

Scottish Parliament
European and External Relations Committee
Written Evidence Paper
For the Committee Meeting - 19th November 2015

By
David Coburn MEP

Introduction – The case for Leaving the EU

In the next year, the people across the UK will get their first chance in over 40 years to have a say on Britain's membership of the EU. After all, this is ultimately a question of who governs the country. Is it the elected representatives in Westminster and devolved parliaments / assemblies in Holyrood, Cardiff and Belfast OR it is the unelected commissars and bureaucrats in Brussels? That is the choice. Anyone who believes in Democracy and national determination should reject rule from Brussels and vote to leave EU and return power to the various UK Parliaments. This is where power should be and not in some supranational bureaucracy which is largely unaccountable to the public.

Lack of Popular Support for the EU project

In 1973 when the UK joined the EEC and in 1975 when we had our last referendum on EU membership The British public were told that we were joining a free trade area. Over time via new treaties this free trade community has gained more power from Successive UK governments. At no point have British public had a say in this process even at significant milestones such as the Maastricht and Lisbon Treaties.

It is the same story throughout Europe; those countries whose governments gave the people a say on EU treaties had the results of their referendums either shamefully ignored or were told to vote again and again until they gave the "right" result. Sounds Familiar? Well it should as clearly Nicola Sturgeon must have watched and learned a lot from this "EU Democracy" as she clearly believes in ignoring the outcome of referendums and insist on holding them again and again until they eventually get the "right" result despite assurances that the will of the people will be sovereign.

Contrary to the mantra of Scottish Government the European Union does not enjoy much popular support in Scotland. Yes it is viewed slightly less unfavourably in Scotland in comparison to England, however actual positive support for the EU in Scotland is said to be both "weak" and prone to "Euroscpticism" as this committee has heard from many an expert witness in academia such as Professor Keating. According to a recent poll in the Sunday Express Scotland is only slightly more Europhile than the UK average. It is therefore rather strange claim that a Brexit would trigger another Scottish independence referendum when far more Scottish jobs depend on UK trade than EU trade.

Lack of Democracy in the EU Itself

The European Union deliberately destroys national democracy and is primarily an anti-democratic institution whose primary purpose is remove power from the people and their elected representatives and place it in the hands of unaccountable bureaucrats and technocrats, effectively putting government beyond the reach of the people.

As powers get transferred from accountable national parliaments to the EU, key policy decisions affecting 500 million people made solely by 30 unelected EU Commissioners who are responsible for initiating the directives that have to be introduced by national governments. MEPs can only make amendments and vote on these laws. How does this equate with the notion of democracy? Both the EU and national parliaments are increasing exist purely for ceremonial purposes and whose only function is to rubber stamp directives from Brussels.

Examples: Popular policies championed by some parties that are incompatible with EU Law

- Renationalise the railways and Royal Mail
- State Aid to Industry e.g. Steel
- Cap on energy prices
- Creating new apprenticeship for British citizens equal to the number of people employed from outside the EU will not be allowed under the single market rules.
- Minimum pricing of Alcohol
- The institutions of the EU have ensured the interest of multinational companies take precedent over national laws (namely TTIP see more later).

The EU's Interference in the Democratic Process

- The EU has removed democratically elected governments in both Greece and Italy and installed its own technocratic rulers and recently in Portugal where a left wing anti EU party was prevented from governing.
- Portugal. With unemployment rates at dangerous levels and its economy predicted to contract by 2.3% this year — its third straight year of contraction under austerity policies — the nation's Constitutional Court struck down several austerity measures enacted by the government in compliance with European Commission requirements.
- Ireland had to hold an EU approved budget before a general election which both main parties agreed to implement after the election.

In such ways, EU officials are inserting themselves into the governance of member nations. Yet the ordinary people whose lives are seriously affected by such measures have no recourse — they can't vote to remove them from office. This lack of democratic accountability poses a serious problem for member states and the system as whole. As for political tensions, a system whose officials are responsible for the region's faltering economies but who are not accountable to the tens of millions of unemployed people in them, is obviously exacerbating those tensions rather than alleviating them.

Economic Facts

Poor Economic Performance of the European Union

The EU promised prosperity, social progress and democracy but has now transmogrified into a body for destroying jobs and remember people do vote on the economy and the economic problems in the Eurozone has linked the economy with European constitutional matters. Economically Europe's importance is dwindling. As Mr Juncker notes, 80 per cent of growth in the global economy comes from outside the EU; the bloc's combined economic activity will soon make up barely 15 per cent of the world's GDP. Mr Juncker is surely right to say that the glory days of the European economy are behind it.

The European Union is an economic basket case as shown below.

- The EU's share of world GDP is collapsing. In 1980, the 28 countries that now make up the EU accounted for 30.3% of world GDP. By 2020 this is forecast to fall to just 15.4% or less:
- The UK exports going to EU countries has dropped from 52% in 2003 to 44% and will keep on falling.
- The Eurozone has experienced weaker growth in the past decade than Japan did in its lost decade of the 1990s.
- The gap between the rich and poor countries has widened rather than narrowed.
- The Euro single currency has destroyed the economies of southern Europe. The 17-nation euro zone remains the "weakest link" in our global economy.
- Unemployment in the Eurozone is at record levels. Soon one in eight working age people will be on the dole. In Greece, the jobless rate for Greeks under 25 is 55%.
- Flows of inward investment are starting to dry up.
- Slow growth, over-regulation, incompetent leadership are suffocating the EU while the rest of the world rushes ahead.

Why we must quit the EU: Cost of living would FALL by 8% according to professor Minford in an evidence to UK Parliament

- Britain would be free to buy **imported goods** at "world prices" instead of inflated "EU prices" leaving hard-pressed families far better off. Professor Minford's calculations, revealed to the Foreign Affairs Committee, showed that cutting ties with Brussels could be "lifesaving" for low-paid workers and pensioners, campaigners said. It could be lifesaving. It will certainly lighten their load significantly."

EU Fraud Waste and Corruption

Fraud allegations and waste as EU hands out money faster than states can spend it

The European Court of Auditors, the EU's independent fiscal watchdog, has refused to give the accounts a clean bill of health for the 21st year running, saying payments worth billions of pounds were irregular and possibly illegal. It found that countries are "struggling to absorb" the sums of money allocated to them, leading to wasteful spending.

The report identified an error rate in €144 billion of expenditure of 4.4 per cent – more than double the 2 per cent error margin that is tolerated. Overall, the report gives an "adverse opinion on the legality and regularity of payments underlying the accounts".

- Funding given to landowners was affected by a 3.6 per cent error rate, with the most common cause being farmers overstating the amount of land or number of animals they had.
- They included Greek farmers who declared rocky shrubland as pasture, and Spanish farmers who declared a motocross track as arable.
- The auditors reported 22 cases of suspected fraud to OLAF, the EU's fraud investigators. They included suspected conflicts of interest and "the artificial creation of conditions to receive subsidy".
- It highlighted major waste in EU funding for "ghost" airports. An investigation found that half the projects did not need investment while a third were not profitable and faced closure without constant injections of public money.

<https://www.rt.com/business/214503-ghost-airports-europe/>

- A €764,000 green energy project had a 90 per cent error rate in its accounts.
- In Greece, an EU-funded sewerage network project has remained unused nearly a decade after it was launched after the local government failed to connect it to private homes.
- There was also evidence of waste in Europeaid, the EU's foreign aid budget. It included €6.5 million given to a Caribbean bank to finance sugar planting in Belize, of which just a fraction was used.

Vítor Caldeira, president of the European Court of Auditors, told MEPS: "There is a persistently high level of payment errors, which means too much money is still not spent in accordance with the EU's financial rules. Some Member States are struggling to absorb the EU funds they have been allocated. In fact, in four Member States, the total not yet claimed from the EU budget is equivalent to 15% or more of their governments' annual spending.

Impact of Free Movement of People in the UK and Scotland

- Free movement of workers are providing unprecedented levels of competition for jobs in the UK. Neither governments or trade unions can do little to protect workers job security.
- The European Courts of Justice have ruled the free movement of Labour enshrined in the Treaty of Rome takes precedent over national minimum wage legislation. Two rulings (the Laval and Viking cases) have demolished national minimum wage laws.
- So the Scottish Parliament can have endless enquiries into poverty wages but can do little to stop Scottish workers from being undercut and forced out of work & into welfare. Is that the sort of Scotland that the Scottish people actually want?
- The net effect of uncontrolled immigration is wage compression, higher than normal unemployment and under employment, youth unemployment (PT & Zero Hours contracts).
- Unemployment, under employment and youth unemployment all started to rise as within months of the accession of EU8 countries (Poland et al) into the UK Labour market in 2004 and continued to rise steadily before the financial crash of 2008.
- $\frac{3}{4}$ of New jobs created in the UK went to EU migrants. This is keeping unemployment in the UK and in Scotland much higher than it should.
- We also have to take into the additional costs of mass immigration that are paced on public services such as health, education, housing and transport.

Overall - The either low or non-existent tax take from migrants on low pay does makes little if any contribution to the welfare bill of displaced UK workers let alone pay for the additional services that an increased population will consume. Therefore the UK government is forced into extra borrowing and eventually spending cuts to pay for it all.

Impact on in work benefits (Tax Credits)

The problem can be seen with the recent furore over the changes to tax credits. Tax credits act as a taxpayer-backed subsidy for EU migrants to come to the UK to perform low-paid jobs.

- Almost half of migrants from EU 43% are on benefits. This represents 224,000 EU nationals out of 526,000 new arrivals. About 148,000 of these claimants, some 66 per cent, receive tax credits, housing benefit and other welfare handouts available to people in work.
- Therefore migrants from the EU are contributing very little in taxes and are probably a net drain.
- Working Tax credits etc were designed to help the working poor and get unemployed UK Citizens back into work by in effect by letting them keep some of their welfare payment.
- The UK's generous the UK's in-work benefits means it can make financial sense for an EU citizen to go from an average wage elsewhere in Europe, to a minimum wage in the UK, using the in-work benefits to top up the income.
- EU migrants entitled to so-called "in-work" benefits claimed an average of £5,000 per family, costing UK taxpayers £530 million in 2013.

- More than 10,000 recently arrived EU families claimed over £10,000 through in-work welfare in 2013.

The Effect of the EU in Scotland

- 1 on 5 people in Scotland live below the poverty line.
- EU policies on energy and agriculture have forced hundreds of thousands of Scots into poverty. According to the Trussell Trust, 56,000 people in Scotland have relied on food banks.
- Rises in living costs, stagnant wages and utility bills are to blame.
- EU energy policies increase energy bills for Scottish households. 40% of Scottish Households are in fuel poverty.
- This is down to EU inspired green policies, especially as Scotland uses a large amount of renewable energy.
- The CAP increases food prices and many Scottish families have to use food banks as a result.
- Researchers confirmed that Scotland was a net contributor to the EU, providing £5,585m to the EU budget and getting £4,739m in receipts.
- Therefore EU Membership costs Scotland £800Million a year. That is money that could be better spent in Scotland on relieving poverty than on EU bureaucracy and subsidising other parts of Europe.

EU increases the Cost of Food

- Thousands of Scottish people have to rely on food banks to feed themselves and their families.
- Despite the fact that Scottish farmers receive the least amount of money from CAP, food prices have still been going up.
- CAP adds 17% onto a family's food bill.

EU Energy polices

- The EU has failed thus far to create a single energy market.
- The EU has the highest energy prices in the world.
- This is making industries such as steel, aluminium and cement leave the EU and move to the US and BRICS countries.
- Currently, 40% of Scotland's electricity is generated from renewables, mostly wind farms. UKPIA believes that EU regulations are one of the main reasons why Grangemouth was losing money that threatened it with closure.
- EU inspired green policies are responsible for numerous wind farms in the Highlands and Isles which have been blamed for damage to the land.

In Summary

- The UK does not need to be a member of European Union in order to trade with it or the rest of the world.
- It is destroying national democracy and democratic accountability
- The EU is a declining economic power.
- The EU wastes our money
- Free movement of people is a financial drain on our economy
- EU polices mean higher prices and greater poverty for the EU and Scotland.

We will look at the following areas

- Trade & TTIP
- EU Reform
- UK's upcoming EU referendum

TTIP Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership

Trade with the EU and the World

We do not need to be a member of the European Union to either trade with the European Union or to negotiate trade deals with other countries. In the past EU membership was said to give the UK clout, the truth is now that it is a case of too many cooks. 100% of the UK's economy is subject to the burden of EU Regulation. Less than 10% of UK GDP derives from exports to the EU. Indeed up to 95% of UK firms do not sell to the EU at all. The EU would want a signed trade deal with the UK if it left the bloc because its member states sell far more goods to the UK.

In 2012, China sold €290 billion of goods to the EU and no one is suggesting for one moment that China needs to join the EU.

Claims that "3 Million UK jobs are dependent on trade with the EU" are false. It is based on the false premise that all UK exports to the EU will cease when we leave whilst in fact that will not be the case because: a) Our membership of the World Trade Organisation protects us from vexatious actions by trading partners; b) The other EU Member States export more to the UK than we do to them. Professor Begg whose research this false claim was based in has publicly called it a "A false perspective".

Likewise claims by the Scottish government that 336,000 jobs are directly associated with EU exports have been debunked by the apolitical Scottish Parliament Research Centre (Spice) concluded the actual figure stood at 81,000 - a quarter of the number suggested

Far more jobs in Scotland (some 60 to 70%) depend on trade with the rest of UK than with the EU (10%)

The politicians of the 1960s and the 1970s who advocated EU membership made the wrong choice.

- Since 1975, all the UK's Trade Agreements have been negotiated by the EU Trade Commissioner. He or she has to take into account the interests of 28 Member States, many of whom are protectionist.
- The EU has agreements that relate to trade with over 100 countries. The countries include Mexico and South Korea. It follows, after exit, a UK-EU Trade Agreement is inevitable.
- A country does not need to be in a large trading bloc in order to negotiate trade agreements.
- The UK has little "influence" in the EU. Just 8.24% of the votes in the Council of Ministers. Even that influence is declining.
- The prospects for the economies of the EU are dismal to dire.
- The countries of the Commonwealth are growing fast. 7.3% annual growth has been predicted for 2012-2017.
- There have been successive tariff reductions (the Tokyo round 1973-1979 and others) since the UK joined the predecessor to the EU. The EU Customs Union is worth a lot less to the UK now than when we joined.
- The GDP of each of the 20 countries with whom the USA has Free Trade Agreements is smaller than that of the UK.
- The UK should exit the EU and thereby regain the ability to negotiate trade agreements in our national interest. The UK should then immediately reactivate our seat at the WTO. Exit would also relieve 100% of the UK's economy from the burden of EU Regulation.

The case in point here is the proposed TTIP Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is a proposed free trade agreement between the EU and United States. Economic barriers between the EU and the United States are relatively low due to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and work by the Transatlantic Economic Council.

TTIP – Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership

Ukip is that we are the most staunchly free trade party in the UK. TTIP is not free trade it is a corporatist scam designed to that favours big multinational corporates over the interests of smaller businesses, and most importantly TTIP strongly impedes the democratic right of people to set policy through elections. TTIP as it currently stands could hand the NHS lock, stock, and barrel to huge corporations against the wishes of the British people.

Whilst UKIP believes that a Britain outside the EU is far better place to negotiate a Free Trade deal with the USA which is in our national interest. It is also possible of course that the TTIP trade talks between the EU and US may break down as a result of the fact that the EU has to represent far too many divergent interest.

The main criticism of TTIP

- It gives unfair advantage to large corporations.
- It is a lobbyists dream.

There are 30,000 lobbyists here in Brussels - that's over 40 per MEP. There are more lobbyists here than there are in Washington DC and therefore it's no surprise to me that the big groups in this parliament support TTIP.

Documents released by the European Commission in July 2014 group the topics under discussion into three broad areas:

- Market access;
- Specific regulation
- Broader rules and principles and modes of co-operation.

The benefits of TTIP

The benefits of TTIP are questionable. Tariffs between the United States and the EU already low, the United Kingdom's Centre for Economic Policy Research estimates that 80 percent of the potential economic gains from the TTIP agreement depend on reducing the conflicts of duplication between EU and U.S. rules on those and other regulatory issues, ranging from food safety to automobile parts." Modelling is hard, but the European Commission reckons slashing "non-tariff barriers" would account for four-fifths of the 0.5% boost to European GDP that an "ambitious" deal could bring by 2027.

So TTIP if implemented would take about a decade to give a 0.5% improvement in GDP in a decade that is a gain of 0.05% per year. The gains are just too small to accurately measure.

The possible gains of TTIP.

- The European Commission claims that passage of a trans-Atlantic trade pact could boost overall trade between the respective blocs by as much as 50%
- The United States and European Union together represent 60% of global GDP
- 33% of world trade in goods and 42% of world trade in services.
- Trade conflicts between the two powers only affect 2% of total trade.
- A free trade area between the two would represent potentially the largest regional free-trade agreement in history, covering 46% of world GDP

Examples of regulations

Fracking, pharmaceuticals, agricultural products including GMOs and finance and tightening laws on copyright. Each of these areas are controversial.

Positive Economic Impact

Many studies and forecasts have been produced that indicate that TTIP will produce at best very low / moderate improvements in GDP.

A March 2013 economic assessment by the European Centre for Economic Policy Research estimates that such a comprehensive agreement would result in annual GDP growth of 68-119 billion euros by 2027 and annual GDP growth of 50-95 billion euros in the United States in the same time frame.

The 2013 report also estimates that a limited agreement focused only on tariffs would yield annual EU GDP growth of 24 billion euros by 2027 and annual growth of 9 billion euros in the United States

The European Commission says that the TTIP would boost the EU's economy by €120 billion, the US economy by €90 billion and the rest of the world by €100 billion.

Possible negative impact

An October 2014 study by Jeronim Capaldo of the Global Development and Environment Institute at Tufts University indicates that there will be losses in terms of net exports, net losses in terms of GDP, loss of labour income, job losses, reduction of the labour share, loss of government revenue and higher financial instability among European countries

European negotiators are also pressing the United States to loosen its restrictions on the export of crude oil and natural gas, to help the EU reduce its dependence on energy from Russia. The United States has so far reserved its position.

The NHS and other Public Services

A big worry about TTIP is the possibility of public services such as the NHS being opened up to private American healthcare management organisations (HMOs). The UK government should have insisted on a specific exemption for the NHS from TTIP, however David Cameron chose not to do so stating that it was unnecessary despite the expert advice leading to suspicion that the Tories wish to see the back door privatisation of the NHS especially given links between senior Tory MPs and private healthcare companies. The French government certainly protected their national interest by managing to exclude the trade in audio-visual services from the EU negotiating mandate.

An amendment in the European Parliament which "require the commission to exclude specifically our British National Health Service from TTIP in its entirety." One such amendment was roundly defeated 142-507.

"the only way that citizens can defeat TTIP now is to vote to leave the European Union.

Any government or political party in favour of remaining in the EU has therefore signed up to the privatisation of the NHS.

ISDS

One controversial aspect of drafts of the deal would be to establish a quasi-judicial trade court to which the two blocs would be subject. This could allow large corporations to 'sue' national governments for enacting any policy that potentially harmed their profits. Critics say that this would erode democracy and increase corporate power. More recently such claims have increased in number and value and some states have become increasingly resistant to such clauses.

An example of things to come with ISDS was the Raytheon e-Borders fiasco where the UK Government was stung for £224m after US IT giant sued via a mechanism similar to ISDS after the UK government scrapped a £750m contract for a passenger-checking computer system at its borders. The e-Borders IT project, which is supposed to scrutinize the identities of people entering the country, was signed in 2007, back when the Labour Party was in charge. However, shortly after the Conservative-Lib Dem coalition took over in 2010, the powers-that-be canceled the contract with supplier US giant Raytheon, citing long delays and a non-functioning database of terrorist suspects.

Such worries have already forced the EU's trade commissioner, Cecilia Malmstrom, into a partial retreat on a measure of TTIP that lets firms sue governments.

The Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy Group, of which UKIP is part tried to prevent the creation of ISDS, a private corporate-led arbitration court which would allow multinationals to sue states if their profits were challenged. The Socialist amendment on ISDS (no 117) was passed by 447 votes to 229. The Socialist Group amendment is basically ISDS-lite which still allows corporate investors to sue states outside normal courts for making democratic decisions.

2) Renegotiation

David Cameron's renegotiation has been exposed as fraud that was designed to trick enough people into voting to stay in the EU in the hope that the EU can be significantly reformed.

We believe that the David Cameron's renegotiation is nothing more than window dressing by the tory party. David Cameron and the tory high command are committed Europhiles who have already stated that they will campaign to stay in the EU regardless of the outcome the so-called renegotiations. The whole charade is going to be on par with Neville Chamberlain returning from Munich declaring peace in our time.

At most we may only get a few cosmetic changes. After all the negotiation settlement would have to be agreed by all the other member states. The French have already said that EU membership is not *A La Carte*.

The EU is unreformable any treaty change requires the consent of all of the member states of the EU most of whom have incentives not to make concessions. If reform and treaty change was possible it would take years rather than months to negotiate, agree and ratify it.

David Cameron sets out EU negotiation objectives

1. Protect the single market for Britain and others outside the Eurozone. What I mean by that is a set of binding principles that guarantee fairness between Euro and non-Euro countries."
2. Write competitiveness into the DNA of the whole EU, he will say: "This includes cutting the total burden on business."
3. Exempt Britain from an "ever-closer union" and bolster national parliaments. He will warn that this must "not be through warm words but through legally binding and irreversible changes".
4. Tackle abuses of the right to free movement, he will say it is vital to "enable us to control migration from the European Union, in line with my manifesto."

Yet only a day after he has somewhat belatedly EU referendum: David Cameron accused of backtracking on demands to restrict benefits to migrants

Six months ago Mr Cameron pledged a Conservative government would "insist" that EU migrants who wanted to claim tax credits and child benefit must have lived in Britain and paid taxes for a minimum of four years. The party's election manifesto said the welfare changes would be an "absolute requirement in the [EU membership] renegotiation". But in a speech in London on 10 November, Mr Cameron hinted that the benefit restrictions were no longer a red line for the Government, following fierce resistance to the idea from EU countries such as Slovakia and Poland. Instead, the Prime Minister said, he was "open to different ways of dealing with" the issue of migration.

So David Cameron is a flip flopper who says one thing one day and another thing the next day.

He cannot be trusted to deliver any significant renegotiation.

EU reform: the key demands

Iconic changes

Getting an opt-out for Britain from the EU's founding principle of "ever closer union". This is intended to ensure the UK is never forced to join a new European super state.

The euro

Explicitly writing into the European treaties that the EU is a multi-currency union, deleting references to the euro as the EU's official currency

Practical changes will be much harder.

Repatriating powers from Brussels to Britain, giving Parliament more autonomy and scaling back the influence of EU law on domestic affairs. Detailed work is already under way on this and European officials are understood to be considering calls for a so-called "red card" system to allow parliaments to block new EU directives.

Major structural reforms

Is the Europe of the Common Agricultural Policy, the Common Fisheries Policy and the incredibly expensive and inefficient Regional Policy reformable? And if so, how? If it is not (the last government and this one have an abysmal record of failure when it comes to reform) do we get out?

The EU will go on trying to "reform" the EU system around the margins. European economists and officials will likely remain steadfast in their belief that their policies have been right all along, that all they need is yet more time, and that the real fault lies with the moral defects of those who believe in national sovereignty — who must be compelled to do what's good for them and for the EU as a whole.

UK's upcoming EU referendum

Many commentators rightly praised the "democratic engagement" of the Scottish public during last year's Scottish Independence referendum, therefore the Scottish Parliament should surely welcome the opportunity of the people of Scotland and the rest of the UK to give their democratic verdict on EU membership.

UKIP welcomes the upcoming referendum on the EU. Our party was formed in order to stop Britain from being absorbed into a Federal EU super state to campaign for with drawl from the European Union. We welcome the opportunity herein in break the Pro EU cozy consensus in the Scottish political establishment that fails to fully and properly represent the views of Scottish people regarding the EU. To some extent the debate on the EU has played second or third fiddle to the debate on devolution and independence in Scotland. In addition to Eurosceptic tory and Labour voters, we meet many SNP supporters and activists who are staunchly anti EU. Indeed the SNP used to anti EU until around 1988 when it adopted its "Independence in Europe" slogan and many old school SNP voters are Eurosceptic, especially those who can remember the EU's destruction of Scotland's fishing industry.

Certain facts like the extent of the influence of EU law making in Scotland (the EU initiates 65 to 80% of our laws) have been rather conveniently buried by both the SNP and the Unionist Parties (Lib, Lab, Con) as have the implications for our currency – had Scotland voted for Independence last year, we would have had to agree to adopt the Euro (within a decade) in order to gain re-entry to EU, something that would not be Scotland's long term economic interest.

In Scotland it is true that less people understand that when they see a sign saying that a project of has been paid by EU Funds, certainly there is less of realization that it is actually money their own taxes that have paid for it we could afford to do a lot more of such investment if we did not have to pay for EU bureaucracy or fund similar schemes in other EU member states.

We have a number of concerns regarding the possible timing of the referendum, especially as the date of the referendum has not been set.

We agree that the Franchise should be UK nationals only.

The UK entered the EEC later the EU as the member in 1973. If a the UK votes for a Brexit, then the UK leaves as a member.

Anyone who believes in Democracy and national determination should reject rule from Brussels and vote to leave EU and return power to the various UK Parliaments. This is where power should be and not in some super national bureaucracy which is largely unaccountable to the public.