SPEAKER: Sir Anton Muscatelli, Principal of the University of Glasgow.

Well, good evening ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the University of Glasgow. My name is Anton Muscatelli. I’m Principal of the University, and it’s my very great pleasure to welcome you to the latest in series of public lectures arranged under our Policy Scotland banner. Previous speakers in the Policy Scotland lecture series have included Lord Kerr, Sir Ivan Rogers, Sir Martin Donnelly, and Ruth Davidson, amongst many others.

I do believe that these lectures are highly significant. They re-affirm this University’s position as a leading venue for leading commentators in their field to share their insight on the defining issues of the moment.

And, of course, there is no bigger issue than what has been happening in politics, an that has been one of the areas we have covered in the Policy Scotland lectures, which is Brexit.

But, of course, now we have another big topic which has been much in the news as well, and I’ll say a bit more about that in a moment. All of the topics in the Policy Scotland lecture series are about what country we want to be, and I think that is the common theme that runs across all of these lectures that we’ve run.

And that brings me to this evening’s speaker and I ma delighted to welcome our distinguished lecturer for tonight, David Martin. David is the most influential of those people who have represented Scotland, in deed any part of the UK, in the European Parliament.
David was first elected as a member of the European Parliament in 1984 and he served for 35 years in that capacity as an MEP, the longest of any UK member and the second longest of any member from any country. He was also vice-president of the European Parliament between 1989 and 2004, the longest spell of office in that very senior post. David played a major role in developing the Accords that led to the Maastricht Treaty, served as a rapporteur on both the Maastricht and Amsterdam treaties and he has been very influential in recent years – and he spoken to it at the university – in developing EU trade policy, where he is an acknowledged expert.

In a sense this is almost an inaugural lecture for David because he’s just been appointed recently to the College of Social Sciences here in the University as a Visiting Professor, where he works very closely with the Policy Scotland team. And his knowledge of Europe, of course, and his standing in European institutions and in Scotland, in his latest capacity, involved in the Citizens Assembly, will be hugely valuable to us, whatever the outcome of the debates, the many constitutional debates that we are currently undergoing in Scotland and the UK.

I also know David because he is a member of the First Minister's Standing Council on Europe which I currently chair, and David’s been offering some fantastic advice to me as Chair over the three years that that body has run. And he is highly regarded across the political spectrum, and his ability to work across political divides and his knowledge and personal qualities have led to this appointment as the Co-Chair of the Citizen’s Assembly of Scotland, which he is going to speak about tonight.

So the Assembly is going to try and gather views on that most fundamental question to which I referred earlier – ‘what kind of country do we want to live in?’- and I’m sure that developing the deliberative process involved in Citizens’ Assemblies will present several interesting challenges but I am sure that there is no better candidate as co-chair to tackle this calmly and competently like David.

David, warm welcome back to the University. You’ve been here before, can I now Invite you to speak to us on the topic that you see there and afterwards you’ll have an opportunity to ask questions of our speaker and I’ll moderate a Q and A session. But over to you David.
SPEAKER: David Martin, Convener of the Citizens’ Assembly of Scotland

Slide 1: David Martin, Professor of Policy Scotland; Co-Convener of the Citizens’ Assembly of Scotland.

Thank you, Sir Anton, for the introduction and thanks to you, Des McNulty and Professor Chris Chapman, for the opportunity to join the University of Glasgow as a Professor for Policy Scotland.

It's a privilege to be part of a University which combines a global reputation for academic excellence with a firm grounding in its local community. I hope I can use my political experience to help Glasgow maintain and develop its good links with Europe and encourage domestic politicians to make better use of the expertise they have on their doorstep.

When politicians lose elections, they often reach for the famous Mark Twain remark “the people have spoken – the bastards”. I can honestly say I felt the exact opposite. I feel privileged to have represented Scotland in the European Parliament for the last 35 years and am profoundly grateful to everyone who made it possible including “the People”.

Of course, at the end of such a long career it is inevitable that you compare and contrast the situation at the beginning to that at the end.

Slide 2: shows a photo of the modern European Parliament with David Martin talking to an audience

When I was elected in 1984, I shared a one room office and one fixed line telephone in Brussels with two other MEPs. We had one fax machine for the whole of my political group (180 people), no computers, no mobile phones, today's papers arrived tomorrow and my main way of finding out what was happening in the world was a longwave radio on which on good days you could pick up Radio 4.

At the end of my time in Parliament I had three rooms, three staff members, 4 computers, mobile phones and laptops. A television in my room beaming in over 600 channels from every one of the 28 Member States of the EU. 24-hour rolling news at the press of a button.

So much better connected to my voters? Actually no. All this information overload can leave you operating in a bubble. This was brought home to me most dramatically when I was the European Parliament's rapporteur for something called ACTA – the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement. There was a massive lobbying campaign on this with the pharmaceutical
companies, the music industry and other copyright holders lined up against Google and Facebook and pressure groups like Anonymous (you might remember the Guy Fawkes masks they wore).

At the height of the campaign I was getting 10,000 emails a day and as we say in Scotland assumed this was the talk of the steamie. Yet back in Scotland when I spoke to family, friends, neighbours or at meetings I discovered that few if any of them knew or cared anything about ACTA. So a tool which in theory allows ordinary citizens better access to their politicians actually amplifies the interests of organised interests groups and here we are not just talking about big business.

**Slide 3: Quote from Ben Elton.** The internet tells us everything, but prevents us learning anything. “Nobody knows what’s going on anymore. The national focus evaporated with the internet.”

“I know it’s a truism to say we live in a post-truth society but really that is the case. If you want to deny that vaccinations, which self-evidently have changed the world for the better and saved millions of lives there are a million sites to prove it. Or that 9/11 was carried out by the CIA – or the local greengrocer.”

In a brilliant interview with the Sunday Herald the comedian Ben Elton outlined his concerns. There’s a paradox, he points out, that the internet tells us everything, but prevents us learning anything. “nobody knows what’s going on anymore. The national focus evaporated with the internet.

He said “I know it’s a truism to say we live in a post truth society but really that is the case. If you want to deny that vaccinations, which self-evidently have changed the world for the better and saved millions of lives there are a million sites to prove it. Or that 9/11 was carried out by the CIA – or the local greengrocer”.

This fake news has infected politics. We must admit that politicians have always bent the truth for electoral advantage, but we now have it on an industrial scale and not just on the other side of the Atlantic.

We know the Prime Minister has lied to the Queen which is outrageous because most people assumed that was Prince Andrew’s role.
I also believe that social media has changed the tone of politics. Again we have always had robust debate but that has boiled over into contempt for the views of others.

So why did Michael Russell the Cabinet Secretary, a combative SNP politician invite me a defeated Labour politician to take on the role of Co-Convenor of Scotland’s Citizen Assembly.

I think in part it’s because we are both democrats and come from a generation of politicians who understand that without differing views and competing visions there is no democracy.

I don’t know for sure, but I think it might also date back to a conversation we had at a Burns supper in Brussels in January of this year. When we discussed how for many politics was not something done by them or even for them but to them. That despite all the millions of twitter postings for most people we do not have participatory democracy but audience democracy.

We both believed that there has to be a better way of engaging the public in the political process so when he called me 4 or 5 months later, as I wandered around Marks & Spencer’s in Bearsden I had no hesitation in agreeing to be one of the Co-Convenors of this exciting development in Scottish politics.

I know my fellow convenor Kate Wimpress, who comes from an arts and community background and brings different skills and perspectives, than mine, to the Assembly, shares my enthusiasm and has described the Assembly as an opportunity to have “real people in the room making a real difference”

**Slide 4: Quote from Kate Wimpress, Co-Convenor of the Citizens’ Assembly of Scotland: An opportunity to have “real people in the room, making a real difference.”**

**Quote from James Fishkin, American political scientist “What would the people think should be done if they could consider key issues under good conditions for thinking about them?”**

The American political scientist, James Fishkin, describes Citizen’s Assemblies or people’s juries or mini publics as an opportunity to answer the question -

“What would the people think should be done if they could consider key issues under good conditions for thinking about them?”

Citizens Assembly and why it differs from ordinary democracy / public engagement.
So, before I go on to talk specifically about the Citizens’ Assembly of Scotland, I want to emphasise that what we are undertaking is not just ‘public engagement’ as usual.

There are a wide range of well-established ways that governments consult with the public – from opinion polling, to workshops with stakeholders or service users, through to formal written public consultations.

They all have their place, BUT… This is something different!

Slide 5: Citizens Assemblies. Not more of the same. Membership is key component.

Innovative structured approach: diagram with box labelled learning; and an arrow to a box labelled Dialogue, arrow to a box labelled Deliberation, then an arrow to a large box which says ‘Outcome from: - informed consideration and – public reasoning’

Citizens’ Assemblies, are fundamentally an innovative structure for engaging with the public that are characterised by 2 key features – features that differentiate them from our more well established ways of involving the public in the work of government:

Firstly, the participants are randomly selected to be broadly representative of the population at large (i.e. this is not about hearing from the ‘usual suspects’, the ‘loudest voices’ or the organised groups that exist to represent different interests); and

Secondly, that the participants are taken through a structured process of learning, dialogue and deliberation before being asked for their opinions – ensuring that the final outcomes are the product of informed consideration and a process of public reasoning.

And as such, this is not just something new for Scotland, but something that needs to be seen as a crucial part of embedding a wider participatory agenda into the way we do government in Scotland.

This focus on participation is something that was firmly established in the Standing Orders of the Scottish Parliament from the outset and successive governments have looked for ways of giving the Scottish public opportunities to play a more active and involved role in influencing the decisions that affect their lives, their communities and their futures.

The Citizens’ Assembly of Scotland is an opportunity to realise this ambition in a bold and decisive way. At the same time, it will position Scotland at the forefront internationally in
Deliberative democratic innovations, like Citizens’ Assemblies, are gaining traction in the UK, and across Europe at present. Many of you will have seen in recent months that there have been numerous calls from politicians (from all parties), the media and civil society organisations for Citizens’ Assemblies to take place across the UK on a wide range of issues from Brexit, to our approach to criminal justice, and climate change.

In part, this demand has been driven by an increasing sense that the public are disconnected from decision making in the UK, giving rise to a lack of trust in politicians, and political institutions, to really serve the best interests of the public.

In contrast, the potential of deliberative processes like Citizens’ Assemblies have been held up as having the potential to challenge this disconnect by giving ordinary members of the public an opportunity to meaningfully influence the decisions that affect their lives, their communities and their futures in an informed and considered way. This has been picked up by many as a way of helping get our existing political institutions ‘back on track’ with the will of the public as a whole.

**Slide 6: Theoretical approach to Citizens’ Assemblies.** Diagram shows a small circle labelled ‘Citizens Assembly’ with an arrow labelled ‘Supplements’ pointing from it to a larger circle labelled ‘Traditional Representative Democracy’.

Deliberative democratic innovations like Citizens’ Assemblies however, are not about challenging, or seeking to replace, our current systems of representative democracy – indeed across most western democracies where models like this have been adopted and used it is clear that they serve an advisory function only.

Instead, they seek to complement representative democracy structures by giving elected decision makers access to a different type of information and understanding of public opinion than might otherwise be available to them – i.e. the informed and considered views of a broadly representative cross section of the public who have had the opportunity to go through a process of learning, dialogue and deliberation on an issue before coming to a conclusion.

What processes like Citizens’ Assemblies do, however, set out to challenge is how public discussions about contentious and controversial issues take place within society.
Most of our current public discourse about public policy issues is based on the tradition of 
debate - where sides are drawn and the objective is to win, to literally ‘beat down’ opposing 
arguments in order to gain support for a pre-determined position.

**Slide 7: Theoretical approach to Citizens’ Assemblies.** Diagram shows a funnel 
containing ‘bubbles’ of ‘Dialogue’, ‘Deliberation’ and again ‘Dialogue’, and out of the 
bottom of the funnel comes ‘Shared Understanding.’

In a deliberative process like a Citizens’ Assembly the underlying goal is to change the way 
that public discussions take place – by focusing on building patterns of dialogue and 
deliberation into the process.

The word ‘dialogue’ is particularly important here. Dialogue is, intrinsically, a collaborative 
process of shared inquiry and, unlike patterns of debate which tend to entrench established 
points of view, allows people to expand their understandings and explore and discover 
common ground. Establishing ‘dialogue’ between people therefore is not simply about 
creating space for people to talk with each other, but is instead about putting in place the 
conditions that enable conversations explicitly focused on building an understanding of 
different points of view.

When space and time is given to developing meaningful dialogue between a diverse group 
of people, the potential for them to discover aspects of ‘common ground’ are increased. 
Further, in something like a Citizens' Assembly, it enables members to enter into the 
deliberation stage with a wider appreciation of what is important to others and why?

This foundation, in turn, supports the members to engage in effective deliberation – weighing 
options and making choices together in order to deliver (hopefully) a win / win situation – but 
if not, at least an outcome that everyone involved will accept as fair, informed, considered…
and something that they all can ‘live with’.

and now on to the specifics…

**Slide 8: Quote from Scotland’s First Minister Nicola Sturgeon, on 24 April 2019, saying** 
“a Citizens’ Assembly to ensure we debate our choices about the future of the 
country respectfully and in a way that seeks maximum areas of agreement and which 
lays a foundation that allows the people of Scotland to move forward together.”
When the First Minister announced, in April 2109, that government was to convene a Citizens’ Assembly of Scotland she made clear that this new initiative was about embracing a new approach by government to understanding the people of Scotland’s ambitions for their country.

Slide 9: Remit and terms of reference. The Citizens’ Assembly will consider:

- What kind of country we are seeking to build?
- How best can we overcome the challenges Scotland and the world face in the 21st century, including those arising from Brexit? And
- What further work should be carried out to give us the information we need to make informed choices about the future of the country?

She established 3 broad questions for the Assembly to address:

- What kind of country we are seeking to build?
- How best can we overcome the challenges Scotland and the world face in the 21st century, including those arising from Brexit? and
- What further work should be carried out to give us the information we need to make informed choices about the future of the country?

This remit not only establishes the Citizens’ Assembly as a forum for having the, admittedly potentially difficult and divisive conversations that are needed about Scotland’s future, but demonstrates a high degree of trust in the ability of the people to have a mature, informed and considered conversation about the future of Scotland.

As everyone knows the remit of the Citizens’ Assembly has been controversial amongst the political parties. I’ve set out my views on that debate previously and I don’t intend to go over that again tonight.

But that aside, it remains the case that the remit is very broad and that an early priority will be to bring focus to it so that Assembly members can agree the more detailed areas where they want to take evidence. The Government has made clear that it is for the Assembly, under the independent stewardship of the conveners, to determine these matters. It might be helpful if I set out a few comments on how we are thinking on these issues.

Slide 10: Current context
• Will we leave the EU? When?

• Scottish Government intention to hold a further independence referendum.

• Westminster uncertainty

First of all, the Assembly is taking place against the backdrop of significant uncertainty about Scotland’s place in the world, including our relationships with our near neighbours in the UK and our wider partners in the EU. In particular:

We don’t know for certain yet whether we will remain in or leave the EU and, if we do leave the EU, when we will do so and on what terms.

The Scottish Government has made clear its intention to hold a further independence referendum and, most recently, the Programme of Government said that it intends to refresh the propositions set out in the previous White Paper.

The upheaval at Westminster further demonstrates the uncertain outlook for our constitution and our politics.

This backdrop matters. There is no doubting that different constitutional journeys will have a profound impact upon the lives of citizens. There will be choices to be made – certainly in elections and possibly in further referendums on EU membership or independence.

Slide 11: Photograph of convenors Kate Wimpess and David Martin

The conveners of the Citizens’ Assembly are very clear that our remit does not extend to making these choices for people; so, anyone who looks to the Assembly to validate a particular constitutional outcome is, I’m afraid, going to be disappointed. It would not be possible to take the range of evidence and undertake the deliberation required to work through any, let alone, all, of those constitutional choices and come to conclusions that meet the quality standards required and which could realistically be agreed and seen to have been reached fairly by Assembly members.

That said, the Assembly can help people to think through what they need to know when faced with such big choices and to set expectations about how citizens’ are supported to take decisions. It can help them explore how different constitutional changes might impact in real life and to answer the question set in our remit on ‘what information people need in order to be able to make choices about the future’.
Not everyone would agree – and they are entitled to that view - but I come to the Assembly firmly of the view that the constitution is instrumental; it is a means to an end rather than an end in itself. I don’t doubt the importance of matters about how we are governed and how decisions are taken, but it is the test of any arrangements in the real world in enabling the best possible outcomes for people that matters most to me; outcomes that are fair, that meet our needs now and into the future, and help us give of our best to each other and to the world.

So, the Assembly will not dwell upon these constitutional issues, but will consider them in the context of the state of the nation and the outlook for the future. That will include presenting people with evidence, including the facts and figures presented in a balanced and accessible way, free from bias and spin, so that we develop a shared understanding of where we are and the opportunities and challenges ahead of us.

And, while the Citizens Assembly will be producing a report for government as a result of its deliberations on these topics, ultimately it is there to produce recommendation for activity on how people are supported, including the information they need to make informed and reasoned decisions when they are making choices about Scotland’s future.

Slide 12: Photograph of a smiling woman with the words ‘Welcome to the Citizens’ Assembly of Scotland’ and web address www.citizensassembly.scot

Now that myself, and my co-convener Kate Wimpress, have been appointed to lead the Citizens Assembly we are pushing ahead with arrangements for how to bring the remit we have been given to life…

Slide 13: Arrow showing timeline with these points in order: First Minister announces Assembly (April 2019); Conveners Appointed (July 2019); Pre-Assembly work (recruitment, design and promotion); Citizens Assembly 1st meeting; (26-27 October); Assembly meetings take place in Glasgow; Assembly Final meeting (24-26 April); Report to Scottish Government 31 May 2020; Report laid in Scottish Parliament.

The Citizens’ Assembly of Scotland is the biggest, most ambitious example of a Citizens’ Assembly held in the UK to date – both in terms of the number of members and the fact that it will be meeting over 6 weekends between now and the end of April.
In taking on a leading role in this exciting democratic innovation for our country, I'll admit, both myself and Kate have embarked on a steep learning curve about the role and value of participatory and deliberative approaches to public engagement!

We have been, however, in the fortunate position of being able to benefit from the experiences of experts and innovators in the field of deliberative democracy from across the UK, across Europe, from Canada and Australia to help inform our plans overall – and we are grateful to the people who have given their time and knowledge to support and assist us on this journey.

**Slide 14: Photos of documentation or locations related to other citizens’ assemblies including the Citizens Assembly of Ireland; the Melbourne People’s Panel; Le Grand Débat National and the city centre of Gdansk**

What these discussions have confirmed to us is, that while still innovative, Citizens’ Assemblies are not experimental!

Their value to political decision making has clearly been demonstrated time and time again:

From the City of Melbourne’s Peoples Panel which came together to inform the development of the city’s 10-Year Financial Plan and produced recommendations to wipe out the city’s projected $ overspend.

To the Citizens’ Assembly in Gdansk, Poland, which effectively addressed the issue of flood prevention in the city.

To the 21 Regional Citizens' Assemblies in France that worked to develop propositions on the 4 key topics of the Grand National Debate: Ecological Transition, Tax System, Organization of State and Administration and Democracy and Citizenship.

We’ve also taken a number of specific lessons from some key local examples:

The Citizens Assembly of Ireland, for example, which brought together 100 people to explore 5 topics over 18 months –

- the repeal of 8th amendment (where their recommendations led to a referendum to change abortion law);
- The challenges and opportunities of an ageing population;
- making Ireland a leader in tackling climate change;
the manner in which referenda are held; and

• fixed term parliaments.

The experience in Ireland has shown us that people are willing to give over significant amounts of their time, and engage constructively with complex and contested issues, when they see the issue as being of national importance.

The UK Parliament’s Citizens’ Assembly on the future funding of social care which was commissioned to inform the report of the joint select committee enquiry. This example has also been a vital learning too, as the positive response from the Committee’s to its findings gives us confidence that the public are able to produce, within this framework, considered, relevant and useful recommendations to government - when given time to learn, discuss and really consider the trade-offs that need to be made on difficult decisions.

**Slide 15: Principles: Independence from government; Transparency; Inclusion; Accessibility; Balance; Cumulative learning; Open-mindedness**

For the Citizens Assembly of Scotland, however, while drawing on international good practice, we are developing a model that is distinctly Scottish – one that is responding directly to our own unique history, culture and context.

To do this we are drawing on 7 key principles agreed to guide all aspects of the Assembly’s development and operations:

1. Independence from government
2. Transparency
3. Inclusion
4. Accessibility
5. Balance
6. Cumulative learning
7. Open-mindedness

How we are putting these principles into practice in the lead up, and throughout the life of the Citizens Assembly of Scotland is what I would now like to focus on.

Independence from Government
An assurance of the Citizens’ Assembly’s independence from government was a key condition upon which Kate and myself have taken on the role of co-conveners.

The Memorandum of Understanding that we have signed with Minister ensures that we are able to pursue this role free from interference and intervention from government and gives us the freedom to deliver on the remit entrusted to us in the way that we see fit.

Our role as conveners is one of:

Stewarding the Assembly, by that I mean overseeing the planning arrangements in order that the Assembly delivers its remit and members are supported.

Convening meetings of the Assembly: by hosting and contributing to the meetings;

Representing the Assembly – by being a voice for the membership of the Assembly in the media, and bringing the work of the Assembly to the attention to the wider Scottish public.

To further ensure we can do this the government has provided us with the support of an impartial secretariat. This Secretariat, staffed largely by civil servants seconded into this role, will take direction from us throughout the life of the assembly, rather than from Ministers. I am delighted that Ian Davidson, a deputy director with the Scottish Government, has taken on the task of leading this team and Ian is here tonight and I’m sure will be able to answer any difficult questions!

The independence of the Assembly is also being further assured by the appointment of independent contractors to recruit the assembly members (and I’ll come back to that shortly) and an independent design team and facilitation team who will work with Kate and myself to plan and deliver the Assembly meetings.

Transparency: at all levels of the operation of the Assembly, from the framing of the questions, to the selection of members and expert witnesses, through to proactive publication and live-streaming of deliberative sessions and clarity about what the outputs will be used for.

I’ve laid out in some detail why a Citizen’s Assembly is different from a focus group or a public meeting. The remit we have been given and the modus vivendi of the Assembly. For the Assembly to work it must be a genuine mini public or microcosm of society so before concluding I want to share with you the basis on which we have recruited the Members of the Assembly.
Slide 16: Stratification criteria. Geography; Age; Gender; Ethnic Group; Highest Educational Level; Long term limiting condition; Voting intention

You will see from the PowerPoint that we have used geography, age, gender, ethnic origin, educational qualifications, limiting long term conditions to ensure the Assembly Members reflect Scotland as a whole. We had a more difficult decision to make on what we should do about voting intentions. Should we assume that any microcosm would automatically reflect political attitudes or should we specifically build this in?

Jumped to slide 24: Three pie charts showing voting intentions with regard to...

Scottish Parliament: SNP, 30%; Scottish Conservative, 18%; Scottish Labour, 16%; Scottish Liberal Democrat, 6%; Greens, 4%; Other, 4%; Don't know/ Undecided, 11%; Would not vote, 11%.

EU membership: Remain in EU, 56%; Leave EU, 30%; Don't know/ Undecided, 6%; Would not vote, 8%.

Scottish independence: Yes - in favour of independence, 40%; No - opposed to independence, 45%; Don't know/ Undecided, 6%; Would not vote, 9%.

In the end we decided to build in three political criteria based on voting intentions, attitudes to EU membership and Scottish Independence. You can see the percentages that we went for. How we did this was that we went back over 12 months of opinion polls. And so rather than take one snapshot we took a series of opinion polls over year. Some people looking at these pie charts, might think that SNP at 30% is way below where they are in the current opinion polls but as I say that was based on the last year. Some might say that support for independence is even higher than on the last pie chart but again because we didn’t just decide to take a snapshot but a long-term perspective, these are the figures that we came po with. So, we added voting intentions to the other criteria, and if we can go back I can quickly go through the other criteria.

Jump to Slide 19: Pie chart showing Age: 16-19, 21%; 30-44, 23%; 45-59%, 26%; 60-74, 20%; 75+, 10%.

We wanted to make sure that Scotland was represented across the whole age spectrum, from 16 to 27 and this is the break up that we ended with.
Slide 20: Gender: Male, 48%; Female, 52%.

We wanted to make sure we were gender-balanced across the whole of the Scottish population, which means there are going to be more women than men involved in the assembly.

Slide 21: Pie chart of Ethnic Origin. White: Scottish, 77%; White: British, 12%; White: Other, 7%; All other ethnic groups, 4%.

We wanted to make sure that when you had a picture of this assembly, it looked like a picture of Scotland, so we made sure that the ethnic origin is based on the actual ethnic origin of Scotland.

Slide 22: Qualifications pie chart. Don't know, 1%; No qualifications, 16%; Level 1-3 (Standard Grade, Higher), 52%; Level 4 (Degree), 31%.

Very important; we didn't want this to be a meeting with self-selecting people who were experts or were very articulate. We wanted to make sure every level, strata of society was represented, so we took qualifications into consideration.

Slide 23: Limiting long-term conditions pie chart. Has limiting condition, 24%; No limiting condition, 76%

Again, we wanted to make sure that nobody was debarred from this so – I have to admit in passing that I was rather surprised to find that 24% of the Scottish population has life-limiting conditions but there we are – they will be represented. Anyone who needs assistance with care, with special hearing needs or with any other facility, again because of the budget provided by the Scottish Government, that will be provided. So everybody will be able to take part in this assembly on a fair basis.

Having gone through all these criteria, when we sent the team out to recruit people I have to say I was very worried that we’d end up ticking enough boxes that to tick all the remaining boxes we would need to find a Shetland Islander, without a degree, who planned to vote Conservative but was in favour of Independence and staying in the EU. Fortunately that did not turn out to be the case. The good news is that we think we will soon be able to announce that the make-up of the Assembly is going to be very close to the mini-public we set out to recruit.
I hope at the end of the Citizens' Assembly process we have a better idea of the aspirations and the real concerns of the Scottish people and more clarity on the obstacles to dealing with them. At the end of the process the Members do not necessarily have to agree but I hope they will have more clarity on what it is they are agreeing or disagreeing about.

Thank you for your attention. And as, Anton said, I'm now pleased to take questions.

This is the transcript of a lecture hosted by Policy Scotland at the University of Glasgow on 30th September 2019.

For more information, see https://policyscotland.gla.ac.uk/democracy-in-scotland-whats-the-place-of-the-citizens-assembly/