



Polls show support for Independence at 53%. An Ipsos Mori poll commissioned by STV found that over half of Scotlands electorate would vote for Independence should a referendum be held tomorrow.

The poll, the first carried out since the Independence Referendum last September, asked 1002 participants how they would vote in the next/another Referendum on Scottish Independence. 44% said they would vote no, 3% remain undecided and **53% would vote Yes**. Even adding the undecided's to the no vote, Yes still has a significant majority. Now, one poll does not make a country free, it does however, show that the attitude of Scots is changing. This could be because more of the better together scaremongering lies are coming to light, the election of another Tory Government, how Westminster as a whole is responding to the election of 56 SNP MPs or the complete disrespect and disregard of the Scotland Bill. Without detailed questioning we will never truly know that answer.

In addition to the voting preference of respondents the poll asked when they would support a second Indyref, 50% said within 5yrs and 58% with 10yrs.

In further questions relating to voting preferences in next year's Scottish Parliamentary Election, results show that the predicted result would give the SNP **74**, Labour **26**, Tories **15**, Greens **8** and Lib Dems **6**. This holds up with other polls in relation to next year's election, but there is a long way to go, a week in Politics is a very long time and we are still waiting on the SNP manifesto. Will there be a commitment to a second Indyref? We also, have to wait (not long now) to see what happens re the Labour leadership, will Corbyn win, if so how will he get on with the Blairite leader of the Scotland branch and will his unionist stance and lack of knowledge about Scottish Politics have a positive/negative effect?

Westminster's Labour, Tory and Lib Dem MPs along with BBC, ITV and almost every newspaper told Scotland that getting rid of Trident from the Clyde would cost Scotland between 6000 and 11000 jobs, depending on who was doing the telling. Labour MSP for Dumbarton, Jackie Baillie, said: *"To remove nuclear weapons from HM Naval Base Clyde would wipe out the 11,000 jobs that are dependent on the base."* - **THEY WERE LYING!**

In response to a Freedom of Information request from Scottish CND the Ministry of Defence replied that **"there are 520 civilian jobs** at HM Naval Base Clyde, including Coulpport and Faslane, that directly rely upon the Trident programme". **MoD employs 159 personnel** at the Clyde base, with private contractors **Babcock Marine and Lockheed Martin UK Strategic Systems employing 254 and 107 people respectively**. The majority of the jobs are for engineering and science specialists.

And so it continues! Mr Osborne, the Chancellor tells us that he's *"upgrading the nuclear base on the Clyde as a dividend for Scotland voting No to independence"*. Ah yes, so everyone knows that Scotland will be happy with that. I mean it is not as if we have said we don't want the atrocity here! And, why announce an upgrade scheme when the renewal of Trident is not even passed yet. With foresight like that I hope he spends some of the Treasury money on a couple of Lotto tickets each week – could help with that deficit you know!

He concluded that he could go ahead with this as the vast majority of MPs were elected on a platform of Trident renewal – well technically they were – the ones that are representing constituencies nowhere near Faslane! The MPs representing the country landed with this horrific waste of money were almost unanimously elected on a platform of removing it altogether. In May **Scotland elected 57 out of 59 MPs** (all but Carmichael and Mundell) **opposed to Trident**. This is yet another prime example of Scotland's wishes being secondary (almost always ignored) to any decisions taken in Westminster. **Over 50% of the voting Electorate in Scotland** voted for **anti-Trident MPs**, but Gideon Osbourne decided that doesn't matter as the vast majority of MPs are for it. Aye? – better together? – *"we hold Scotland dear and would miss her"*. Aye, miss her usefulness as our revenue stream and our dustbin!

Why, at a time when **budgets are being massacred** because of a supposed lack of money, are Westminster willing to spend **BILLIONS** on a programme **that we are not even in control of**? We cannot use the weapons, even if we want to. Not unless Uncle Barrack (or whoever, in years to come) says we can. We are a US dumping ground – an offshore storage for them. But unlike a normal storage facility which would charge to store items, **we PAY THEM to keep them here**. Westminster pay upgrade costs, repair and maintenance costs and any other associated costs/bills for the whole Trident programme but the UK don't own as much as a rivet on it!

Supporters of the programme claim that its removal would be devastating in the area from an economic and employment point of view. And while every job lost is devastating for that employee, the Scottish CND Freedom of Information request detailed in paragraph 2 revealed that under 600 jobs are directly linked to the Trident systems. The SNP has calculated that **diverting just £1 billion** from the Trident replacement programme into infrastructure spending in the West of Scotland would **generate around 15,000 jobs**.

The UK government want to keep the base as is so that they can pretend to be a 'big fish' on the international scene. Given the devastation that is currently being caused (Syria, Iraq, Palestine) by conventional weaponry, is having a 'nuclear deterrent' really worth the costs? Would we even be such a (possible) target if they were not here?

Personally, I would infinitely prefer that the money was spent on creating real employment in the country, on looking at ways to tackle the crippling poverty in many, many places throughout the UK, on bettering the lives of the ordinary citizens rather than playing host to a weapon that is so deadly it can never realistically be fired. Thankfully I am not alone!

When is a National grid not a National grid? Well, it seems when it's run from the South East of England by two of the big six generating corporations. How an energy infrastructure network, who's task is transmitting electricity through overhead conductors to every home and business in the UK, can be run FAIRLY by two of its own, is a bit of a puzzle. I mean how can companies charge themselves the same as their competitors? And, if competitors are using dirty fossil fuels or if they are located in a country where the cost of generating is lower, can the grid operators charge them more? These questions are typical of the conflicts of self interest which only a Tory Government policy of privatisation, can throw up.

Now as a result of this dogmatic approach to distribution and fees, this situation has resulted in the politicisation of electric power. As two of the massive, billion pound generation firms are now in charge of setting the levels of fees the grid charges, both to their own power stations and those of competitors, Scotland is beginning to experience unfairly high connection charges AND punitive tariffs for our renewable energy.

The Conservatives have arbitrarily decided to withdraw all subsidy from Scottish onshore wind generated electricity, a full year before the planned date. And, we are all now aware that the grid has simply hiked connection fees so high, that Longannet coal fired power station cannot afford to run. In fairness, coal power emissions are the worst pollutant in the atmosphere and Longannet alone is responsible for a third of the carbon dioxide emitted by ALL of Scotland in a year.

However, even though that's a fact, the carbon scrubbing and removal technology that would have cleaned that up, & which was tested and found to work, was axed by the UK government before the implementation of a full scale system. But, that's not the reason given by the grid for the eye watering £40 million that they demanded before Longannet could be plugged into the precious grid system.

Oh no. It's not because of global climate change or sea levels? Nope. It's because (wait for it..) the electricity has to be transported hundreds of miles to reach the south east! Now call me a geek if you like, but electricity doesn't need pumping or trucks to carry it down the motorway. Plus, it transpires that generating power in the home counties of the south east, is so incredibly hard and the electrons they make are so expensive and rare, that the national Grid is prepared to pay those firms for the honour of transporting those VIP electrons across their unworthy cables.

So, if you are outside of that bubble around London, everything is a lot more difficult to do and therefore London has every right to charge Scotland for that. I mean when electricity has to pay for its travel to London, why not have emergency services paying tax for the honour of serving north of the border?

The fact that Scotlands Emergency Services must pay VAT (rest of UK don't) those in Westminster obviously believe that Scotland has to pay for the privilege of being better together.



If #Longannet was moved to Central London instead of paying a penalty of £40m in transmission charges it would receive a subsidy of £11m 1/4
03/09/2015 15:54 from Edinburgh, Scotland

127 RETWEETS 75 FAVORITES

Cameron's Conservatives lost their first battle in the House of Commons on Monday (7 Sept) evening. Cameron wanted to change Purdah rules governing the upcoming in/out EU referendum, but suffered his first defeat since being re-elected in May by 312 to 285.

Purdah is a convention whereby governments refrain from making any major announcements in the run-up to general elections or other polls to avoid influencing their outcome. Current rules passed legislation in 2000. They prevent Ministers, departments and Local Authorities from publishing any "**promotional material**" arguing for/against any particular outcome or referring to any of the issues involved in the referendum. The rules, apply to the 28 days up to polling day, do not preclude ministers from issuing press notices or responding to specific requests for information from members of the public (*from www.bbc.co.uk/news*).

Conservative ministers wanted to change the Purdah rules that prevent Government activity (in relation to referendum) during the campaign, but SNP, Labour and some Tory rebels defeated the motion by 27 votes. Euro-sceptic MPs protested that Government Ministers must not be allowed a repeat of the controversial "**vow**" published by Cameron, Clegg and Miliband mere days before Scotland voted in last Septembers Independence Referendum. Tory backbencher Philip Davis asked his own frontbench if the Government could "*like the clumsy intervention with the Scottish 'vow'*" tell the public "*if you vote to stay in (the EU) we will address some of these issues (around membership)*". David Lidington, the Europe Minister, answered "*what he has just described would not be permitted*" under the rules the Government was proposing for the EU vote.

SNP International Affairs spokesperson Alex Salmond said that David Cameron has "*completely lost control*" of the EU referendum. Salmond MP said: "*UK Prime Minister David Cameron has been defeated on the EU referendum in the House of Commons and has completely lost control of the process. It is clear that the UK Government's arrogance has cost them dearly. First David Cameron backed down on collective Cabinet responsibility, then in the face of parliamentary defeat in June he collapsed in his attempt to hold it on the same day as the Scottish elections and, just last week, he was again turned over by the Electoral Commission on the referendum question. Now he has been defeated in the Commons with the help of his own backbenchers. David Cameron has completely lost control of the European referendum process and is now being controlled entirely by events and Parliamentary arithmetic. The arrogance of the Prime Minister and the UK Government has been their downfall – this latest defeat shows that they cannot ride roughshod over parliament.*"

In essence the announcement ("**VOW**") made by the 3 Amigos with only days to go until Scotland voted in Septembers Independence referendum was not "technically made by Government" but by Parties, it did however change the whole outlook of the Indyref and was only made after YES surged into the lead with days to go, had this "**VOW**" never been made would Scotland be an Independent Nation in 2016?

Next Issue: 23 September

Have a look at our website at www.freedomofinformation.scot Request bulletins by email; FOInews@virginmedia.com