

**CULTURE, TOURISM, EUROPE &
EXTERNAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE**
#SPICeBrexitWeekly

Issue 18

26 January

2017

BREXIT UPDATE

SPICe weekly update

**THE UK SUPREME COURT'S
ARTICLE 50 DECISION**

**WELSH GOVERNMENT
PUBLISHES BREXIT PROPOSALS**

**NEW INTERNATIONAL
TRADE CAMPAIGN**

SPICe

The Information Centre
An t-Ionad Fiosrachaidh

Written by Iain McIver, SPICe Research



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

Contents

The UK Supreme Court's Article 50 decision	1
Welsh Government publishes Brexit proposals	9
Joint Ministerial Committee on European Negotiations	10
New International Trade Campaign	11

About this paper

This regular paper produced by SPICe sets out developments in the UK's negotiations to leave the European Union which are expected to formally begin early in 2017.

Ahead of the UK Government's triggering of Article 50, the updates will provide information on the UK Government's approach to leaving the EU, along with details of the Scottish Government and the other Devolved Administrations positions. The updates will also provide information on developments within the EU with regard to the UK's departure. Finally the update will provide information on the key issues likely to be at play during the negotiations and in developing the UK's future relationship with the European Union.

As was clear during the referendum campaign and since the decision to leave the EU was taken, there is an abundance of information and analysis available, and this SPICe paper will try to cover the key issues by drawing on that information and analysis. This week's update provides information on the Supreme Court's judgement in relation to Article 50 and the Welsh Government's proposals in relation to Brexit.

The UK Supreme Court's Article 50 decision

On 24 January, the UK Supreme Court delivered its decision on the UK Government's appeal against the decision of the High Court to prevent Article 50 being triggered by use of the Royal Prerogative.

According to the Supreme Court's [summary](#), the appeal related to the procedure by which the UK Government could give notice of the UK's departure from the EU:

“The principal issue in these appeals is whether such a Notice can, under the UK's constitutional arrangements, lawfully be given by Government ministers without prior authorisation by an Act of Parliament. References from Northern Ireland, and interventions by the Lord Advocate for the Scottish Government and the Counsel General for Wales for the Welsh Government, raise the additional issues of whether the terms on which powers have been statutorily devolved require consultation with or the agreement of the devolved legislatures before Notice is served, or otherwise operate to restrict the Government's power to do so (‘the devolution issues’).”

The [Judgement](#) delivered by the Supreme Court by a majority of 8 to 3 dismissed the Secretary of State's appeal (Lord Neuberger, Lady Hale, Lord Mance, Lord Kerr, Lord Clarke, Lord Wilson, Lord Sumption and Lord Hodge in the majority with Lord Reed, Lord Carnwath and Lord Hughes dissenting). In a joint judgment of the majority, the Supreme Court held that an Act of Parliament is required to authorise ministers to give Notice of the decision of the UK to withdraw from the European Union.

On the devolution issues, the court unanimously concluded that neither section 1 nor section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act is of assistance in the case, and that the Sewel Convention does not give rise to a legally enforceable obligation.

A [summary of the reasons for the Judgement](#) has been provided by the Supreme Court. Some key elements of the summary include:

- Section 2 of the European Communities Act (ECA) authorises a dynamic process by which EU law becomes a source of UK law and takes precedence over all domestic sources of UK law, including statutes. So long as the ECA remains in force its effect is to constitute EU law as an independent and overriding source of domestic law. It operates as a partial transfer of law-making powers, an assignment of legislative competences, by Parliament to EU institutions, unless and until Parliament decides otherwise.
- The Government argues that the 1972 Act (the ECA) does not exclude the power for ministers to withdraw from the EU Treaties, and that section 2 of the Act actually caters for the exercise of such a power as it gives effect to EU law only so long as the power of withdrawal is not exercised. However, there is a vital difference between variations in UK law resulting from changes in EU law, and variations in UK law resulting from withdrawal from the EU Treaties. Withdrawal makes a fundamental change to the UK's constitutional arrangements, by cutting off the source of EU law. Such a fundamental change will be the inevitable effect of a Notice being served. The UK constitution requires such changes to be effected by Parliamentary legislation.

- The fact that withdrawal from the EU would remove some existing domestic rights of UK residents also renders it impermissible for the Government to withdraw from the EU Treaties without prior Parliamentary authority.
- The 2016 referendum is of great political significance. However, its legal significance is determined by what Parliament included in the statute authorising it, and that statute simply provided for the referendum to be held without specifying the consequences. The change in the law required to implement the referendum's outcome must be made in the only way permitted by the UK constitution, namely by legislation. The Government accepts that the resolution of the House of Commons on 7 December 2016 calling on ministers to give notice under Article 50 by 31 March 2017 is a political act which does not affect the issues arising in the appeals.
- The devolution Acts were passed by Parliament on the assumption that the UK would be a member of the EU, but they do not require the UK to remain a member. Relations with the EU and other foreign affairs matters are reserved to UK Government and parliament, not to the devolved institutions. Withdrawal from the EU will alter the competence of the devolved institutions, and remove the responsibilities to comply with EU law.
- As to the application of the Sewel Convention to the decision to withdraw from the EU given the effect on the devolved competences, the Convention operates as a political constraint on the activity of the UK Parliament. It therefore plays an important role in the operation of the UK constitution. But the policing of its scope and operation is not within the constitutional remit of the courts. The devolved legislatures do not have a veto on the UK's decision to withdraw from the EU.

UK Government Statement on the process for triggering Article 50

Following the announcement of the Supreme Court's Judgement, David Davis, the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union made [statement to Parliament](#). In the statement, David Davis announced that the Government would introduce a short piece of legislation to facilitate the triggering of Article 50 and begin the process by which the UK leaves the EU. He told the House of Commons:

"This Government is determined to deliver on the decision taken by the people of the United Kingdom in the referendum granted to them by this House to leave the European Union.

So we will move swiftly to do just that. I can announce today that we will shortly introduce legislation allowing the Government to move ahead with invoking Article 50, which starts the formal process of withdrawing from the European Union."

On the timing of the Bill and consequently the timing of triggering Article 50, the Secretary of State indicated it would be a simple bill that the Government would seek to pass through Parliament in good time to allow for the triggering of Article 50 before the end of March:

"But this will be a straightforward Bill. It is not about whether or not the UK should leave the European Union. That decision has already been made by the people of the UK.

We will work with colleagues in both Houses to ensure this Bill is passed in good time for us to invoke Article 50 by the end of March this year, as my Rt Hon Friend the Prime Minister has set out.

This timetable has already been supported by this House.”

On what the bill would look like and whether it might be amended, the Secretary of State said:

“This will be the most straightforward Bill possible to give effect to the decision of the people and respect the Supreme Court’s judgment.

The purpose of this Bill is simply to give the Government the power to invoke Article 50 and begin the process of leaving the European Union. That is what the British people voted for, and it is what they would expect.

Parliament will rightly scrutinise and debate this legislation. But I trust no-one will seek to make it a vehicle for attempts to thwart the will of the people, or frustrate or delay the process of our exit from the European Union.”

On the role of the devolved legislatures in triggering Article 50, the Secretary of State said:

“The Government’s fifth and final principle for responding to this judgment is to continue to ensure that we deliver an exit that is in the best interests of the whole of the United Kingdom.

The Supreme Court has ruled clearly in the Government’s favour on the roles of the devolved legislatures in invoking Article 50. But while this provides welcome clarity, it in no way diminishes our commitment to work closely with the people and administrations of Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland as we move forward with our withdrawal from the European Union.”

Following the Secretary of State’s statement, there was an opportunity for [questions](#). The Shadow Secretary of State Keir Starmer MP gave the Official Opposition’s response. He said:

“Labour accepts and respects the referendum result, and will not frustrate the process, but we will be seeking to lay amendments to ensure proper scrutiny and accountability throughout the process. That starts with a White Paper or plan—a speech is not a White Paper or plan. We need something on which to hold the Government to account throughout the process. We cannot have a speech as the only basis for accountability for two years or more. That is the first step. There needs to be a reporting-back procedure and a meaningful vote at the end of the exercise. The Government should welcome such scrutiny, and not try to resist it, because the end result will be better if scrutinised than it would otherwise be. I hope that the Secretary of State will confirm that he will not seek to minimise scrutiny and accountability.”

In response to the point about a White Paper and Parliamentary Scrutiny, David Davis said:

“He also talked about a plan. Last week, the Prime Minister gave a 6,500-word, closely argued speech that has been recognised across the country and around Europe as the epitome of clarity with clear objectives, aims and ambitions for this country, so I do not take that point at all.

On scrutiny more generally, we have now had, I think, five statements, 10 debates, and some 30 different Select Committee inquiries. I hardly think that all that in six months represents an absence of scrutiny of a central Government policy.”

Stephen Gethins MP asked the Secretary of State about the role of the Devolved Administrations in the Brexit process:

“We are told today that this is a political decision, and as a political decision on the role of the devolved Administrations, I hope that this Parliament and this Government will continue not to legislate on areas that are the responsibility of the Scottish Parliament without its consent. Today’s judgment said that this process should enhance devolution. If that is the case, will the Secretary of State tell us today that no powers will be returned from the Scottish Parliament to Westminster during the course of this process, and will he seek consent from the Scottish Parliament before legislating in areas over which it has responsibility?”

In response, David Davis said:

“I want to make two responses. First, the process we have gone through with all the devolved Administrations—the joint ministerial process—has been going on for some months now, and at the very last monthly meeting we had a presentation from Mike Russell, the Scottish Government Minister, on the Scottish Government’s proposals. We disagreed with some and agreed with some absolutely—for example on the protection of employment law—and some we will debate in the coming weeks and months, most particularly on the point the hon. Gentleman raised: the question of devolution and devolved powers.

The hon. Gentleman knows that I am a devolutionist. I can say to him firmly that no powers existing in the devolved Administrations will come back, but there will be powers coming from the European Union and we will have to decide where they most properly land, whether that is Westminster, Holyrood or wherever. The real issue there is the practical interests of all the nations of the United Kingdom—for example, preserving the single market of the United Kingdom and the United Kingdom’s ability to do international deals. There is a series of matters that are just as important to ordinary Scot as they are to the ordinary English, Welsh or Northern Irish citizen, and that is what we will protect.”

Pete Wishart MP pursued the question of the role of the Scottish Government and Parliament in the Article 50 process asking the Secretary of State about the Scottish Government's proposals for Scotland's place in Europe:

“Scotland is supposed to have the most powerful devolved Parliament in the world, and the Scotland Acts tell us now that it is permanent and that the Sewel convention is embedded in law, but we now know, of course, that the Scotland Acts are barely worth the vellum they are written on. The Secretary of State says he is listening to Scotland—that is great, he has said it several times today—but when will he act? If he does not accept the very reasonable proposals we put to him, the Scottish people will quickly ask what the point is of our being here at all.”

In response, the Secretary of State said:

“If I remember correctly, the Supreme Court said of the Sewel convention that it was not for the judges to decide. I listened last week as the Scottish Government Minister presented at great length the arguments in their paper. As I said earlier to one of the hon. Gentleman's colleagues, there are bits we disagree with and bits we absolutely agree with—for me, the most obvious one is the protection of employment law, which I take very seriously and on which we are absolutely in the same place. I and others on the Joint Ministerial Committee discussed with the Minister the issue of devolution, and the clear point was that no existing devolved powers were to be retracted. Of course, that is not going to happen, but we also have to think, in rational terms and in the interests of the Scottish people and citizens of the UK more widely, about where the best place is to make decisions. In most cases, I would prefer to devolve powers, but in some circumstances that is not practical. We have to do what is right for the people, not what suits our political interest.”

Other Members pursued the issue of the UK Government presenting a White Paper on its plans for the withdrawal from the EU. At Prime Minister's Questions on 25 January, the Prime Minister [confirmed](#) the UK Government would publish a White Paper acknowledging there was “appetite” for such a plan.

The Scottish Government's reaction to the Supreme Court Judgement

In response to the Supreme Court judgement the Scottish Government published a [news release](#) calling for the consent of the Scottish Parliament to be sought on Brexit. The news release quoted the Minister for UK Negotiations on Scotland's Place in Europe, Michael Russell:

“The Supreme Court made it clear that the UK Government cannot take us out of the European Union without at least a vote of the Westminster Parliament.

“Triggering Article 50 will have profound effects on devolved matters and on the powers of the Scottish Parliament and the Scottish Government.

“The UK Government, in its submission to the court, went out of its way to emphasise that the Sewel Convention could not be enforced by the courts.

“But it has never sought to change the powers of the Parliament or the Scottish Government without the consent of the Scottish Parliament.

“It must not renege on that constitutional requirement.

“A hard Brexit would be disastrous for Scotland – and it is clear that an overwhelming majority across Scotland and in the Scottish Parliament are opposed to the UK Government’s plans.

“The Prime Minister has made numerous statements and commitments there would be a UK approach to Brexit. We published our proposals to protect Scotland’s interests in Europe at the end of last year and we have yet to have any detailed response, or any indication of whether or how the UK Government intends to take them forward as part of its forthcoming negotiations.

“Time is running out for the UK Government to show how it intends to respect Scotland’s interests. If it does not, the Scottish people will face a choice as to whether we continue down the damaging path of a hard Brexit, or choose a better way for Scotland.”

On 25 January, the Minister for UK Negotiations on Scotland’s Place in Europe made a [statement to the Scottish Parliament](#) following the Supreme Court Judgement. He told the Scottish Parliament that once the Bill to trigger Article 50 was introduced at Westminster, SNP Members would introduce a number of amendments:

“The SNP MPs in the House of Commons will lodge a range of amendments to clarify the UK Government’s approach to triggering article 50. Some of those amendments will seek to amend the bill so that the UK Government must first secure unanimous agreement from the joint ministerial committee—the UK’s equal partners—on the triggering of article 50.”

Following the Supreme Court’s decision with regard to the devolved legislatures and legislative consent, the Minister told Parliament:

“Yesterday, the Supreme Court considered the arguments that were put forward in interventions by the Lord Advocate and the Counsel General for Wales on the devolution implications of triggering article 50. We are obviously disappointed with the Supreme Court’s ruling on the legal enforceability of the Sewel convention, but let us be clear about what the judgment actually said. Notifying the intention to leave the EU will have significant consequences for devolved matters and the powers of the Scottish Parliament and Scottish ministers. The court explicitly accepted that. In so doing, it made it obvious that the Sewel convention is triggered by a UK bill authorising the article 50 notice. The court has ruled that the operation of the convention is a political, not a legal, matter, and is therefore outside the court’s remit.”

The Minister indicated that the Scottish Government planned to bring forward a memorandum to the Scottish Parliament once the UK Government Bill to authorise the triggering of Article 50 has been brought forward:

Therefore, once the UK Government Bill is published, and in line with this Parliament’s standing orders, the Scottish Government will publish a memorandum setting out the implications for devolved matters and the powers of the Parliament and Scottish ministers. As things stand, in that memorandum we

will be unable to recommend that the Parliament give its consent to a bill giving the UK Government the power to trigger article 50.

Finally, in relation to the proposals set out by the Scottish Government in Scotland's place in Europe, the Minister said:

"We will use next week's joint ministerial committee meeting to continue to press for the sensible compromise outcomes that are set out in the paper that we published in December 2016."

Following his statement, the Minister took questions from MSPs.

Welsh Government's reaction to the Supreme Court's decision

Following the Supreme Court ruling, the Welsh Government published a new release welcoming the Judgement. The [news release](#) quoting a Welsh Government spokesman stated:

"We welcome the Supreme Court Judgment today which means that the UK Government must seek parliamentary approval in the form of a Bill before it can trigger Article 50 to leave the European Union. It is vital that the UK Government develops an approach to negotiations which reflects the interests of Wales and the UK as a whole – an approach to which the Prime Minister has already publicly committed.

"The judgment preserves and recognises the importance of the Sewel convention whereby Parliament will not normally legislate on areas devolved to Wales and devolved governments without their consent.

"The Welsh Government will continue to work closely with the UK Government, and the other Devolved Administrations, through the Joint Ministerial Committee process to influence the overall UK position. Our aims are to preserve single market access for business and to protect Welsh jobs and investment, along with the rights of workers."

Other reaction to the Supreme Court Judgement

Richard Parry from the University of Edinburgh writing on the Centre on Constitutional Change blog suggested that the [Supreme Court decision being a split vote might be some comfort for the Prime Minister](#). He said:

"The UK Government can derive some comfort from the Supreme Court's judgment. It got three justices to agree with it, including a lengthy dissenting judgment, over half the length of the main one, from Robert Reed, one of the two Scottish justices."

On the decision in relation to the role of the devolved administrations, Richard Parry wrote:

"The UK Government also won handsomely on the devolved legislatures' case for their involvement on the basis of either the Sewel Convention or the original devolution legislation; Reed dismisses it in a phrase that 'the convention concerns

Parliamentary legislation, not the exercise of prerogative powers’ (para 178). The main judgment notes that judges are ‘neither the parents nor the guardians of political conventions; they are merely observers’ (para 146); ‘we would have expected UK Parliament to have used other words if it were seeking to convert a convention into a legal rule justiciable by the courts’ (para 148; lack of the article before ‘UK’ is in the original). Precisely so; this legislative product of the Smith Commission was an empty gesture designed to sound good without ultimately constraining the UK government. There is a minor devolved victory in the Court’s response to possible EU constraints in Northern Ireland legislation: ‘we refrain from deciding whether they impose a discrete requirement for Parliamentary legislation’ (para 132). But generally the result of devolved administrations’ association with the present case has been to knock out their legal route to influence on Brexit, making the political route even more fractious.”

The [UK in a Changing Europe](#) team also published a [response to Supreme Court ruling](#). On the decision of the Supreme Court to require the consent of the UK Parliament before triggering Article 50, Professor Catherine Barnard, senior fellow The UK in a Changing Europe, said:

“The Vote to leave the EU was premised on taking back control to the UK Parliament and courts. The UK courts (the High Court and the Supreme Court) have both said that the UK parliament should take the momentous decision whether to trigger Article 50. This constitutional decision puts the power back into the hands of the representatives of the British people, not the executive. However inconvenient and difficult this makes life for the government, it is an important aspect of control.”

On the decision that the devolved legislatures have no role in the process to trigger Article 50, Dr Jo Hunt, senior fellow The UK in a Changing Europe, said:

“The Supreme Court was always unlikely to find that the devolved parliaments and assemblies’ consent was going to be needed to trigger Article 50 – Westminster Parliamentary sovereignty is so deeply entrenched within all the devolution legislation, and foreign affairs is a matter for central government and Parliament to handle – no parallel powers on withdrawal for the devolved administrations to exercise were recognised.

“The recent placing on a statutory footing in the Scotland (and soon the new Wales) Act of the Sewel Convention (that UK Parliament will not normally legislate on devolved matters without their agreement) has made no difference to the result here. This will disappoint those who believed placing the convention in legislation would give it some bite. The Court’s position here is consistent with its broader approach to respecting Westminster Parliamentary sovereignty – if the convention was meant to be legally enforceable, Parliament would have made sure that was clear in the language used in the legislation.”

The Centre on Constitutional Change published two blogs on the implications for devolution of the Supreme Court decision. Professor Michael Keating discussed the likelihood of a constitutional clash in his blog [We Are Still a Long Way from Federalism](#) and Professor Stephen Tierney discussed Holyrood’s continuing role in the Brexit process in his blog [The Brexit Decision: Holyrood may still have a role to play](#).

Welsh Government publishes Brexit proposals

On 23 January, the Welsh Government published [Securing Wales' Future](#) which it said was “a comprehensive, credible plan for Wales as the UK moves towards negotiations on leaving the European Union”.

The publication was agreed by the Welsh Government and Plaid Cymru for whom its leader Leanne Wood also wrote a preface. The Welsh Government's proposals [set out 6 key areas](#):

- The importance of continued participation in the Single Market to support businesses, and secure jobs and the future prosperity of Wales
- A balanced approach to immigration linking migration to jobs and good properly-enforced employment practice which protects all workers whatever their country of origin
- On finance and investment, the need for the UK Government to make good on promises made during the referendum campaign that Wales would not lose funding as a result of the UK leaving the EU
- A fundamentally different constitutional relationship between the devolved governments and the UK Government – based on mutual respect, reaching agreement through consent
- Maintaining the social and environmental protections and values that we prize in Wales, in particular workers' rights, once these are no longer guaranteed through the UK's membership of the EU
- Proper consideration of transitional arrangements to ensure the UK does not fall off a cliff edge in its economic and wider relationship with the EU if longer-term arrangements have not been agreed at the point of exit.

Publishing the proposals, First Minister Carwyn Jones said:

“The White Paper provides a comprehensive and credible plan for the negotiations with our partners in Europe on the UK's exit from the European Union, based on solid evidence. It places Wales' priorities centre stage, but is designed to work for the UK as a whole. And it is based on dialogue and agreement between ourselves and Plaid Cymru, ensuring it will command strong support in the Assembly.

“It balances the message which the Welsh people gave us that we should leave the European Union with the economic reality that makes participation in the single market so important for the future prosperity of Wales, and indeed the UK as a whole.

“The decision is made that the UK will leave the European Union. The challenge we all face now is ensuring that we secure the best possible deal for Wales and the UK. Together, the Welsh Government and Plaid Cymru, intend to rise to that challenge”

For Plaid Cymru, Leanne Wood said:

“In engaging with this process, Plaid Cymru has prioritised the Welsh economy. We have done this because two thirds of all of our exports go to the European Single Market.

"How we withdraw from the European Union is too important to be left to one party to decide. The consequences following on from the terms under which we leave, what ever they end up being, stand to be far-reaching and long-standing.

"Plaid Cymru has worked constructively with the Welsh Government to write the White Paper and in doing so we have strengthened the Welsh negotiation position.

"I now would urge the UK Government to take these proposals seriously."

Joint Ministerial Committee on European Negotiations

On 19 January, the latest meeting of the Joint Ministerial Committee on European Negotiations (JMC(EN)) met in London. The meeting [discussed](#) the Scottish Government's proposals for Scotland's place in Europe.

Following the meeting, the Scottish Government published a [news release](#) commenting on the outcome of the meeting and calling for the Scottish Government to be treated as an equal partner in the negotiations. Quoted in the news release, Minister for UK Negotiations on Scotland's Place in Europe Michael Russell said:

"I made it absolutely clear at today's meeting that Scotland must not be treated with contempt but as an equal partner in the negotiating process.

"The people of Scotland overwhelmingly rejected a hard Brexit and it is absolutely crucial that this is respected to avoid an economic catastrophe.

"We need to see clear evidence from the UK government that they will take forward the objective of keeping Scotland in the single market even if the rest of the UK leaves, and time is running out for them to do so.

"There was agreement in the meeting today to undertake further detailed work on that objective and I look forward to that process.

"It is extremely disappointing that the Prime Minister chose to disregard the process and make a significant announcement about her position two days before the JMC even considered our paper. It is now clear that single market membership for the whole of the UK is no longer an option and this is hugely disappointing.

"However, there are other options set out in our paper Scotland's Place in Europe and our focus now is to ensure the UK Government takes seriously our objective of keeping Scotland in the European Single Market.

"They need to demonstrate that this is the case because the clock is ticking. The views and economic interests of the people of Scotland cannot be disregarded and brushed aside."

New International Trade Campaign

On 25 January, the UK Government's Department for International Trade started a new campaign to "highlight trade and investment opportunities in Global Britain". According to the [news release](#) announcing the campaign:

"Aimed at international businesses and governments the campaign will showcase the UK's trade and investment opportunities to a global marketplace, including the EU and beyond.

This is the latest initiative in the successful longstanding GREAT Britain campaign to promote the best of what the UK has to offer the world. This campaign positions the UK as the home of impressive and surprising creativity, expertise, innovation, quality and world leading capabilities."

The news release includes quotes from the Secretary of State for International Trade, Dr Liam Fox:

"The UK is open and ready for business, and the launch of our largest international trade campaign today is an important step in showcasing the very best of what our country has to offer to the world.

Businesses who trade internationally are more financially stable, creating jobs and giving a boost to local economies at home and abroad.

Our world-leading digital hub will help more businesses tap into the wealth of British business opportunities and provide all the advice and guidance that they need to break down barriers to trading with the UK."

The target markets for the trade campaign are the United States, Germany, China and Japan.

SPICe The Information Centre
An t-Ionad Fiosrachaidh

Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe)

Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe) Briefings are compiled for the benefit of the Members of the Parliament and their personal staff. Authors are available to discuss the contents of these papers with MSPs and their staff who should contact Iain McIver on extension 85294 or email iain.mciver@parliament.scot. Members of the public or external organisations may comment on this briefing by emailing us at SPICe@parliament.scot. However, researchers are unable to enter into personal discussion in relation to SPICe Briefing Papers. If you have any general questions about the work of the Parliament you can email the Parliament's Public Information Service at sp.info@parliament.scot.

Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in SPICe briefings is correct at the time of publication. Readers should be aware however that briefings are not necessarily updated or otherwise amended to reflect subsequent changes.

Published by the Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe), an office of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, The Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh, EH 99 1SP.

www.parliament.scot

This paper was written by Iain McIver, SPICe Research.

Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Relations Committee

Keep up to date with the Committee via the following links:



www.parliament.scot/europe



europe@parliament.scot



[@SP_European](https://twitter.com/SP_European)



[YouTube](https://www.youtube.com)

#SPICeBrexitWeekly