and climate change? Even the

famous 17th century Highland mystic, the Brahan Seer, who allegedly predicted the outbreak of world war two in 1939, would be stumped. Will it be a hard or a soft Brexit? Will MPs and, indeed, MSPs have a voice before article 50 is invoked? What if the proposed great repeal bill is defeated? What concessions will the remaining 27 member states want in exchange for a continued trading relationship with the UK?

Let me give an example. Recently, I attended the Economic Development Association Scotland conference in Edinburgh, and one of the key speakers that day argued that Spain would demand access to Scottish fishing rights as part of the negotiations. Any suggestion that the UK should continue to have access to the single market would need us to meet the test of the EU's holy grail of the four freedoms, including freedom of movement. There is also a world of difference between being part of the single market and having access to it.

What would a soft Brexit mean for the environment and climate change? One possibility is to negotiate membership of the European economic area, as Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein have done. As members know, the EEA comprises the 28 EU member states and the three European Free Trade Association states. As an EFTA fact sheet states,

“it is therefore impossible to be a party to the EEA Agreement without being a member of either the EU or EFTA.”

Of course, the UK would have to implement EU product standards to access the single market, but it would have no role in shaping future EU environmental policy.

The real threat from Brexit is that Europe's checks and balances may go. Who will enforce Brussels directives post Brexit? Who will be in charge of infraction procedures? My colleague Neil Findlay will talk in more detail about the effect that future trade deals may have on the environment and climate change.

In its briefing, Global Justice Now explains:

“The EU-US trade deal known as TTIP and its Canadian equivalent, CETA, are among the biggest threats to democratic decision making in Europe of our time ... The UK cannot go back to the sewage ridden beaches and environmental destruction of decades past. It is of vital importance that any Brexit deal must involve the UK agreeing to fully maintain EU standards on areas like biodiversity, water and air quality.”

The investor-state dispute settlement system creates tribunals in which foreign investors can sue Governments that interfere with their profit—their bottom line. They are part of CETA, which is the comprehensive economic and trade agreement, and are also likely to be in TTIP, which is the transatlantic trade and investment

partnership. For example, Swedish energy firm Vattenfall used the ISDS mechanism to demand €1 billion from Germany after the state government of Hamburg introduced stricter regulations on the firm's coal-fired power stations. That led to a change of Government policy, a court settlement from Germany and a major set back for the environment and climate change.

The debate is about much more than Brexit. It is about what sort of Scotland we want in the future: a Scotland that is clean, green and sustainable, and a Scotland that is recognised around the globe for the quality of its natural environment, its stunning hills, glens and lochs, its talented multicultural workforce, and the warmth of its welcome to tourists.

In our history, Scots have been leaders: James Watt, the godfather of the industrial revolution; Robert Watson-Watt, the inventor of radar; Willamina Fleming, the early astronomy pioneer. Today, we are leaders in climate change and the environment, and as the great environmental activist, Wendell Benny, said:

"The world is not given by his fathers, but borrowed from his children."

I move amendment S5M-02125.2, to insert after first "climate change":

"and in driving forward collective action for the sustainable development of the marine environment; notes the significant role played by collaborative research across the EU in developing the scientific evidence that underpins protection and enhancement of a healthy environment".

The Deputy Presiding Officer: I call Mark Ruskell to speak to and move amendment S5M-02125.3.

15:01

Mark Ruskell (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green): I welcome the debate.

As we have heard, we live in a Europe where air pollution knows no borders, where fish swim across international waters and where our shared values and actions to protect our commons and our nature are enshrined in European laws and treaties. The days when the UK was known as the dirty man of Europe are over, because EU regulations on the environment dragged us into the modern world. As David Stewart said, we no longer send boats out to dump raw sewage off the east coast—that would be unimaginable today. We no longer treat precious plastic and steel as rubbish to be buried in stinking pits in the ground. We gave the white-tailed eagle, the wildcat and the minke whale the status and protection that they deserve under progressive EU laws. I should declare an interest: I am a champion for the white-tailed eagle.

I openly confess in the chamber that I wept in front of my family on the Friday morning when the Brexit vote was announced, because for me as a Green it represented the casting aside of 40 years of environmental and social progress that we won as a European movement, and it put into grave danger the hope of a further 40 years of progress and reform for my children's generation.

A visit the same day to the Royal Highland Show did not improve my mood, as institution after institution that I spoke to shared their pain. Collaborative projects had been cancelled that very morning, as confidence from European partners drained away.

We are seeing that the cost to Scotland's environment is stacking up. The EU LIFE programme, for example, has provided £42 million in matched funding to support peatland restoration over the past 20 years. Where will that support come from now, when we need healthy peatlands more than ever for both their conservation value and their vast carbon sinks? A proposed RSPB and Plantlife £11m EU LIFE project to eradicate invasive rhododendron has now been withdrawn. That would have been preventative spend, which the Christie commission urged us to invest in. If we do not make such investments, it will cost the environment and the public purse for generations to come.

What will we be left with post Brexit? If we end up with a soft Brexit and remain part of the European free trade area, at least some of our common EU standards will remain, but directives on things from birds to habitats and bathing water quality, and even the common agricultural policy and common fisheries policy, will no longer apply.

I welcome the cabinet secretary's commitment, which I have heard her repeat on many an occasion, to uphold EU laws and directives, but these are early days and times change. Ministers and even Governments change, and already lobby groups are seeing the opportunity to weaken what they see as red tape in a CAP and CFP-free zone.

That is why it is more important than ever to refocus efforts on respecting scientific advice and adopting an ecosystems approach to regenerating our seas and fish stocks. It is also why we need to revisit the defining principles of our agriculture policy, possibly for the first time since the pivotal post-war Agriculture Act 1947, which was passed when we lived in a nation that was desperately hungry. The Scottish Government has the chance to put in place a progressive agricultural vision that can be reflected across the EU, including the prioritisation of organic production, the smarter use of fertiliser and the raising of livestock health. That approach will find support across Europe, particularly from the French, who now have placed

agro-ecology at the heart of their national agriculture policy.

The proposed good food nation bill should start by recognising that food overproduction has destroyed biodiversity, has effectively strip mined our soils in some areas and is driving land use into becoming an even bigger emitter of carbon than the entire energy generation sector. That has already been the stand-out point in the evidence that the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee has received in the few weeks that it has met. The evidence of the UK Committee on Climate Change shows that that we have a crisis in agriculture with regard to not just carbon emissions but adaptations. The need for agricultural reform is clear, but we must move forward together to raise the playing field of standards across the EU and shift subsidies away from blunt support for overproduction to measures that can deliver real benefits for taxpayers, from flood protection and species reintroduction to clean soil, air and water.

On the moral imperative that is climate change, our targets have been set in the context of a Europe that is driving hard progress on carbon and energy. A weaker set of UK climate targets agreed with the United Nations would take the pressure off the UK, and with a Westminster Government that is mad keen on nuclear energy and fracking, it is likely that energy market rules established in the wake of Brexit will stifle Scotland's ambitions for renewables instead of realising them.

In that respect, it is incredible to hear Maurice Golden talk about the subsidy regime, given that it has been cut by the Conservatives. His Government is no longer supporting renewables in Scotland, and people are losing jobs as a result. We have seen how it has butchered that renewables subsidy scheme, and it is switching off the investment pipeline for onshore wind and other technologies in Scotland just as the cost gap with conventional generation is starting to narrow. The news that the UK has dropped to 14th most attractive place for renewables investment in the world behind Morocco is a disgrace, given the richness of our renewable resources and innovation expertise. Indeed, the signs are not good, given that we still await Westminster's action plan to deliver the UK's climate targets, with no clear timescale on the horizon.

A post-Brexit bonfire of environmental regulations, investment, research and subsidies from Westminster will only drive bad consequentials for budgets in Scotland and put our own green ambitions firmly back in the box. However, the hard Brexit scenario offers an even more terrifying prospect of a race to the bottom in environmental and social standards driven by

neoliberal trade deals that undermine the democratic will of citizens across the world. CETA and the transatlantic trade and investment partnership are not benign trade agreements that helpfully reduce tariffs and quotas; they allow public policy on everything from climate change to food standards to be challenged by corporations. The right to trade trumps everything and states that those who stand in the way can be sued through closed corporate courts. As Alyn Smith has said, we do not live in an economy, we live in a society, and those trade agreements have the potential to pull our public services and hard-fought environmental protections apart.

That is why the Green amendment reflects three key red lines around democratic accountability and protection for public services and the environment. There are examples that I can highlight for Liam McArthur's benefit. In Quebec, corporations have sued Governments over fracking bans. It is unthinkable that such a thing could happen here in Scotland, but all Algy Cluff would need to do to sue the Scottish Government would be to open up an office in Vancouver—he would not even require an office here.

It is clear that, collectively, states and devolved Parliaments across Europe have taken their eye off the ball with CETA. Scrutiny at Westminster has been non-existent and the devolved Administrations are coming late to the debate.

Liam McArthur: Will the member give way?

The Deputy Presiding Officer: The member is in his last seconds.

Mark Ruskell: Wallonia stuck its neck out and although it was largely isolated, it spoke for millions of citizens across Europe who have petitioned and campaigned against TTIP and CETA.

A strong democratic heart is beating louder than ever in Europe, and now is the time for Scotland to step up, join that beat for reform and create a fair Europe that protects and builds on the environmental and social progress that we have delivered together, leaving a world fit for future generations. That is why I move the amendment in my name.

I move amendment S5M-02125.3, after "trade negotiations;" to insert:

"notes that, like the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), the final Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) text contains an arbitration court that sits outside of the domestic court system and is only accessible to foreign investors, mechanisms that might create a downward pressure on environmental regulations and risks to public service provision; believes that the passing of CETA might result in significant negative implications for environmental protection in Scotland; calls therefore on the UK Government to act to address these concerns;"

15:10

Liam McArthur (Orkney Islands) (LD): This is my first opportunity to participate in the now weekly debates on the consequences of Brexit. I make it clear from the outset that I absolutely share the dismay that is felt by many at the mess that the Tories have landed the country in through an abject failure to manage divisions within their party. I believe that the vote by the UK to leave the EU was a backward, self-defeating step of historic proportions, and one that was not in the interests of the UK, of Scotland or of the Orkney community that I represent.

Back in June, my constituents voted heavily in favour of remaining part of the EU. They recognise that EU membership is profoundly in their interests for a host of reasons, so I will do all in my power to safeguard those interests in the months ahead. However, Orkney voted even more overwhelmingly in favour of remaining part of the UK back in 2014, and I simply do not accept that layering the additional uncertainty of a second independence referendum on top of what we already face with Brexit is compatible with representing and safeguarding the interests of those whom I was elected to serve.

There will be colleagues in the chamber—I will not name them—who can chart a more long-standing commitment to European integration and the principles that underlie it. For me, though, it is at the heart of why I am a Liberal Democrat. A passionate belief in empowering individuals and communities to fulfil their potential only works if one also accepts the necessity of collective action and collaboration to tackle problems and seize opportunities that transcend nations.

An obvious example of an area in which such action is required is climate change and, more broadly, the protection of the environment. The Government's motion is absolutely right to point to the pivotal role that the EU has played in developing the environmental agenda, raising standards in air and water quality, cutting emissions, reducing waste and a host of other areas. In part, the EU has achieved that by securing concerted collective action and lifting the threat that steps taken by one member state would leave it at a competitive disadvantage compared with others. It has also succeeded in bringing those issues into the main stream of political debate across the continent and further afield.

Domestically, it is estimated that around 80 per cent of our environmental legislation originates at an EU level. To take just one example, Scottish Renewables claimed in 2013 that EU directives and their implementation by the UK and Scottish Governments were responsible for delivering much of the progress that had been achieved in the sector up to that point, although Mark Ruskell

made some sensible observations on what has happened in the past couple of years.

However, that did not stop the Scottish ministers setting renewables targets for 2020 that were more challenging than those for the UK or the EU. In truth, there is nothing to stop the cabinet secretary taking a bolder, more ambitious path on the environment, regardless of whether we are inside or outside the EU. The RSPB and others make that very point in their briefings, along with the case for securing sustainable land and sea management and future funding for environmental initiatives, which other members have mentioned.

The current uncertainty over Brexit and the UK Government's platitudinous mantra of "Brexit means Brexit" are wholly unhelpful, but that is not a justification for the Scottish Government to throw its hands up in the air and say that nothing can be done, or for this Parliament to renege on its responsibility to hold ministers to account on the environment.

WWF has set out a range of areas in which that can and must be done. Heat and transport, to which my amendment refers, are prime examples. Although excellent progress has been made in reducing emissions from electricity, the same cannot be said of heat, which is responsible for more than half our greenhouse gas emissions. Currently, renewables account for only 4 per cent of Scotland's heat. WWF argues that that will need to improve tenfold by 2030 if we are to begin to meet our climate change targets.

On transport, the situation appears to be little better. Emissions from transport have fallen by less than 1 per cent since 1990, and WWF highlights ways in which improvements might be made in the future. What is not suggested is that the Scottish Government should give a £250 million tax break to the airline industry through changes to air passenger duty, which will also pump 60,000 tonnes of carbon into Scotland's air each year. Also absent from any to-do list for decarbonising transport is flag-waving Scottish Government support for Heathrow expansion. That decision is set for years of legal dispute over breaches to EU and UK laws on air quality and noise, and it flies an Airbus A380 through the SNP's commitment to tackling climate change and reducing environmentally damaging short-haul flights. Doubtless, Heathrow lobbyists will be congratulating themselves on money well spent at the recent SNP conference.

Before closing, I will touch briefly on the final element of my amendment and the Government's motion. As discussions continue over what precisely Brexit will mean in practice, Scottish voices must be heard and Scottish interests protected. In the area of climate change and the environment, that is not in the interests of just

Scotland or the UK, but in the interests of the EU. The breadth and depth of our expertise here are truly world class. I cite the example of Heriot-Watt University only to illustrate what is to be found across our colleges, universities and research institutes, as well as in the private, public and voluntary sectors in Scotland.

I will not undermine Heriot-Watt's achievements by trying to describe its work on surface active agents under the MARISURF project. Suffice it to say that that collaborative venture under the horizon 2020 programme amply demonstrates how Scottish research is highly regarded and its direct relevance to addressing the environmental challenges that many of our industries face, as do industries across the continent and further afield.

Although such initiatives have needlessly and recklessly been made more difficult by Brexit, it is hard to understand SNP ministers' view that a vote for Scotland to leave the UK would have had no impact on the allocation of research funding or collaboration, but that Brexit presents an existential threat. Whatever the future holds, I hope that the Scottish and UK Governments, and indeed the EU, will continue to recognise and invest in the world-class research, innovation and skills that are to be found here in Scotland.

The tragedy of June's vote takes many forms, and making collaborative action on the environment and climate change less straightforward is but one. However, with a climate change bill, a warm homes bill and an energy strategy in the pipeline, the Parliament will have opportunities in the months ahead to show leadership on the environment, if it so chooses.

I move amendment S5M-02125.4, to leave out from "believes" to end and insert:

"considers that while the EU has helped secure concerted collective action, it has always been open to governments to set more ambitious standards; believes that Scotland's status as a climate change leader is jeopardised by the Scottish Government's lack of progress to reduce emissions in areas such as heat and transport, coupled with its support for environmentally damaging policies on air passenger duty and Heathrow expansion, and further believes that the expertise available in Scotland on environmental and climate change matters, and its needs, must be taken into account by the UK Government during the Brexit decision-making and negotiation process."

The Deputy Presiding Officer: We now move to the open debate. I remind all members who wish to take part to ensure that their request-to-speak button is on. Perhaps some members do not realise that if they make an intervention, their request-to-speak button is switched off. I ask members to make sure that their button is still on if they have made an intervention.

I call Kate Forbes, to be followed by Alexander Burnett.

15:17

Kate Forbes (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP): As the MSP for what I like to say is one of the most environmentally important constituencies in Scotland, I am glad to be able to speak in favour of the Government's motion today.

We must not forget that it has been a good start to the parliamentary term with the news that the nation met our annual targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The collective effort of many organisations and individuals and the Scottish Government is to be commended for progress in mitigating climate change. Challenges remain, however, not least of which is the vote to leave the European Union.

However, in the face of Brexit-related confusion and uncertainty, I am delighted that the cabinet secretary has given assurances that we will continue to champion policies that protect the environment. We need to be ambitious and aim high with innovative and transformative policies that do not just impose themselves on stakeholders, but are an inherent part of society's daily life. We are all stakeholders in that—fishermen, farmers, office workers, children, parents, and commuters. We make choices, and we need to make the right ones, but those choices need not be onerous or inconvenient. Many benefits to our economy, health, culture and education derive from mitigating climate change and managing our natural resources well.

Therefore, I will direct much of my focus today on natural capital—that is, the benefits, be they social or economic, that we can derive from Scotland's natural assets. The cabinet secretary has already identified that we are global leader in that regard, having launched the natural capital asset index. We are the first country in the world to publish such a detailed document to monitor annual changes in our natural capital. We are fortunate to live in a country that is rich with natural assets, such as fertile land, diverse animal species and natural energy capabilities. We rely on our natural resources to provide the very basic goods and services that are vital to economic activity and society's wellbeing.

With financial capital, if too much is spent, debts are accrued and bankruptcy can ensue, and the same is true with natural capital. The Scottish Wildlife Trust summed it up when it said:

"If we keep drawing down stocks of natural capital without allowing nature to recover, we run the risk of local, regional or even global ecosystem collapse."

Avoiding that risk takes cross-border efforts and, in the past three decades, the EU has played an important role in supporting and protecting our precious resources. Environmental challenges such as air pollution do not respect borders and I

hope that we will continue to collaborate internationally to combat climate change and protect natural resources.

Some fantastic projects in my constituency have derived from the natural capital of our country and have created jobs, boosted our tourism industry and benefited our food and drink sector. I will give a few examples. The Wilderness Scotland tour in Aviemore and the Nevis Range mountain experience in Fort William both make use of stunning scenery and biodiversity and have each been awarded gold certifications from Green Tourism. On Skye, which is the second most visited place in Scotland, the status of Fairy Glen as a geological wonder has been used to promote tourism and strengthen the island's position as a must-visit location for tourists who visit Scotland from across the globe.

Likewise, my constituency has benefited from a number of EU wildlife regulations. The Moray Firth is home to a large group of bottlenose dolphins, a mammal that is classed as a European protected species. The habitat regulations of 1994 have ensured that those beautiful creatures can continue to cultivate their natural environment without interference from pollutants and other industrial waste—long may that continue.

To effectively manage our natural capital, we have to take the requisite action so that we do not run up our ecological, social and economic liability. The EU has been the primary legislator on environmental matters and, with the UK Government thus far showing an unwillingness to continue that work, it is more important than ever that Scotland leads the way with ambition and conviction. We must do that with an effort to engage all stakeholders in the process and to make combating climate change an inherent part of society's daily life.

15:23

Alexander Burnett (Aberdeenshire West) (Con): I draw attention to my registered interests in forestry, biomass and timber construction.

It is important to make the Scottish National Party aware that voting remain was not the same as wanting independence. For most of us, that would seem obvious, but I fear that some on the SNP benches have not yet understood it. What is more obvious is that we are leaving the European Union and we are going to make a success of it. Unfortunately, we are all too aware of what the SNP wants to achieve today.

Gillian Martin (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP): Does Mr Burnett agree that, in the independence referendum, the better together cohorts campaigned on securing Scotland's place in the European Union and that is why a great deal of

people voted no in that referendum? We should not make the assumption that the member makes.

Alexander Burnett: Most people who voted in the Scottish referendum understood that there was the very strong possibility that there would be an EU referendum and made a choice in the knowledge that a referendum would happen. All of them believed in the democratic process and I hope that everyone in Scotland will continue to believe in it.

Returning to the debate, the SNP will blame its failures on the environment before Brexit for the reasons that it is failing the environment after Brexit. From missing targets to targets without end dates, the Scottish Government is failing our forestry sector. I can imagine the SNP briefing for this debate reading like a broken record: Tories bad, Brexit worse. The facts simply do not add up for the SNP in the sector. Forestry is one of our strongest areas—from timber production for paper, biomass or construction, wood is the most environmental product that we have, and we should have it in abundance in Scotland.

By leaving the European Union, Holyrood will get the powers over directives that affect our environment. Those powers cover the forestry strategy—unfortunately, it is riddled with shortcomings—and will give us an opportunity to create a bespoke Scottish model.

Stewart Stevenson: Will Alexander Burnett identify a specific piece of power that Scotland would expect to get?

Alexander Burnett: We will get more control over what we will be able to do for planting, which I will come to. The powers covering forestry will come to Holyrood.

The Scottish Conservative MEP, Dr Ian Duncan, held a consultation that asked Scottish stakeholders—including wildlife charities, government agencies and private sector companies—how EU environment legislation could be amended or altered for the benefit of Scotland. The conclusion was that EU legislation has become cumbersome and confusing.

One of the main problems with the directives is that they have to take into account the needs of 28 other nations. In forestry, that means 28 nations finding a single solution to fit all forests from the mountain birch trees in Abisko in the Arctic circle to the stone pine forests of Donana national park just north of Africa. For a party that wants independence, I find it strange that the SNP would be willing to give that legislation back to Brussels instead of deciding it here.

However, perhaps we know the real reason why the SNP does not want future forestry powers discussed here. A quick look at its track record on

planting reveals that not once in the past six years has the SNP Government hit its target of 10,000 hectares. Without the planting needed for our basic needs, let alone the areas required to hit our climate change targets, the forestry sector is continually let down by the SNP Government.

Planting figures were one of the main discussion points when I recently met the Confederation of Forest Industries, the industry body. It recognised the need to establish a fully devolved arrangement that can make a success of Scottish forestry. It has pushed for a well-resourced effective forest and management service that works with the private sector for the benefit of Scotland.

Confor seems to have put more thought than the Scottish Government has into how we can make a success of Brexit for forestry. It has outlined five key aspects that need to be fixed in order to create a thriving forestry and timber sector. I encourage the cabinet secretary to take on board those and many other stakeholders' suggestions.

Confor states that Brexit offers a unique opportunity to integrate forestry and timber production as a major driver of the rural economy. Is it not the case that the Scottish Government should get behind the ideas of the industry instead of perusing political point scoring?

However, it should have been clear from the outset that the First Minister and her colleagues have never had any intention of delivering on Brexit opportunities. Not one member of Nicola Sturgeon's expert panel has been involved in the forestry sector. That is simply not good enough when nearly 20 per cent of Scotland is covered by forest and the industry, which is worth £1 billion, employs more than 25,000 people.

To conclude, we have a Government that is hell-bent on a single policy and which is willing to use any legislation to promote its ultimate goal. It is now more important than ever for the SNP to quit its grievance politics and get behind the opportunities that Brexit will bring our forestry sector.

15:29

Graeme Dey (Angus South) (SNP): After years of the drip-drip undermining and misreporting of the EU by sections of our print media, was it altogether surprising that so many people in the UK fell for the claims of Brexit advocates about aspects of EU-inspired law? There were stories about those Brussels bureaucrats who were imposing their will on the Brits and demanding that bananas and cucumbers not be overly curved, that firemen no longer be allowed to slide down poles, that pale ale no longer be called pale ale—and all that nonsense. So great in scale and variety was

the nonsense that a website is dedicated to debunking the myths.

When it comes to shaping law on the environment, it is undeniable—to the extent that even the right-wing media struggle to make a case against this—that EU membership has been a force for good. Brexit raises obvious and significant concerns for an area that is covered by more than 650 pieces of legislation. The concerns are being highlighted not just by environmentalists but by academics. They are also being highlighted in our sister Parliament in Northern Ireland.

The Scottish Government has been clear in its commitment to maintaining high environmental standards, whatever the future holds. However, there are implications and possible threats in that regard.

The overarching principle is that right now the EU is there to keep Governments honest and hold them to account on environmental commitments. The mechanisms that we have in place enable action to be taken to ensure that obligations are met. The mere fact that they exist is, by and large, enough to ensure compliance.

Against the backdrop of our so-called taking back control, what will the future hold for a Scotland that is in the UK but outwith the EU? Stakeholders who gave evidence to the UK Environmental Audit Committee were of the view that the EU has provided a necessary enforcement mechanism, which has incentivised the UK Government to take action that it might not otherwise have taken. They gave the example of the air quality directive. The committee noted in its report, "EU and UK Environmental Policy", that many witnesses expressed the fear that

"if the UK were free to set its own environmental standards, it would set them at a less stringent level than has been imposed by the EU."

We can understand why such concerns exist. The deregulatory tone of the UK Government's rhetoric and—even more so—that of the leave campaign might easily be regarded as a sign that the flexibility that Brexit offers is more likely to be used to reduce than to strengthen environmental protections when they conflict with other goals.

As Dave Stewart asked, when we are outside the EU, who will ensure compliance? Will the laws survive in their existing form to be complied with, if powerful voices in the UK marine and, in particular, land sectors demand a slashing of red tape and approaches that favour their short-term interests?

What of the risk of reverse devolution, at least in relation to cross-border areas, which academics have flagged up? Is it conceivable that a UK Government will appoint itself as overseer of environmental compliance and a consistent

approach across these islands and their devolved Administrations? That is a concerning prospect. One can certainly imagine a situation in which, where Scotland's environmental standards were higher than standards over the border, powerful lobbying forces would demand to compete on a level playing field.

We might already be seeing signs that such an approach is emerging. Scottish Land & Estates, in its paper on possible post-Brexit relationships between Scotland, Wales and the UK in the context of food, farming and the environment, gets only as far as the second paragraph before it asserts:

“Crucially, we suggest that there is a need for a level of consistency across the UK, so that farmers, landowners and rural businesses are not disadvantaged by geography”.

In the interests of fairness, I acknowledge that the paper makes a number of reasonable and considered points. However, one other comment jumped out at me as I worked my way through: the demand that policy development involve consultation with landowners and farmers at every stage. I noted the lack of reference to environmentalists. Of course, the organisation represents farmers and landowners, and I hope that the absence of an acknowledgement that environmentalists would rightly also need to be involved is no more than an oversight.

Many, not insignificant environmental questions arise from Brexit. One is the EU emissions trading scheme, which is administered at EU level and does not simply transfer into UK law. The UK could negotiate continued involvement of some kind in the scheme, but we must be realistic and ask how accommodating the EU will want to be, given that that might offer encouragement to other member states that are entertaining thoughts of splintering off. Even if the UK could remain involved in ETS as some sort of associate member, how would UK interests be fully protected in the rightful drive to tighten the cap, if the UK could not vote on legislative changes to the EU ETS? If that is a non-starter, will we have to set up a replacement national trading scheme? How might that work in practice?

The politics around environmental legislation could be huge, but even if we set politics to one side we find that the considered view is that Brexit's impact has the potential to be significant for our environment, as Professor Colin Reid of the University of Dundee set out in his paper, “Brexit: Challenges for Environmental Law.” I will just refer to Professor Reid's conclusions. He says:

“For environmental law overall, the most significant changes are likely to be not so much in the details of any legislation, but the new vulnerability of environmental rules to short term political pressures and the removal of the

means by which the government can be called to account. Whatever its flaws, the EU has provided a stable framework of environmental law and the means to ensure that governments and others live up to their obligations. The post-Brexit world will be more volatile. We do not know what the coming years will bring in terms of the details and timing of the UK's withdrawal, the nature of future relationships with the EU and others or the extent to which existing laws based on EU measures will survive unchanged. The one certainty is uncertainty.”

There are so many questions and so few obvious answers, highlighting the absolute need for Scotland to be able to safeguard and indeed build upon the environmental progress that we have made, however that might be achieved.

15:35

Neil Findlay (Lothian) (Lab): This debate is timely and important. It speaks to the broader question of how we in this Parliament and in the UK Parliament handle our departure from the European Union, because in my view it will happen whether we like it or not. If it does not happen, I believe that there is the real potential for an ugly social, political and democratic crisis. In a recent *Guardian* article, George Monbiot summed up the possible consequences of such a scenario. He said:

“Were this vote to be annulled ... the result would be a full-scale class and culture war ... pitching middle-class progressives against those on whose behalf they have claimed to speak, and permanently alienating people who have spent their lives feeling voiceless and powerless.”

I think that the stakes are that high and, tragically, I fear that he may be right—an issue that I will return to later. First, there is much in the Government motion that I agree with but there are other assumptions that I believe are in need of challenge. I recognise the benefits that being part of the EU have brought to our environment. Our drinking water and beaches, the treatment of waste water, air quality, climate change targets and the protection of wildlife have all seen positive action as a consequence of joint working across the nations of the EU.

Through legislation, enforcement and awareness raising, the importance of the environment and our need to protect it has risen up the political agenda and we must ensure that the standards set by the EU are sustained and improved on as we continually strive for a better environment. However, we know that there is a constant tension and often a contradiction at the heart of things—between trade policy and a desire to see environmental protection; and between protecting and sustaining the environment and adhering to the neoliberal economic doctrine driven by the EU, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Those institutions often talk a good game in terms of

environmentalism but it always seems to play second or third fiddle.

We can see examples of those tensions playing out here in Scotland with the very powerful airline industry. The Scottish Government sets much-lauded targets to cut carbon emissions but at the same time promotes airport and air route expansion and the scrapping of air passenger duty and is a cheerleader for Heathrow expansion. All that will result in more flights, resulting in more pollution and more greenhouse gases. Once again, economic gain trumps environmental protection.

The EU falls into the very same trap. It has put in place worthy directives, which have been transposed into our law, but it is also in thrall to many of the corporations that pollute and damage our environment, exploit workers and avoid tax on an industrial scale as they put profits before people, planet and communities. TTIP and CETA are cases in point. Both deals are currently being negotiated outside democratic lines of accountability, a situation that goes to the very heart of the democratic void at the centre of the EU. They are agreements that are more concerned with protecting free trade than with protecting our communities and the environment and which will see corporations at the heart of policymaking, with a seat at the table.

If—it is a big if—Governments then put in place policy and legislation that run counter to corporate interests, those democratically elected Governments could be taken to court and sued. It has happened in Canada, Australia and elsewhere. What arrogance; what an affront to democracy. I believe that it is for those reasons—and many more—that voters across the UK voted leave.

We must not think that such things could not happen here. Imagine if TTIP had been up and running: Ineos or some other similar company might be dragging the Scottish Government through the investor-state dispute settlement system to stop a democratically elected Parliament deciding its own policy on an issue such as fracking.

I am raising these concerns—I will continue to raise many more—as the debate over the terms of Brexit unfolds, because the political class in Scotland is coalescing around a narrative that seeks to frustrate the democratic will of the people who voted in a referendum not as separate nations but as one entity. We are in danger of fulfilling Monbiot's gloomy prediction. I say that as someone who voted remain.

A failure to heed the warnings and to hear the voices of marginalised communities across Europe, a failure to take urgent action on mass

youth unemployment in Spain, Portugal, Croatia, Italy and elsewhere and a failure to listen to those forced to leave their homelands to find work—often very low-paid, exploitative work—elsewhere, will drive people towards the simplistic solutions of the far right and threaten greater instability on the continent.

We all know that there is a rocky road ahead with Brexit, but if all we talk about is doom and gloom it will be a self-fulfilling prophecy. We have the opportunity to argue for a social Europe, for a progressive Europe and for a Europe that protects our environment and puts people and communities first. We have the opportunity to make those points here and now, and not to focus on what I will continually call project fear on steroids. *[Interruption.]*

The Deputy Presiding Officer: I ask people—or even one person—in the public gallery not to applaud, please.

15:42

Emma Harper (South Scotland) (SNP): I very much welcome the Scottish Government's motion on securing the interests of the environment and continuing progress on climate change, following the EU referendum result.

Since the SNP came to power in 2007, climate change has been a key area, in which Scotland has formed a distinctive approach. When it gained royal assent, the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 was the most ambitious climate change legislation anywhere in the world. We have exceeded one target that was set in the legislation by reducing emissions by 42 per cent six years earlier than expected. The Scottish Government will now set a new and—I am sure—more testing target for 2020 of reducing emissions by potentially a further 50 per cent.

In May, Nicola Sturgeon appointed Scotland's first Cabinet Secretary for the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform, which shows the importance that we continue to place on our ambitions in that area.

There is no doubt that the European Union has played a vital role in securing collective 28-country action and progress on climate change, or that Scotland has led by example as a devolved nation within that union. However, environmentalists have voiced a number of concerns about how the UK will proceed as it leaves the EU, dragging Scotland with it, and how that may affect our ambitions here in Scotland. Commenting on the morning of the referendum result, Richard Dixon, who is the director of Friends of the Earth Scotland, said:

"Many of the politicians backing the leave vote are climate sceptics and against renewable energy, and much

of the 'red tape' they complain about are the laws that have given us cleaner air and water, and forced companies to reduce pollution."

Unfortunately, those fears appear to be well founded.

Two days after the EU fast-tracked ratification of the Paris climate deal, Theresa May failed to make mention of her own plans for ratification of the agreement in her keynote speech at the Conservative Party conference. The Prime Minister's decision not to address the issue follows a worrying trend in her premiership that began back in July with the abolition of the Department of Energy and Climate Change. DECC was, of course, set up to implement the Climate Change Act 2008. That process will now be overseen by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. David Powell of the New Economics Foundation said that it is "every bit as likely" to

"prop up the oil and gas industry and build nuclear power stations as it"

is to "lead in green technology."

Another indication of Theresa May's attitude to tackling climate change can be seen in her Cabinet appointments. Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Andrea Leadsom has voted against key measures to stop climate change, including voting in 2012 and 2016 against setting a target on reducing carbon emissions. Ms Leadsom was a devout supporter of the vote leave campaign and is joined in the Cabinet by several other Brexiters.

The link between climate change deniers and Eurosceptics became clear during the EU referendum campaign. In February, it was revealed that the climate-change-denying think tank the Global Warming Policy Foundation had moved its headquarters into the same building as Brexit campaign groups business for Britain and vote leave. The think tank was established by Nigel Lawson who, coincidentally, also headed the Conservatives' vote leave group. It was a natural alliance that was formed from the shared belief that market freedom trumps all and should not be interfered with by regulations or state intervention.

With political will, we can take action to tackle climate change whether we are in or out of the EU. To determine whether the will exists, we must look at who has the power and whether they think action is worth taking. No matter how hard Scotland pushes for progress, we will be limited by the policies of a Westminster Government that is hostile to the notion of taking real action on climate change. For example, efforts to support and expand renewable energy production in Scotland have been key to our progress, and EU funding has been vital to development of that industry.

However, it seems likely that the EU's power to set renewables targets will be transferred to a hostile UK Government. The EU Renewable Energy Directive—which requires the UK to source 15 per cent of its energy from renewables by 2020—was already unpopular among Conservative MPs who lobbied against an extension of those targets before the referendum in June, and the renewables obligation will close to all new generating capacity on 31 March 2017.

Neil Findlay: On lobbying, does Emma Harper support her party's decision to support the expansion of Heathrow?

Emma Harper: The Government has decided to support the expansion of Heathrow, and we are aware that we can offset potential emissions by other measures. As the First Minister said at one of our events, we have to be aware of offsetting economic delivery and growth against climate change, so we will do whatever we need to do to balance those.

The UK Government's plans have been criticised by a wide range of experts and stakeholders. Research that was conducted by Scottish Renewables before the EU referendum suggested that investors were already less willing to lend to wind farm projects.

The reality of Brexit is that it puts significant investment and jobs at risk—many of which could be located in my region. The best way forward for us is to maintain—by whatever means necessary—Scotland's relationship with the EU and our place in the single market. Scotland will continue to deliver global leadership through involvement in the United Nations climate talks. I welcome the Scottish Government's plans to work with the Committee on Climate Change to develop a new climate change bill while we continue to fulfil obligations under the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009.

15:49

Finlay Carson (Galloway and West Dumfries)

(Con): More than four months after the EU referendum, today's debate is another chapter in the series of debates trying to hide the SNP Government's failure, with SNP members once again blaming either Westminster or Brexit. Whether we like it or not and whether we supported it or not, the UK is leaving the European Union and we have to—and we will—make a success of it. This debate is nothing more than a smokescreen to hide the SNP's inadequacies and failings when it comes to the environment and climate change.

I will quote the Scottish Wildlife Trust, which has said:

“The state of Scotland’s natural environment is inextricably linked to Scotland’s future prosperity, the wellbeing of its people and Scotland’s ability to cope with the effects of climate change. The quality of Scotland’s natural environment and being renowned for maintaining high environmental standards are both significant to ‘Brand Scotland’ and hence Scotland’s economy e.g. the tourism sector is worth at least £11.6 billion—nature-based tourism alone is estimated to generate at least £1.4 billion, with around 39,000 full-time equivalent jobs.”

Therefore, there is no doubt that climate change is very important to Scotland. Moving forward, in or out of the EU, we must take every step to ensure that all our efforts and initiatives will enhance the protection of our vital natural environment. It is disappointing that the cabinet secretary suggests that if we are out of the EU, we will not strive for—or, possibly, achieve—the highest standards of environmental protection. Mr Ruskell suggests that if we do not have the stick of Europe, we are unlikely to carry through some of our current policies and standards.

In my constituency of Galloway and West Dumfries more than £300 million can be attributed to tourism. Our natural environment is of huge importance and covers marine, coastal and hill habitats. Eco-tourism is the fundamental basis for this industry.

Today’s motion states that

“membership of the EU has ensured progress on a wide range of environmental issues in Scotland and continues to underpin vital environmental protection”,

but as our amendment states, the EU has “at times aided progress” in certain areas,

“with a variety of international organisations and nations”

that should also be commended for their work.

However, the real problem for the Scottish Government is that it cannot get it right—even with us inside the EU—with agriculture and the common agricultural policy debacle, for which the Scottish Government is very fortunate not to be faced with a heavy fine. The same can be said of its rushed and poorly thought-out salmon conservation regulations. This Government failed to defend to the EU the fact that Scotland has long practised regulatory conservation of fish stocks under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries (Consolidation) (Scotland) Act 2003. Instead of gathering factual evidence on mixed-stock fisheries, the Government used inadequate and scientifically and analytically inappropriate stock modelling to create a quick fix that was acceptable to the EU and to avoid further fines.

Too often, the Government picks and chooses when to use proper scientific research. It has been forced to impose draconian catch-and-release restrictions that are based on a flawed and poorly researched river categorisation. I accept that measures are necessary to conserve salmon

stocks for future sustainability, but the process that this Government used to categorise our rivers was clearly flawed and lacked the scientific evidence that it should have sought.

In Dumfries and Galloway, traditional fishing was given a special dispensation on the River Annan, on historical grounds. However, the River Nith was not afforded the same comfort, despite both rivers flowing into the Solway Firth and having similar historical fishing rights. Instead, what we got was a model that was based on the historical number of catches, with no consideration of the number of people who fish our rivers, or the rivers’ water quality. We should not be totally surprised by that; it is another example of SNP centralisation in which it has adopted a one-size-fits-all approach to every river in the country.

The result has been devastating not only for the fishing industry but for tourism businesses that rely on fishermen. In Dumfries, for example, the number of fishing tickets being issued on the River Nith has halved, with fishing rate charges now totalling more than tickets sales can cover. Worryingly, a 150-year-old commercial wild salmon fishery in my constituency, which has been a long-standing heritage, educational and tourist attraction, was closed for three years in April for “conservation purposes” but is in danger of being closed permanently if the Government proceeds on the current course.

The cabinet secretary and the Scottish Government need to get a grip on the situation. Scotland is a world-famous location for wild fishing, which is important for Scotland’s economy as a whole and especially in areas such as my constituency, where fishing helps to underpin many communities. If the high-handed one-size-fits-all approach continues, we will see local economies being hit hard. The wild fishing industry is a very big part of Scotland’s tourism industry. Whether we are in or out of Europe, the Government needs to step up to the mark with regard to the huge challenges that are brought about by climate change.

The fact of the matter is that the Scottish Government can no longer hide behind its failures on Scotland’s wild fisheries industry. The Conservatives believe that locally based river management plans are needed, supported by proper scientific and circumstantial evidence. The Scottish Government could take such action inside or outside the European Union.

Emma Harper: Will the member take an intervention?

Finlay Carson: I am in my last minute.

The Deputy Presiding Officer (Linda Fabiani): I can give you time back if you wish, Mr Carson.

Emma Harper: I am well aware of the fishing issues in the Dumfries and Galloway part of my constituency. We attended one of the research surveys that was conducted on the River Fleet, and the scientific evidence from that will be brought forward. The constituents whom Finlay Carson mentioned have also contacted me and I have agreed to represent their concerns to the Scottish Government.

Finlay Carson: I take on board Emma Harper's comments, but the scientific evidence will be looked at only after the catch-and-release programme has been in place for a year. Businesses in Newton Stewart have lost out because of the falling number of fishermen.

As I have said in the chamber previously, the Scottish Government has a unique opportunity post-Brexit to revitalise Scotland's fishing communities and create an all-inclusive, effective and sustainable system. Instead of hauling Scotland back to the divisions of 2014 with the constant threat of a second referendum on independence, the Scottish Government should get back to its day job of delivering for Scotland.

15:56

Stewart Stevenson (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP): Here we are today with, still, no plan for Brexit nor even any definition of it, to echo Finlay Carson's words. I will address the last topic that he covered. In 1968 I was a water bailiff for the Tay District Salmon Fisheries Board, and as a minister I had the great privilege of having dinner with members of the fisheries board in Mr Carson's constituency. At that time—I am uncertain as to whether it was 2008 or 2009—the board reported that, as a result of the environmental improvements that were made under the previous Labour-Liberal Administration and continued by the SNP Government, the number of wild fish in the River Nith had quadrupled. That is slightly at odds with what I am hearing today. Things may all have gone in the wrong direction since then, but I rather suspect that they have not.

As other members have done, I declare that I am a species champion; I think that someone with a sense of humour must have offered me the opportunity to be the champion for the European spiny lobster. I will address a couple of points that have arisen in the debate.

During the recent referendum campaign, Nigel Farage—who I accept is not the most reliable of sources for political facts—quoted research by the business for Britain campaign suggesting that the UK had been overruled by the EU Council of Ministers on 55 occasions. My research shows that that is entirely wrong—the number of such

occasions was 56. However, to provide some context, there were 2,466 decisions on laws, so the number of occasions on which the UK failed to get its own way amounted to just over 1 per cent. The UK has chosen not to reject the overwhelming majority of laws and regulations that have come via the EU Council of Ministers. In our debates, it is always as well to base some of what we say on facts.

I will not claim that the UK said that all the laws that it supported were perfect in every detail; there is always compromise in such matters. As the minister who took the Climate Change (Scotland) Bill through Parliament, I had two hours and 25 minutes to speak on the subject at stage 3—members will be delighted to know that I have only six minutes or so today—and the Queen graciously granted royal assent for the act on my ruby wedding anniversary on 1 August 2009, to my wife's immense delight.

I apologise unreservedly to Parliament for this Government's having failed to meet its target: we promised that the reduction would be delivered in 2020, so I unreservedly apologise for our having delivered it in 2014. Similarly, I unreservedly apologise to Parliament for the Scottish Government's being so far ahead on its renewable energy targets and beating out of the park all the targets that were set. Our failures are to be gloried in, not to be derided.

Mark Ruskell: I acknowledge the Government's strong record on electricity, given the difficult times with the subsidy cuts, but is not it the case that we are probably going to miss our 2020 target on heat?

Stewart Stevenson: I am not here to defend everything that the Government has or has not done. I am entirely happy to say that in 2009 we set ourselves, collectively and unanimously, a challenging set of targets across a range of areas. Heat is one of the more challenging areas in which there is clearly more work to be done.

I will pick up on a couple of other things. I direct Maurice Golden to the Scotland Act 1998, schedule 5, head E1, on transport. I find that we have no power whatever to legislate in relation to electric cars. We can provide electric charging points and we can subsidise councils and campaigns to encourage, but we have no powers whatever over electric cars.

Liam McArthur: On electric vehicles, does Stewart Stevenson accept not just that there is a great deal more to be done on installation of the infrastructure, but that maintenance is proving to be a real problem for a lot of EV users across Scotland?

Stewart Stevenson: I am not personally aware of that problem, but I will not attempt to rebut it. I

now have a little hybrid car, which is just terrific. It is five years old, and it sometimes does 100 miles per gallon, which I absolutely love. That illustrates a very important point about addressing environmental issues. I am not just benefiting the climate; my wallet is getting a wee handout as well. That is often something that the Tories fail to recognise.

Looking at the text that the Tories want to substitute into the motion, I see that it

“recognises the positive impact that being part of the UK has had on climate change”.

I await news of what that “positive impact” might be. I absolutely recognise the negative impacts of the interference on renewables support from the UK Government. That has not been a helpful situation to be in for a single second.

The environment is not simply the purview of a single legislature or a single state. It is an international issue—one that affects people across Europe and in the world beyond. That is why it is vital that we continue to have the kind of focus that the EU has encouraged us to have, and which has led the way for countries across our continent. That is why we need to continue to adhere to the highest possible standards. We must not sign up to the Tories’ intention to disconnect the peoples of the nations of the UK from international agreements that support the environment—that world that we will bequeath to the next generation who will follow us.

16:03

John Scott (Ayr) (Con): I begin by declaring an interest as a hill farmer and food producer.

I, too, welcome this debate on the future of our Scottish environment post Brexit. None of you will be surprised to know that I have been allocated the slot in the debate dealing with land use, excluding forestry, which has already been elegantly discussed by my colleague Alexander Burnett.

Notwithstanding the fact that I voted for us to remain in the EU, Brexit offers the UK and Scotland a chance to re-examine our land use strategy and the environmental goals that we all want to achieve. Although developing a spatial land use strategy was considered during Richard Lochhead’s term in office and a land use strategy was lodged in the Parliament on 22 March, the day before dissolution, we still have a sectoral, piecemeal approach, with constant and abiding tensions still in place between food producers, environmentalists and wind farm and tourism interests, with our Government not always certain about its own ambitions for our rural areas.

We know that the Government is already failing in several areas, such as delivering better air quality, and that it does not comply with annex 15 of its own CAFS—“Cleaner Air for Scotland”—report. We also know that, although rural land use emissions and sequestration targets are difficult to measure, they are probably not being met as fully as they might be. We know that targets on native woodland planting and restoration need further work, and that deer management systems are not yet effective, try as we might to make them so. We also know that Scotland’s carbon footprint is increasing instead of decreasing.

Stewart Stevenson: On whose numbers does the member found the remark that our carbon footprint is increasing rather than decreasing?

John Scott: I think that that was in evidence that was provided to the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee recently. The member will find it there, but I am happy to provide the paperwork for Mr Stevenson, if that would be of help.

I will talk about two main subjects: overall strategic planning and peatland restoration. The most recent Scotland’s Rural College report on rural policy in Scotland stated:

“Whilst there are strategies for land use (the Land Use Strategy) and spatial planning (National Planning Framework), there is no overall strategy for rural Scotland and all that it encompasses. What is absent is a strategic framework setting out: specific rural outcomes; a baseline, targets, indicators, monitoring or review processes to see whether targets are being met; and the identification of the means by which collaborative working would be put in place to achieve them.”

For me, it is quite clear what the future should be, and it can be summed up in two words—working landscapes. Brexit offers us a much needed opportunity to reset our priorities, and indeed it will be a driver for that. Although we welcome the land use strategy that was laid before Parliament on 22 March, we still need a coherent, strategic spatial land use plan—in other words, we need more than we have.

We are concerned that the Scottish Government might seek to use Brexit as a way of driving a wedge between previously shared UK and Scottish objectives—the cabinet secretary’s opening speech certainly confirmed that view—which must not be allowed to happen. The Scottish Government must get on with the day job and start delivering on the objectives and targets that it has already defined and set for itself instead of viewing the current situation as an opportunity to weaken or deregulate environmental legislation or targets—the Scottish Wildlife Trust, too, has expressed concern about that. Agri-environment schemes that are funded by pillar 2 payments must continue to be supported for the real and

obvious public benefits that they provide, and continuation of those and other schemes must be assured beyond 2020.

The cabinet secretary's enthusiasm for the environment is well known—it is further evidenced by her cheerful and enthusiastic approach to that brief not once but twice—so she will know that peat restoration is one of the areas that need her special attention. I do not wish to invoke too much the memory of Rob Gibson's lectures in the chamber on the importance of peat restoration—or, as Jackson Carlaw memorably put it, “peat wetting”—but the serious point is that the Government has not put its back into peatland restoration, which would be a hugely efficient way of capturing carbon.

The Scottish Government's low-carbon Scotland report in 2013 suggested that up to 21,000 hectares per year of peatland restoration was technically feasible. Professor Robin Matthews of the James Hutton Institute estimated that restoring 21,000 hectares per year would contribute to an 8 per cent reduction in total Scottish carbon emissions. However, between 1990 and 2012, the average area of peatland restored annually was only 1,400 hectares.

To be fair, it is true that the restoration of 3,000 to 6,000 hectares a year was achieved between 2012 and 2015, but it is self-evident that that is far short of the potential 21,000 hectares a year that the Government's report stated was technically possible. Certainly, it will be a big ask for the Government to provide funding for peatland restoration on the scale that was previously provided for it by Europe. However, it is certainly one of the easiest and most cost-efficient methods of carbon capture. Of course, the Government makes the task more difficult for itself by damaging peat flows through allowing wind farms to be put in peatland areas—often after cutting down trees already planted on those flows—in Caithness and Sutherland, as well as south-west Scotland.

Finally, I have a question for the cabinet secretary that she might wish to address in her closing remarks. Will funding be allocated in this year's budget for peatland restoration, and if not—as I suspect will be the case—why not?

16:10

Angus MacDonald (Falkirk East) (SNP): I am pleased to have the opportunity to contribute to this important debate, not least because it allows me to highlight concerns about the environment that have been raised with me both locally and nationally since the Brexit vote on 23 June.

I say at the outset how pleased I was to see the Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform announce during the

summer recess—on 24 July—that the Scottish Government will refuse to turn back the clock on environmental laws and will abide by European Union rules that protect wildlife and prevent pollution, despite the Brexit vote. A pledge not to weaken a raft of Brussels legal measures that are regarded as crucial for conserving plants and animals and keeping air, water and land clean and healthy must have been music to the ears of every environmental activist in the country.

Things have moved on slightly since July, although we are still none the wiser as to the detail of the Brexit negotiations, probably because it appears that the UK Government itself does not yet know what it is trying to achieve. That makes life extremely difficult for the rest of us. The uncertainty is making some of my constituents in Falkirk East slightly nervous, not least the residents of Grangemouth, who live cheek by jowl with the petrochemical and agrochemical industries in the port. Local residents have expressed to me their concerns about local air quality. There have been breaches of the limits for sulphur dioxide emissions in Grangemouth. However, considering the concentration of industry in and around the town, it is thanks to EU directives on air quality that there have not been more complaints, or indeed breaches.

Grangemouth is home to six of Scotland's 15 large Chemical Industries Association-registered companies. The Scottish Environment Protection Agency, which has oversight of large industrial sites in the town such as those of Ineos and CalaChem, has worked closely with those firms to improve working practices, tighten up procedures in order to ensure that they are operating within the legislative framework that is already in place and highlighted best practice for operation within the air quality limits that have been laid down by the EU. There is still work to do in ensuring that those high standards are maintained, and the uncertainty over whether compliance will be as easily enforceable without the back-up of the EU should be of some concern to us all.

That brings me to our international obligations. There is no doubt that, post Brexit, there will need to be some co-ordination between the countries of the UK. Until now, the EU has provided that envelope, and we need to know at an early date what arrangements will replace it. For example, there could be a scenario where the UK forced Scotland to accept things such as genetically modified crops by signing trade deals with little or no input from Scotland's Government or Parliament.

There is significant concern out there regarding the implications of Brexit for UK environment and climate change law and policy. For example, there are concerns in the academic world from a

Scottish perspective regarding the UK nationally determined contribution under the Paris agreement. In a nutshell, NDCs are documents that contain details of what each country intends to do to contribute to the 2°C goal that is enshrined in the Paris agreement in each of the five-year cycles that are envisioned in the treaty. The first such cycle covers the period 2020 to 2025.

From the beginning, EU member states opted to implement their commitments under the climate treaties jointly. In 2015, therefore, the EU submitted an NDC on behalf of all the EU member states. Now, the UK will no longer have the luxury of leaving that work to EU officials and will have to undertake the work itself. The ratification process of the Paris agreement has seen EU member states such as France deposit their ratification instrument and a declaration that asserts that they intend to rely on the NDC that the European Union submitted in 2015. Instead of that approach, the NDCs of some EEA countries such as Norway and Iceland assert that they intend to pursue their mitigation action in co-operation with the EU.

The UK is still a member of the EU, but it will no longer be one after 2020, when the first cycle that is envisioned in the Paris agreement will kick in. To comply with its formal obligation under the Paris agreement to submit an NDC, the UK will have to produce one of its own. We have to ask whether it has the capacity to do that.

It will be the first time that the UK engages in such an exercise. The closest proxy is EU negotiations concerning the so-called effort sharing decisions, through which EU member states shared among themselves the burdens that are associated with achieving the targets that are embedded in EU climate law and the Kyoto protocol. However, in that context it was a matter of deciding how much each member state would do, after a decision on how much to achieve collectively had already been taken at EU level. Now, instead, it is a matter for the UK to decide on its own—hopefully through consultation with all devolved Administrations, although we will wait and see—the level of ambition to embed in its NDC and how to achieve it.

With Brexit, the UK is, or should be, about to engage in an exercise to decide what it wants to include in its NDC for the period 2020 to 2025. As there is no precedent for that, the cabinet secretary and the First Minister must stress to the UK Government that devolved Administrations must be involved in the process.

It is clear that, with our strong domestic climate change legislation, we must be determined that Brexit must not result in a reduction in ambition when it comes to climate change action in Scotland. I was encouraged to hear the cabinet secretary say at this week's meeting of the

Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform Committee that the Scottish Government is proceeding as planned with the climate change plan, which gives some certainty in an uncertain situation.

Although environmental policy is devolved, policies and countries are linked in many ways. Countries working together are able to achieve better outcomes than they can in isolation. Let us remember that the EU referendum result cannot reduce the strength of laws made in the Scottish Parliament, and we must all do all that we can to ensure that our regulatory bodies do all that they can to regulate and protect our environment.

16:16

Gillian Martin (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP): Before I start my speech, I declare that I am the parliamentary liaison officer for the Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform.

There is considerable concern that one of the main impacts of leaving the EU will be that institutions conducting environmentally important research will no longer have the access to European Union funding programmes that they have enjoyed up until this point. A cursory look at any of our leading institutions that carry out environmental protection research will reveal that a great deal of their programmes are supported by EU funding—some completely and others in part. Their research programmes, which underpin our world-leading reputation for work on the bioeconomy and food security as well as on environmental protection and climate change, are not just science projects in hallowed ivory towers. That is research that is powering Scotland's economy and worldwide reputation, including Scotland's world-renowned food production and export industries, which Kate Forbes alluded to in her speech.

There are too many examples to mention, but I have chosen a few. Scotland's Rural College heads up the land economy, environment and society research group, which has done pioneering research on sustainable agriculture, food supply chains, environmental management, sustainable use of natural resources, environmental economics, climate change and rural community resilience. The Rowett institute in Aberdeen, which is right next to my constituency, is a world leader in animal and human nutrition. In my constituency of Aberdeenshire East, the European offshore wind deployment centre, which is also known as the Aberdeen Offshore Wind Farm, is running an environmental research project on the interactions between offshore wind, the natural world and the local human environment. That €3 million project will get half its

funding from the EU, and its results will facilitate continued development of environmentally sustainable offshore wind energy, using sound science to develop an empirical evidence base and novel methods to advance and streamline environmental impact assessments.

It must be said strongly that many of those research projects are staffed by leading academics in their field, hailing from across the EU. There it is again: the question of freedom of movement and the impact that will be felt on our labour market, not least in our scientific and research communities, which have been able to attract talent from across the EU.

We are poised to innovate on carbon emissions management—or, should I say, we were poised. I want to mention the cancelled UK research funding for the carbon capture and storage project which, if continued, could have seen Peterhead, which is in the constituency of my friend and colleague Stewart Stevenson, who is not here just now, be a world leader in that technology, which would have assisted considerably in meeting Scotland's emissions reduction targets. That technology would have provided jobs and would have been patented and exported across the globe to reduce emissions in other persistently fossil fuel-reliant economies—by which I mean pretty much every world economy.

The disastrous cancellation of UK Government funding for the carbon capture project is a stark indication of the UK's environmental intentions. I would like to think that the cancellation might have been mitigated somewhat by access to EU funding that would have allowed it to continue, but I guess that we will never know now that that option is closed to us. On Mr Golden's point about grievance politics, I am not really involved in that, but I will say to him, "If you don't want to hear our grievances, don't cause them." Perhaps if his UK Government colleagues had not pulled the rug from under CCS, shut down the renewables obligation or cut subsidies for those wishing to play their part by investing in a wind turbine, we might not have felt so aggrieved.

I do not feel particularly comfortable knowing that research funding is reliant on the UK Government, given that neither emissions reduction nor climate change issues are a priority for it. I have to admit that, when I read the Tory amendment and saw the phrase

"recognises the positive impact that being part of the UK has had on climate change in Scotland",

I had to take a wee moment to calm myself, remembering how former Tory chancellor George Osborne swept aside the CCS projects and diverted the money elsewhere.

I am also nervous of a UK Government that has allowed fracking contracts to be awarded under national parks with no debate and which has ploughed on with that technology without carrying out any serious research into the environmental consequences. I wonder whether the very heartfelt comments that were made by Mr Golden and Mr Burnett about establishing more woodland mean that they agree that fracking under areas of national significance is an abomination. Do I trust a Government that takes such an approach to support renewable energy or emissions reduction research programmes? Frankly, I do not.

Neil Findlay: Will the member give way?

Gillian Martin: I do not think that I have the time.

EU funding streams are vital to environmental research in Scotland. We need answers now from the UK Government on what is set to replace them post-2020 and how Scottish research organisations will be able to access them.

16:22

Liam McArthur: I start by taking my lead from the spokesman for the spiny lobster, Stewart Stevenson, and declaring an interest as an ambassador for the Scottish primrose.

Members: Aw.

Liam McArthur: I am showing a softer side.

Unlike Neil Findlay, I am not a veteran of these Brexit debates but, unlike Finlay Carson and his colleagues, I have been pleasantly surprised by the extent to which large parts of the debate have broken free of the Brexit shackles to consider the wider environmental issues. The cabinet secretary set the tone in her opening remarks, but a number of speakers have followed on from that. For example, Gillian Martin's comments on the leading role of Scottish research in shaping the environmental landscape were entirely valid. I cited the example of Heriot-Watt University, but I made it clear that there are many other examples, which Gillian Martin referred to.

In a considered speech, Mark Ruskell probably covered the ground more expansively than anyone. I had concerns about where he seemed to be going with regard to agriculture but, even there, I believe that a challenge has been set down to those in the farming sector to step up to the plate. Likewise, Kate Forbes made interesting points about the importance of natural capital, although I take violent exception—she would expect nothing less—to her assertion that her constituency is perhaps the most environmentally significant.

I did not cover any of the amendments in my opening remarks, so let me address that shortcoming now. David Stewart's amendment makes useful points about collective action to protect the marine environment as well as about the collaborative approach to research across the EU to underpin environmental protection. Indeed, I made the same point earlier. Mr Stewart also—rightly—suggested that this is not a one-way process and that the UK has been instrumental in shaping the environmental agenda at an EU level, particularly in relation to wildlife and climate change.

Similarly, Maurice Golden's amendment makes reasonable points, but it glosses over the damage that has been done by the Tories' failure to deal with the divisions in their party over Europe. Unlike Stewart Stevenson, I agree that being part of the UK can help us to meet our climate change ambitions, but not if the current UK Tory Government persists with a reckless approach towards the development of renewables and continues to reverse the progress that was made on the green agenda under the coalition Government.

Mark Ruskell's amendment was written in far more moderate terms than previous iterations—I would expect nothing less of him—but in recent times trade agreements have been the subject of more focus, more scrutiny and more vigilance than ever before. That is a good thing, which has resulted in more transparency and an improved process. As a result, Liberal Democrats have been alert to a number of the concerns that have been raised, raised them at UK and EU levels and secured change as a result. However, as a trading nation, we benefit from trading and it is not clear to me what we would be asking the UK Government to do if we agreed to the Greens' amendment.

Mark Ruskell: I hear Liam McArthur's points. I take it that he will not back our amendment, but a number of his party's MSPs backed similar forms of words before the Holyrood election. Will this be another tuition fees moment for the Liberal Democrats?

Liam McArthur: There I was being complimentary about Mark Ruskell and he has thrown it back at me.

Genuine concerns have been expressed about TTIP and CETA, and a light has been shone on the process in a way that has not been done on any trade agreement negotiations in the past. We have highlighted those concerns and have sought changes as a result but, at this stage in the process, it is not clear to me what we would be asking the UK Government to do.

Neil Findlay: Will the member give way?

Liam McArthur: Not at the moment, Mr Findlay.

I turn to the broader debate. The Scottish Government is anxious for us to focus entirely on the consequences of Brexit. I certainly do not diminish them—I whole-heartedly agree with what the cabinet secretary said about the importance of the EU to research on the environment and how the UK Government's treatment of non-UK EU nationals as a pawn in a game has had a damaging effect and been utterly self-defeating—but it would be a missed opportunity if we were not to shine a light on how we are doing as an EU member state now or to consider what our ambitions should be, whatever the future holds.

The Scottish Parliament passed world-leading climate change legislation and I pay tribute to the part that Stewart Stevenson played in that. He was right to say that the legislation was passed collectively and unanimously, but I think that he would accept that that was the easy part. Since then, we have met our emissions targets only once in five years. The UK Committee on Climate Change concluded that only two out of 28 Scottish Government adaptation priorities had

“plans in place, actions being delivered and progress being made”.

It also said that two thirds of the Government's policies and proposals had no timescale for delivery, so there is a great deal of work to be done.

As I highlighted in my opening speech, two areas in which we need a step change are heat and transport. WWF has said that a tenfold increase is needed in the heat that is generated from renewables, from which only 4 per cent of Scotland's heat is currently generated. The warm homes bill offers an excellent opportunity, but we need a commitment to rapid growth in district heating and renewable heat. We must translate energy efficiency from a national strategic priority into delivery on the ground, and the necessary investment must be provided for that. As an aside, there is a need for catch-up zones to target resources at the areas that top the league table on fuel poverty.

Action is also needed on transport. The take-up of electric vehicles is higher in Orkney than anywhere else, but the figures for Scotland as a whole are behind those for the rest of the UK.

As I said earlier, those goals will not be achieved through the £250 million tax cut for the airline industry or the Scottish Government's support for Heathrow expansion. The expansion of Heathrow is likely to mean that, if we are to meet our emissions targets, ministers will have to cut airport capacity in regional airports or other sectors of the economy.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Close now, please, Mr McArthur.

Liam McArthur: I will conclude where I started. I firmly believe that the UK vote to leave the EU was a wholly regrettable and retrograde step. Collective action on the environment has been one of the clearest examples of where the EU has acted as a driver of change and progress. However, as today's debate has highlighted—

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Close now, Mr McArthur.

Liam McArthur: There is a wide range of areas on which the Parliament must in the future—whatever the future holds—focus attention and hold the Government to account.

16:29

Ross Greer (West Scotland) (Green): Considerable criticism can be levelled at the European Union and the Greens' amendment does that without losing sight of the broader issue that is at stake. The progress that the continent has made in safeguarding our environment and tackling climate change—the most urgent issue of our generation—is a success of the European project. That success here in Scotland and across these islands is potentially under threat from Brexit.

If Scotland is forced out of the European Union despite the result of the vote, there is much that we can protect by using the Scottish Parliament's powers, and I welcome the reassurances that the cabinet secretary gave. However, much is outwith our control and we must pressure the Westminster Government to take that seriously.

Some Conservative colleagues seem keen to derail the debate and to divert us from their party's record and actions. Finlay Carson said that the debate was just a smokescreen for Scottish Government failures, which I found a bit bewildering. The Greens have consistently called out Scottish Government failures on the environment and climate change. Are the Conservatives suggesting that we should not debate the significant impacts that Brexit could have on every portfolio area for which the Parliament is responsible?

Maurice Golden almost always makes substantial points on the environment, so I was disappointed that he reverted to the single transferable speech of the Conservative Party post Brexit. That is not what we need in this kind of debate.

Alexander Burnett raised important points about forestry and planting. He is right that the Scottish Government has failed to make the required progress. However, I am glad that, unlike Mr Burnett's colleagues down south, the Scottish

Government has not tried to sell off our publicly owned forests.

Liam McArthur: It tried.

Ross Greer: On that point, I am enthusiastic about giving forests to community ownership, but we will object to any Government attempts to sell off forests to commercial interests. *[Interruption.]*

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Excuse me, Mr Greer. Could Mr Russell and Mr McArthur take their private arguments outside? Thank you.

Ross Greer: The cabinet secretary noted that there is significant reason to doubt the UK Government's credibility, given that one of the first acts of the new Government under Theresa May was to abolish the Department of Energy and Climate Change. Its responsibilities have moved to the new Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

That move illustrates the mistake that the UK Government and many other Governments have made in their approaches to tackling climate change. We should tackle climate change not simply for economic benefit but because there is a moral imperative to do so. We should bring every possible resource to bear in the fight. We have no right to leave the environment uninhabitable for future generations. We have no right to wreak untold damage on our fellow citizens of the world.

Eight of Scotland's hottest years on record were in the previous decade. That presents problems for us, but it is not a catastrophe. However, in May last year, more than 1,300 people died during a 10-day heatwave in Andhra Pradesh. Members will remember the European heatwave in 2003 that killed more than 70,000 people. Climate change is killing people here and now.

The think tank that was founded by Kofi Annan, a former United Nations general secretary, estimates that more than 300,000 people die every year because of climate change. It is the ultimate example of the poor suffering the consequences of the actions taken by the earth's richest.

I do not mean to say that the solutions to climate change are separate from the economics. Indeed, we will tackle the crisis only with wholesale economic transformation and by achieving the people's Europe that Neil Findlay referred to. I am optimistic that Scotland can still play a full part in that.

At First Minister's question time today, Patrick Harvie spoke of climate justice, which almost all of us in the Parliament are in theory committed to. I say "in theory" because such a commitment is not compatible with commitments to maximising the lifespan of the fossil fuel economy or to supporting airport expansion and tax cuts for those industries.

That is why the Greens appreciate the amendment in Liam McArthur's name. However, I fail to see why that amendment would remove the reference to the Scottish Government deserving a role in the Brexit negotiations; that would be an unfortunate omission.

Liam McArthur: The point is about broadening the process to ensure that wider civic society and the expertise that is to be found in Scotland have a place in the debate, which needs to be secured, so that it is not just the Scottish Government that has a role in however the UK Government discussions in the JMC have evolved.

Ross Greer: I thank Liam McArthur for that point and agree enthusiastically. I just feel that the amendment takes away a necessary inclusion, because the Scottish Government has an issue with being involved in the Brexit negotiations.

The European Union has been a leader in the fight against climate change and in the protection of our environment; it is not just a follower, as the Conservative motion seems to imply. David Stewart gave the example of what the EU has achieved for our beaches, which were previously polluted by sewage but have been transformed in recent decades.

However, as the Green amendment highlights, the European Union is far from perfect and should be robustly challenged on the priority that it has given to economic growth and a commitment to neoliberal economics that is incompatible with ending the climate crisis. Just today, the comprehensive economic and trade agreement has made a comeback. That trade deal between the EU and Canada places hard-won progress on environmental protections at risk. Angus MacDonald rightly raised the threat that it could pose of forcing GM crops on Scotland.

At its core, CETA is a deal that places corporate power above democracy. The proposed dispute mechanism will result in secretive corporate courts that are unaccountable to our elected Parliament. They would be able to reverse the Parliament's decisions or even punish us for having made those decisions.

Liam McArthur asked the cabinet secretary for examples of the dire consequences of such deals. The investor-state dispute settlement mechanism, which Neil Findlay mentioned, has been used by Veolia to sue Egypt for increasing the minimum wage and by numerous energy companies to sue Argentina for freezing energy prices. The awards that have been given to multinational corporations have been eye watering. For example, the US company Occidental Petroleum won compensation of more than \$1.5 billion in a claim against Ecuador.

The Deputy Presiding Officer: Come to a close, please.

Ross Greer: The Scottish Parliament does not have the power to stop CETA, although other devolved Parliaments, such as that in Wallonia, have the ability to do so. However, the fight is not over. We can note our concern today and force the Westminster Parliament to address it. The Greens urge colleagues across the chamber to support our amendment.

16:36

Claudia Beamish (South Scotland) (Lab): I am pleased to speak in this debate on climate change, environmental protection and Brexit. I intend to focus on some specific threats and I will try to pose some questions, although frankly I do not know how many answers I have. I will talk about the marine environment, then explore research and development and finally delve into climate change challenges.

It is essential that we support the Green amendment in the name of Mark Ruskell. As he said, the strong democratic heartbeat has to be considered. We in Scottish Labour feel strongly about TTIP and CETA. We will also support the Scottish Government motion.

Our marine environment has been measurably bettered by the EU *acquis communautaire*. Marine issues cannot be effectively tackled without collaboration and we have a responsibility to maintain or strengthen the collective ambitions that have proved to be sustainable for the environment and the economy. Since the 2014 reform of the common fisheries policy, it has been robust. It is vital that we maintain Scotland's part in multinational management of shared natural resources. Our fish stocks and coastal communities cannot afford to have fishing policy slip back 10 years.

It is essential that there is a replacement for the European maritime and fisheries fund. Scotland benefits substantially from the fund, receiving approximately 42 per cent of the UK's allocation. Coastal communities need long-term funding assurance to allow them to continue to fish sustainably, diversify their economies and finance new projects.

We have successfully designated a number of marine protected areas and those, too, must receive continued funding and monitoring. I welcome the cabinet secretary's decision to proceed with new special protected areas, as we are still an EU member, but I am interested in whether she will commit to seeing those 40 SPAs through to implementation come what may.

As many members, including Gillian Martin and Liam McArthur, have highlighted, another serious concern as we leave the European Union relates to the academic community that the EU fosters. Research and development are collaborative by nature, and that is prized by the UK in application considerations. Once we are out of the EU, we run the risk of isolation. Concerns have already been raised that the UK is an unfavourable research partner because of the funding issue and freedom of movement uncertainties. Many environmental issues cannot be overcome by individual national efforts. It would be a travesty to weaken those knowledge-sharing paths.

The briefing that we have received from Heriot-Watt University demonstrates that starkly through a case study. The MERCES—marine ecosystem restoration in changing European seas—project focuses on the restoration of degraded marine habitats. It is a collaboration between 28 partner institutions that has been granted €6.65 million of horizon 2020 funding. Although those funds were initially secured through the UK Treasury, the issue of longer-term funding for that and many other research projects must be squarely faced in the Brexit negotiations.

Beyond funding considerations, we also face the removal of a layer of accountability. Although many EU directives are encompassed in Scottish Government legislation, the loss of funding and accountability puts research and development at risk. There must not be a loss of impetus.

Finally, I turn to climate change. The Government motion states that the Parliament

“recognises the importance of the EU in securing collective action and progress on climate change”.

On that issue, I focus on the EU emissions trading scheme for heavy emitters; it is not perfect, but it has focused minds on reduction. Scotland has its own allowance as it is part of an EU member state. The UK Committee on Climate Change has published a note about Brexit and climate change implications for the UK, which states:

“It is possible that the UK would remain as part of the EU ETS even after leaving the EU ... More generally, increased linking (rather than delinking) of international carbon trading schemes is desirable in promoting the least-cost international path to reducing global emissions.”

The Prime Minister has made some encouraging moves on climate change: rapid approval of the fifth carbon budget and the announcement of its intention—finally—to ratify the Paris agreement by the end of the year. However, members including Mark Ruskell have highlighted the butchering of the feed-in tariffs and Emma Harper has highlighted the deplorable DECC decision. When my colleague Barry Gardiner, shadow secretary for energy and climate

change, asked Jesse Norman, the Tory energy minister, about that issue, he replied:

“Those targets could be more testing, less testing or exactly at the level required by the ETS itself, so there need not necessarily be anything particularly problematic about it.”—[*Official Report, House of Commons, Delegated Powers Committee*, 18 July 2016; c 8.]

That last line is extremely worrying to me and to the Scottish Labour Party. It exemplifies why Scotland, in the words of the motion, must have

“full involvement, in all UK negotiations.”

This is not just about what present Governments, or indeed the next Governments in Scotland and the UK, can do; it is about establishing and maintaining an international and European framework far into the future beyond our lives on a stable basis, and how that can be done.

16:42

Gordon Lindhurst (Lothian) (Con): I am pleased that we have had this debate on Scotland’s environment and efforts to tackle climate change.

We all recognise that the natural environment is a key asset for Scotland and that beauty and heritage must be maintained. It is key in attracting the visitors whom we welcome every year and who bring an estimated £1.4 billion to our economy and 39,000 full-time equivalent jobs. Our world-renowned food and drinks sector, which is worth an estimated £5.1 billion in exports, also relies on our rich natural heritage, as does our diverse and unique range of animal species, which includes the pine marten and the wildcat. Whatever the prevailing or future political context in our country, it is imperative that Scotland’s natural environment is maintained and retained for future generations.

Our debate is in the context of the UK-wide decision to leave the European Union. There are policy areas where we are currently tied to EU legislation that impacts on the environment, such as the emissions trading scheme or the birds and habitats directives. Finlay Carson referred to wildlife in the EU context, and Mark Ruskell commented on that and the difficulties of being tied to that EU set-up when the EU gets things wrong.

The UK and Scotland have led the way in environmental and climate change policy in Europe, as was highlighted by the minister, Roseanna Cunningham. While welcoming the vote to leave, we should have confidence in our abilities and track record. I support the Scottish Conservative amendment to the Government motion, which reflects the reality that we will not fall off a cliff when we leave the European Union, any more than we would if we stayed in.

The amendment recognises that, in today's globalised world, environmental and climate change policy transcend European and international borders, as David Stewart pointed out. Many of the UK's commitments were made in the context of international frameworks, such as the UN sustainable development goals and the Paris agreement on climate change. Following the European Parliament's approval of the Paris agreement in September, the UK minister Greg Clark committed to ratifying the agreement by the end of the year.

In contrast, at about the same time, during the convention on international trade in endangered species of wild fauna and flora, in Johannesburg, the EU was instrumental in blocking proposals that would have given elephants the highest-possible level of international protection. The approach could have been key to ending the current ivory poaching crisis. Let us emulate the EU's success in environmental matters, but let us not follow its errors.

Scotland controls its own destiny in many areas. The Scottish Conservative amendment to the motion calls for the Scottish Government to consider what it can do to protect the Scottish environment. The Scottish Government should recognise what it has been capable of achieving, which I am delighted to acknowledge. In certain areas Scotland can hold its head up high, as we heard.

However, we cannot rest on our laurels. There are many areas in which being in or out of the EU is of little consequence. In the transport sector, emission levels have fallen by less than 1 per cent since 1990. St John's Road in Corstorphine, here in Edinburgh, for example, is among the most polluted roads in the country.

There is work to be done by the Scottish Government in that regard, which, as Liam McArthur pointed out, is not predicated on EU membership. Our Scottish transport minister—whether or not he is a transport expert—needs to get to grips with making our public transport infrastructure more appealing to commuters. Maurice Golden talked about Norway, where electric cars are part of the circular economy. We need to be more ambitious in Scotland in that regard.

My Conservative colleagues have indicated where the Scottish Government has failed to meet targets, irrespective of EU membership. Action in such areas could successfully protect our natural environment in the years to come. Let us look forward. Alexander Burnett commented on the need for Scotland to contribute positively to Brexit negotiations.

The EU has had positive effects for Scotland's environment in certain areas, as I said, as a result of initiatives that members have described. It developed those initiatives in the context of world recognition that our planet might be robust but needs to be taken care of. In the past, we have failed to take care of the planet and damage has been done. We need to improve our stewardship of creation for future generations.

Although the UK Government and the Scottish Government have made progress in some areas, we need to do more. The Scottish Parliament has the power to make further progress. Let it do so. The Scottish Conservatives will continue to push the Government to get on with the job that it is tasked with, rather than focusing on powers that it does not have.

Before I conclude, I commend my parliamentary colleague Stewart Stevenson for his humourous contribution to today's debate—I have benefited from Stewart's sense of humour since I stood for the Scottish Parliament in 1999 and took part in hustings with him. I think that all members were most enlightened by his comments about what the Queen's grant of royal assent to enact legislation can do for domestic relationships. I thank him again for that contribution.

I wish Stewart Stevenson and the Scottish Government well in recovering from what appears to be a chronic state of self-induced Brexititis. As my colleague John Scott said, the Scottish Government has got a job to do; it should get on with it.

16:50

The Minister for UK Negotiations on Scotland's Place in Europe (Michael Russell): I start by declaring an interest, as others have done. I have been a species champion of the corncrake and the tree lungwort—but not at the same time, I stress.

The purpose of these debates is to try to discover common ground and to hear new and positive ideas. That is the same idea that motivates the meetings that I am having with party leaders and much of the discussion that I am taking part in across Scotland.

Unfortunately what we have learned today, which we learned at the very outset of this debate, is that the Scottish Conservatives do not want to take part in that process. Mr Golden was very testy about it in his opening speech. Finlay Carson also pooh-poohed it, although I am glad to see that my reasonable friend John Scott welcomed the fact that these debates were taking place.

The reason why the Scottish Conservatives do not want to take part in these debates is that they

expose the emptiness of their position, because if the debates are about bringing ideas and imagination to help Scotland move forward, the Scottish Conservatives are found wanting.

I think that bringing ideas and imagination to this chamber and standing up for our constituents and for Scotland is our day job. I suggest to the Scottish Conservatives that they get back to their day job and start to bring some ideas and thoughts to this chamber rather than simply complaints.

I am delighted to be involved in the debate—

John Scott: Will the minister take an intervention?

Michael Russell: Not at this moment, Mr Scott, but I will let you in later on. I have some more to say about Mr Scott, which will be positive, of course. [*Laughter.*]

It is a pleasure, even with the little voice that I have left today, to support my friend Roseanna Cunningham on environmental issues. She succeeded me as environment minister in February 2009. We agree, I think, that the job is the best job in Government, and I am delighted that it is now of full cabinet rank. She is a great defender and advocate of a greener Scotland, but her skills, passion and knowledge will be needed as never before because the environment must become a key issue in the Brexit negotiations.

It is already clear to me from the discussions that I have had that the UK Government is not really interested in the issue of the environment—it is low down its list of priorities. The Scottish Government can help the UK and Europe—and, one might even say immodestly, the planet—by making sure that it takes centre stage.

It has been a pleasure to hear Claudia Beamish and Mark Ruskell in the debate. The three of us are among the five nominees for the Nature of Scotland politician of the year award this year. The other two nominees are Richard Lochhead and Sarah Boyack. The smart money should be on Sarah Boyack for her contributions in the chamber. It is probably important to mention that now, because this is a debate that she would have relished and which she would have contributed to with great distinction. But on to less happy matters.

Mr Golden opened the debate by saying that he believes that “Brexit means Brexit”. Later on, Mr Burnett told us that

“we are leaving the European Union and we are going to make a success of it”.

Just as there was a little red book of Mao quotations, there is now clearly a little blue book of Theresa May quotations, because those are direct quotations from Theresa May.

However, it will take more than quoting the little blue book to convince anybody in the chamber or in Scotland about the reality of Brexit, because what we are hearing from the Tories—as the First Minister said this morning—is not collaboration or co-operation; it is capitulation. We are hearing nothing at all from them about standing up for Scotland or putting the case for Scotland in relation to Brexit. That was, alas, also true of what Mr Golden had to say.

Mark Ruskell made that point almost immediately after Mr Golden’s speech, because he pointed out that the reliance in the Tory motion on UN agreements will undoubtedly allow the UK to weaken environmental protection—just the type of agreement that the Tories seem to want. Mark Ruskell pointed out, if members want proof of it, the damage that has been done by the Tories to the renewables infrastructure since they decided to start reducing the subsidies.

If we are looking for evidence of what the Tory position on the environment will be on Brexit, we can see it already. It is a desire to weaken standards.

I would have liked to have heard Liam McArthur support that. This is the first time that he has taken part in one of these debates, as he said, and he opened very strongly. He said that Brexit was not in the Scottish or the Orkney community’s interest and that EU membership was profoundly in the interest of this country and his constituents. However, the logic of that position would surely put him in support of ensuring that all the options are considered for the future. Until the Scottish Liberal Democrats are prepared to consider all the options then, alas, they are not being true to that objective.

Liam McArthur: I am very grateful to the minister for his generous remarks. As I have pointed out, Orkney voted in favour of remaining part of the EU, but it voted overwhelmingly more so to remain part of the UK. That, I would have to say, remains very much their interest.

Michael Russell: Neither Mr McArthur nor his constituents are being asked to make that choice at the present moment. Mr McArthur is being asked to be part of considering the options for the future. Unfortunately, by refusing to consider all the options, he is not taking the issue forward rationally.

Kate Forbes made an important contribution on natural capital. It is worth observing that Scotland is the first country to have a natural capital asset register. I will refer to another contribution that immediately followed on from her speech. Mr Burnett, having talked about making a success of Brexit, then, unfortunately, said something about the Scottish referendum in 2014 that must be

corrected. He said that he had understood that those who had voted to remain would have had the knowledge that they would be voting to leave the EU. I have to say that not everyone did have that knowledge. I refer the member to the statement:

“No means we stay in, we are members of the European Union.”

Ruth Davidson said that in September 2014.

Alexander Burnett: I will make a correction for the record. I said that when people voted in the Scottish referendum they did so in the awareness that there was going to be another referendum, although not of what the result was going to be.

Michael Russell: I repeat what the member's leader said:

“No means we stay in, we are members of the European Union.”

People were, unfortunately, misled by a number of people, including by the leader of the Scottish Tories.

I was delighted to know that Stewart Stevenson was the species champion for the spiny lobster; I was also delighted to have his testimony, which this chamber has heard, that there was always a lack of support from the UK Government on climate change. That should make us even more nervous going forward.

John Scott made a reasoned speech; I disagreed with it. There was an alarming indication in it about what a future Tory tactic would be. John Scott was demanding that this Government addresses and funds every possible application under pillar 2. The tactic now seems to be that the Scottish Government, having been criticised over many years for not replacing every cut from Westminster, is now to be criticised if we cannot replace every funding shortfall from Europe. That would be unreasonable. I hope that Mr Scott, who is not an unreasonable man, will reflect on that.

I will address Gillian Martin's points on the wider issues regarding research. It is vital that we look at every issue in the Brexit debate not simply as a self-contained devolution issue; we must reflect on the wider issues. The wider issues of freedom of movement and funding for research depend on us being part of and engaging with the EU. The problems that we will have in researching the environment will grow enormously unless we are engaged fully with Europe.

Mr Lindhurst summed up in what I would describe as a calm manner. He said that it is important that we do more and that we have more engagement, but he did not explain how. I got a little bit confused by his contribution. It appeared to me as though he was saying that we should give up the European Union birds directive that

protects, for example—if I may mention it again—the corncrake, but that we should sign up to the CITES convention that protects elephants. Those are not mutually exclusive, but it seems rather confusing to prefer elephants to corncrakes and to use that as a reason for leaving the EU.

Finally, I cite Gillian Martin. She said to the Tories very memorably—it was the most memorable line in the debate—that if they do not like hearing about grievances they should stop causing them. That is the reality of the Brexit situation. The Tories have put us in this situation; they should stop making it worse. They should come to the table with ideas and debate it sensibly. We have not heard that so far, and Scotland and the chamber are the losers.

Decision Time

17:00

The Presiding Officer (Ken Macintosh): There are five questions to be put as a result of today's business. I remind members that, if the amendment in the name of Maurice Golden is agreed to, the amendments in the names of David Stewart, Mark Ruskell and Liam McArthur will fall.

The first question is, that amendment S5M-02125.1, in the name of Maurice Golden, which seeks to amend motion S5M-02125, in the name of Roseanna Cunningham, on the environment and climate change—European Union referendum, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Carlaw, Jackson (Eastwood) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (South Scotland) (Con)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Ross, Douglas (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Thomson, Ross (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)

Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
 McKee, Ivan (Glasgow Provan) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McMillan, Stuart (Greenock and Inverclyde) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)

Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 27, Against 87, Abstentions 0.

Amendment disagreed to.

The Presiding Officer: The next question is, that amendment S5M-02125.2, in the name of David Stewart, which seeks to amend motion S5M-02125, in the name of Roseanna Cunningham, on the environment and climate change—European Union referendum, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

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

MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
McKee, Ivan (Glasgow Provan) (SNP)
McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
McMillan, Stuart (Greenock and Inverclyde) (SNP)
McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Against

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
Carlaw, Jackson (Eastwood) (Con)
Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
Hamilton, Rachael (South Scotland) (Con)
Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
Ross, Douglas (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
Thomson, Ross (North East Scotland) (Con)
Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 87, Against 27, Abstentions 0.

Amendment agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: The next question is, that amendment S5M-02125.3, in the name of Mark Ruskell, which seeks to amend motion S5M-02125, in the name of Roseanna Cunningham, on the environment and climate change—European Union referendum, 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 (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (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)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)

Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
 McKee, Ivan (Glasgow Provan) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McMillan, Stuart (Greenock and Inverclyde) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Against

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Carlaw, Jackson (Eastwood) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (South Scotland) (Con)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Ross, Douglas (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Thomson, Ross (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 83, Against 31, Abstentions 0.

Amendment agreed to.

The Presiding Officer: The next question is, that amendment S5M-02125.4, in the name of Liam McArthur, which seeks to amend motion S5M-02125, in the name of Roseanna

Cunningham, on the environment and climate change—European Union referendum, as amended, be agreed to. Are we agreed?

Members: No.

The Presiding Officer: There will be a division.

For

Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)

Against

Adam, George (Paisley) (SNP)
 Adamson, Clare (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (SNP)
 Carlaw, Jackson (Eastwood) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Coffey, Willie (Kilmarnock and Irvine Valley) (SNP)
 Constance, Angela (Almond Valley) (SNP)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Crawford, Bruce (Stirling) (SNP)
 Cunningham, Roseanna (Perthshire South and Kinross-shire) (SNP)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Hamilton, Rachael (South Scotland) (Con)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)

Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
 McKee, Ivan (Glasgow Provan) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McMillan, Stuart (Greenock and Inverclyde) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Neil, Alex (Airdrie and Shotts) (SNP)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Douglas (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
 Thomson, Ross (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 10, Against 104, Abstentions 0.

Amendment disagreed to.

The Presiding Officer: The final question is, that motion S5M-02125, in the name of Roseanna Cunningham, on the environment and climate change—European Union referendum, 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 (Motherwell and Wishaw) (SNP)
 Allan, Alasdair (Na h-Eileanan an Iar) (SNP)
 Arthur, Tom (Renfrewshire South) (SNP)
 Baillie, Jackie (Dumbarton) (Lab)
 Baker, Claire (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Lab)
 Beamish, Claudia (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Beattie, Colin (Midlothian North and Musselburgh) (SNP)
 Bibby, Neil (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Brown, Keith (Clackmannanshire and Dunblane) (SNP)
 Campbell, Aileen (Clydesdale) (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)
 Denham, Ash (Edinburgh Eastern) (SNP)
 Dey, Graeme (Angus South) (SNP)
 Doris, Bob (Glasgow Maryhill and Springburn) (SNP)
 Dornan, James (Glasgow Cathcart) (SNP)
 Ewing, Annabelle (Cowdenbeath) (SNP)
 Fabiani, Linda (East Kilbride) (SNP)
 Fee, Mary (West Scotland) (Lab)
 Findlay, Neil (Lothian) (Lab)
 Finnie, John (Highlands and Islands) (Green)
 FitzPatrick, Joe (Dundee City West) (SNP)
 Forbes, Kate (Skye, Lochaber and Badenoch) (SNP)
 Freeman, Jeane (Carrick, Cumnock and Doon Valley) (SNP)
 Gibson, Kenneth (Cunninghame North) (SNP)
 Gilruth, Jenny (Mid Fife and Glenrothes) (SNP)
 Grant, Rhoda (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Gray, Iain (East Lothian) (Lab)
 Greer, Ross (West Scotland) (Green)
 Griffin, Mark (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Harper, Emma (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Harvie, Patrick (Glasgow) (Green)
 Haughey, Clare (Rutherglen) (SNP)
 Hepburn, Jamie (Cumbernauld and Kilsyth) (SNP)
 Hyslop, Fiona (Linlithgow) (SNP)
 Johnson, Daniel (Edinburgh Southern) (Lab)
 Johnstone, Alison (Lothian) (Green)
 Kelly, James (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Kidd, Bill (Glasgow Anniesland) (SNP)
 Lamont, Johann (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Lennon, Monica (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Leonard, Richard (Central Scotland) (Lab)
 Lochhead, Richard (Moray) (SNP)
 Lyle, Richard (Uddingston and Bellshill) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Angus (Falkirk East) (SNP)
 MacDonald, Gordon (Edinburgh Pentlands) (SNP)
 Macdonald, Lewis (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 MacGregor, Fulton (Coatbridge and Chryston) (SNP)
 Mackay, Derek (Renfrewshire North and West) (SNP)
 Mackay, Rona (Strathkelvin and Bearsden) (SNP)
 Macpherson, Ben (Edinburgh Northern and Leith) (SNP)
 Maguire, Ruth (Cunninghame South) (SNP)
 Marra, Jenny (North East Scotland) (Lab)
 Martin, Gillian (Aberdeenshire East) (SNP)
 Mason, John (Glasgow Shettleston) (SNP)
 Matheson, Michael (Falkirk West) (SNP)
 McAlpine, Joan (South Scotland) (SNP)
 McDonald, Mark (Aberdeen Donside) (SNP)
 McKee, Ivan (Glasgow Provan) (SNP)
 McKelvie, Christina (Hamilton, Larkhall and Stonehouse) (SNP)
 McMillan, Stuart (Greenock and Inverclyde) (SNP)
 McNeill, Pauline (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Paterson, Gil (Clydebank and Milngavie) (SNP)
 Robison, Shona (Dundee City East) (SNP)
 Ross, Gail (Caithness, Sutherland and Ross) (SNP)
 Ruskell, Mark (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Green)

Russell, Michael (Argyll and Bute) (SNP)
 Sarwar, Anas (Glasgow) (Lab)
 Smyth, Colin (South Scotland) (Lab)
 Somerville, Shirley-Anne (Dunfermline) (SNP)
 Stevenson, Stewart (Banffshire and Buchan Coast) (SNP)
 Stewart, David (Highlands and Islands) (Lab)
 Stewart, Kevin (Aberdeen Central) (SNP)
 Sturgeon, Nicola (Glasgow Southside) (SNP)
 Swinney, John (Perthshire North) (SNP)
 Todd, Maree (Highlands and Islands) (SNP)
 Wheelhouse, Paul (South Scotland) (SNP)
 Wightman, Andy (Lothian) (Green)
 Yousaf, Humza (Glasgow Pollok) (SNP)

Against

Balfour, Jeremy (Lothian) (Con)
 Briggs, Miles (Lothian) (Con)
 Burnett, Alexander (Aberdeenshire West) (Con)
 Cameron, Donald (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Carlaw, Jackson (Eastwood) (Con)
 Carson, Finlay (Galloway and West Dumfries) (Con)
 Chapman, Peter (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Cole-Hamilton, Alex (Edinburgh Western) (LD)
 Corry, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Fraser, Murdo (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Golden, Maurice (West Scotland) (Con)
 Greene, Jamie (West Scotland) (Con)
 Hamilton, Rachael (South Scotland) (Con)
 Harris, Alison (Central Scotland) (Con)
 Kerr, Liam (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Lamont, John (Ettrick, Roxburgh and Berwickshire) (Con)
 Lindhurst, Gordon (Lothian) (Con)
 Lockhart, Dean (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 McArthur, Liam (Orkney Islands) (LD)
 Mountain, Edward (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Mundell, Oliver (Dumfriesshire) (Con)
 Rennie, Willie (North East Fife) (LD)
 Ross, Douglas (Highlands and Islands) (Con)
 Rumbles, Mike (North East Scotland) (LD)
 Scott, John (Ayr) (Con)
 Smith, Liz (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Stewart, Alexander (Mid Scotland and Fife) (Con)
 Thomson, Ross (North East Scotland) (Con)
 Tomkins, Adam (Glasgow) (Con)
 Wells, Annie (Glasgow) (Con)
 Whittle, Brian (South Scotland) (Con)

The Presiding Officer: The result of the division is: For 82, Against 31, Abstentions 0.

Motion, as amended, agreed to,

That the Parliament agrees that membership of the EU has ensured progress on a wide range of environmental issues in Scotland and continues to underpin vital environmental protection; recognises the importance of the EU in securing collective action and progress on climate change and in driving forward collective action for the sustainable development of the marine environment; notes the significant role played by collaborative research across the EU in developing the scientific evidence that underpins protection and enhancement of a healthy environment; further recognises that a healthy environment supports prosperity and allows the promotion of Scottish produce and tourism around the world; notes that the value of the natural environment to the people of Scotland must be recognised by the UK Government in any future trade negotiations; notes that, like the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), the final Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) text contains an arbitration court that sits outside of the domestic court system and is only accessible to foreign investors, mechanisms that might create a downward pressure on

environmental regulations and risks to public service provision; believes that the passing of CETA might result in significant negative implications for environmental protection in Scotland; calls therefore on the UK Government to act to address these concerns; welcomes that the Scottish Ministers will pass on in full the EU funding guaranteed by the UK Government so far, which is vital to protecting, maintaining and enhancing the natural environment; believes that Scotland must protect its position as a climate change leader, and calls on the UK Government to ensure that Scotland has a role in the decision-making, as well as full involvement, in all UK negotiations.

Meeting closed at 17:05.

This is the final edition of the *Official Report* for this meeting. It is part of the Scottish Parliament *Official Report* archive and has been sent for legal deposit.

Published in Edinburgh by the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, the Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh, EH99 1SP

All documents are available on the Scottish Parliament website at:

www.parliament.scot

Information on non-endorsed print suppliers is available here:

www.parliament.scot/documents

For information on the Scottish Parliament contact Public Information on:

Telephone: 0131 348 5000

Textphone: 0800 092 7100

Email: sp.info@parliament.scot



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba