

SCOTLAND’s ECONOMIC FUTURE POST-2014
SUBMISSION FROM YES SCOTLAND

Introductory remarks
This evidence is intended to provide an overview of the economic arguments for a Yes vote in September and is arranged in two sections.

The first addresses the question, ‘could Scotland be an independent country’ and sets out some of the key factual information that demonstrates the strength, depth and, in many ways, untapped potential of Scotland’s economy. It also sets out our stronger financial position, with national accounts that have consistently been healthier than the UK’s.

The second turns attention to the question ‘should Scotland be an independent country’. In this regard, there are three key points for the Committee to consider, which will form the core of this written submission. These are:

The Westminster system isn’t working for the people of Scotland or our economy
The trajectory we have been on as a result of Westminster policy is one of relative underperformance, compared to both London and the south-east and comparable international nations.

There is massive and unsustainable imbalance in the UK economy, driven by the consensus approach to economic policy over more than three decades: an economic consensus that sees Scotland as little more than a region, when what we urgently require is a national approach and a national economic policy.

As we look forward, Westminster policy is continuing to follow the same narrow economic agenda, and very few, if any, lessons learnt from the crash and recession, with a number of experts suggesting the UK economy is heading for another “bust”. Scotland needs the powers, urgently, to make different and more sustainable economic choices and to give ourselves greater confidence and financial security, both personal and national, into the future.

Developed nations of Scotland’s size enjoy an independence bonus, which Scotland too should claim
Over a period of 30 years, whether before the crash, or including the period of the financial crisis and recession, Scotland’s growth rate has lagged behind growth in the UK and in similar, independent nations. Small differences on an annual basis may not seem like much, but over time they amount to a considerable lag in performance, which translates into fewer business opportunities, fewer jobs, lower salaries and lower standards of living than should be expected. A Yes means we can lift Scotland’s trajectory to where it should be.

There are key advantages of size that Scotland should be enjoying, not only in areas of devolved responsibility but across the full policy range. These include shorter lines
of decision-making, greater flexibility and responsiveness and the ability to maximise areas of comparative and competitive advantage. The increased decision-making in Scotland after a Yes will enable us to make more of our natural strengths by designing policy more directly suited to our circumstances.

Looking at comparable countries, there is no advantage they have in terms of resources, people or ingenuity that explains the relatively stronger performance: the sole advantage they all enjoy is their independence. This independence advantage is open to Scotland too and matching the economic growth of similar nations will deliver a major, positive economic impact over the short and medium term. The limited powers of devolution have allowed us to close some of the growth gap, but with independence we will have access to the full range of policy levers to deliver advantages for the Scottish economy.

**Yes means we can make Scotland’s vast wealth and resources work much better for the people who live here**

Scotland experiences a Westminster wealth gap, which means that despite Scotland’s economic output being higher than the UK’s, the wealth owned by people in Scotland is substantially lower than the UK average. This suggests that too much of the economic benefit of the wealth created by the people of Scotland is lost to Scotland.

Independence will also enable us to feel the full benefit of stronger national accounts. Over the past 5 years, Scotland’s higher tax take and healthier fiscal position, would have enabled a Scottish government with full powers to invest more in recovery, public services and jobs.

Moving forward, with full access to Scotland’s tax revenues and the ability to make different decisions on spending across government, policies designed to deliver advantages to people and job creators in Scotland would be possible.

**Scotland’s got what it takes to be a successful independent country**

As the Scottish Government set out in November 2013, excluding North Sea oil and gas, Scotland’s economic output per head is 99% of the UK average and 118% when output from the Scottish continental shelf is included. On this basis, in 2011, Scotland would be 8th in terms of economic output per capita in the OECD. For many in Scotland it does not feel as though we live in the 8th wealthiest nation in the developed world and that is one of the most pressing reasons why we need a Yes vote. As set out later in this evidence, the great opportunity with a Yes is that we will be able to make sure Scotland’s wealth and resources deliver more for people living in Scotland.

An alternative measure is Gross National Income (GNI) per person, which takes the total amount of income available in the country. In Scotland in 2010 GNI is estimated to be approximately £26,000, significantly higher than the equivalent UK figure of
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approximately £24,000. On this measure, Scotland would be 10th in the OECD league table.  

Looking only at our public finances, Scotland’s national accounts have been healthier than the UK’s over the past five years and over the past 30 years. Over the past five years, looking at our Net Fiscal Balance, Scotland and the UK have both run budget deficits, along with most other nations. But over these past five years Scotland’s deficit has been lower than for the UK as a whole, as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Net Fiscal Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2: Net Fiscal Balance: Scotland and UK (2007-08 to 2011-12)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% GDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Government Expenditure and Revenue Scotland 2011/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debate often focuses solely on Scottish public spending, but when both sides of the financial equation are taken into account, this demonstrates a stronger fiscal position. Indeed, in each and every one of the last 32 years, Scotland has contributed more tax per person to the UK coffers than the UK average.  

Together, this tells us that Scotland has the economic and financial strength to be a successful independent nation, a position confirmed by UK Prime Minister, David Cameron, who has said: “Supporters of independence will always cite examples of small, independent and thriving economies across Europe, such as Finland, Switzerland and Norway. It would be wrong to suggest that Scotland could not be another such successful, independent country”. The Prime Minister’s assessment was given further backing by an eminent group of international economists, including two Nobel Laureates, who concluded that, “by international standards, Scotland is a wealthy and productive country”. Given this expert viewpoint, it is little wonder that leading figures in the No campaign, such as Ruth Davidson, concur with the Yes campaign that Scotland “is big enough, rich enough and good enough to be an independent country”. Analysis by the Financial Times has concluded that “Scotland has all the ingredients to be a viable nation state” and that we would “start with healthier state finances than the rest of the UK”.  

Our undoubted strengths include an extensive range of world leading industries and substantial natural resources. We have five of the world’s top 200 universities and an international reputation for the quality of our research. Our oil reserves are worth up to £1.5 trillion - ten times our estimated share of the UK national debt. The energy sector is a vital area for technological advance and export growth with a report from
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2 GNI figures in [http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0043/00438277.pdf](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0043/00438277.pdf), 15. International comparisons provided by SPICe. The United Kingdom is 15th in the international league in terms of GNI.  

3 [Government Expenditure and Revenues Scotland 2011-12](http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2013/03/1859).  


Sir Ian Wood suggesting an additional £200 billion could be extracted if the approach to managing and regulating the North Sea was improved.\(^6\)

As we look forward, there is the opportunity of a second energy windfall, with Scotland blessed with 25% of Europe’s potential offshore wind and tidal energy and the home to a host of innovative offshore renewable companies and devices.

In addition, we have hugely successful food & drink, tourism, construction and agriculture sectors worth £39 billion a year. Recent figures show food and drink exports at an all-time high of £5.4 billion. Our world-leading industries include engineering, life sciences, tourism, life assurance and wealth management. And, unlike the UK, we export more than we import. This shows the breadth and depth of the Scottish economy and the strong foundations that exist for future success.

**Conclusion:** There is now little serious challenge to the view that Scotland could be a successful independent nation like Norway, Finland or Switzerland, as the Prime Minister suggests. This is agreed across the Yes and No campaigns and the Committee is urged to make this a key part of their considerations.

When we look at the many strengths across Scotland’s economy, it is clear that they all point to the enormous potential for an independent Scotland to deliver the higher levels of social and economic success that have been beyond our reach while economic policy has been decided at Westminster.

**Yes means a wealthier, fairer and more sustainable Scotland**

One of the central purposes of a Yes vote this year is to open the door to new economic opportunities for Scotland. With economic policy made in Scotland, for Scotland, we will be able to focus activity on the vital task of creating more jobs and new opportunities, strengthening our industrial base and labour market, maximizing our competitiveness and delivering improvements in living standards and quality of life for people in Scotland.

The evidence for these independence gains, comes in three ways:

**The Westminster system isn’t working for the people of Scotland or our economy.**

The current arrangements are not working for Scotland, with key aspects of economic policy decided by governments a majority of people in Scotland opposed. A Yes means no more governments we didn’t vote for and no more economic and social policy that we have overwhelmingly rejected. What is right for the UK is very often wrong for Scotland, and there is little or no interest at Westminster in providing solutions designed for the specific needs and circumstances of Scottish society and our economy.

The evidence of Westminster failure is most apparent in a UK economy that has become dangerously imbalanced, with the Westminster system proving incapable of
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changing course. A Yes opens up the possibility of different choices and a new path forward.

The position has been stated succinctly by a group of economists writing recently on the London School of Economics’ British Politics and Policy blog:

“The fact that after nearly ninety years of regional policy Britain’s economy is still spatially divided between South and North suggests that the problem is a systemic one, requiring a systemic solution. It is often claimed that the success of London and the South East is merely testament to the ‘natural workings’ of the market. Some take this argument further and suggest that we should encourage economic activity and workers to abandon northern towns and cities and move to the South to maximize growth there.

Such pronouncements fail to acknowledge the reality that the economies of London and the South East are not simply driven by market forces, but also heavily underwritten by the State; that this apart of the country enjoys preferential access to finance; that it is able to exert a disproportionate influence on government economic policy; and that in London it has a city which has a degree of political and economic autonomy not found in other UK cities.”

In the recent downturn, between 2007 and 2010, more than 85% of jobs lost were in the ex-industrial regions of the West and North while, in contrast, the number of jobs in London increased. While between 2007 and 2012, workforce jobs increased by 267,000 in London but fell by 284,000 in the rest of the UK.

Over the same five-year period, during one of the biggest downturns in modern history, London’s economic output grew 15.4 per cent, a far larger rise than for any other part of the UK. In 2012 London’s economic output was 174.8 per cent of the UK average, up from 164.6 per cent in 1997 at the start of the New Labour government.

According to research highlighted by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, economic divergence has been growing faster in the UK compared with other comparable countries: “The data for the most recent period (1995–2007) suggests that of the five industrial countries considered, Germany and Italy experienced a decrease in regional imbalances, France experienced neither increasing nor decreasing imbalances, while the United Kingdom and the United States experienced increasing imbalances.”
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10 http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/6d0dd35a-6251-11e3-99d1-00144feabdc0.html?siteedition=uk#axzz2nFmtFh
This “spatial imbalance” has become “an entrenched and enduring feature of the United Kingdom economy” according to analysis from the Centre for Geographical Economic Research at the University of Cambridge, despite the current Prime Minister describing the concentration of so much economic activity in London and the south-east as “fundamentally unstable and wasteful.”

These geographic imbalances are heightened by growing social inequalities. As the OECD concluded, in a report published in 2011, “[i]ncome inequality among working-age persons has risen faster in the United Kingdom than in any other OECD country since 1975.” The Scottish Government’s Fiscal Commission Working Group has set out clearly its view of the growing gap between rich and poor: “[s]uch patterns of inequality will continue to have a negative impact on growth and prosperity over the long-term.”

The group also found that “the vast majority of the important policy levers that can tackle these issues are reserved to the UK Government. Independence would provide the opportunity for tailoring Scottish policy responses to Scottish economic conditions. It would be the responsibility of the Scottish Government to ensure whether these policies are used optimally or not.”

Alongside concern over the direction of travel to date, is the path we are now on (and which will continue if there is a No vote in September). A consequence of a No vote is more of the same Westminster policy that caused the economic collapse, with the same narrow economic agenda, and very few, if any, lessons learnt from the crash and recession. As Tony Dolphin, senior economist at the IPPR, has stated, “[w]e should be alarmed that growth is being driven by exactly the same mix of factors that contributed to the depth of the last recession.” It is “another boom headed to a housing bust,” according to David Blanchflower, former member of the Bank of England’s monetary policy committee – a policy he described as “idiocy.”

**Conclusion:** Scotland needs the powers, urgently, to make different and more sustainable economic choices and to give ourselves greater confidence and security into the future. There is a choice of two futures. One of the clear gains of a Yes is that we will avoid the risks and costs of a No, which are becoming clearer.

We would urge the Committee to assess and quantify the dangers posed to Scotland’s economy from a continuation of Westminster policy, including the likely
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12 [http://www.landecon.cam.ac.uk/staff/publications/ptyler/CGERworkingpaperno1v5.pdf](http://www.landecon.cam.ac.uk/staff/publications/ptyler/CGERworkingpaperno1v5.pdf)


17 [http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/86ed2bf0-7493-11e3-af50-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2rKo8RqeZ](http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/86ed2bf0-7493-11e3-af50-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2rKo8RqeZ).
impact of future planned spending cuts and potential losses due to changes in the Barnett Formula, which are being called for by figures in the London-based parties.

Proximity to London should be an economic advantage for Scotland, but at the moment we do not get the maximum benefit, but instead bear the full weight of London’s gravitational pull. We would ask the Committee to investigate whether or not the Westminster government has, in living memory, introduced a policy on tax or the economy designed to give Scotland an economic advantage over London.

Developed nations of Scotland’s size enjoy an independence bonus, which Scotland too should claim
As the Fiscal Commission Working Group reported, “[i]t is widely accepted that, in terms of economic growth, Scotland has underperformed relative to both the UK and other small EU countries.”

This underperformance is quantified in Table 2, with the 0.5 percentage point gap with the UK and the 0.4 percentage point gap with other small EU countries over the 30 years to 2007 highlighting a failure by the Westminster system to adequately support and encourage growth in Scotland, compared to London and the south-east. This growth gap means that the size of Scotland’s economy is now half that of Norway’s, even though both countries have similar populations and both are resource rich.\(^\text{18}\)

A Yes in September means we can finally get targeted policies, designed to capture the unique strengths and address the relative weaknesses of Scotland’s economy – a step forward which is vital if we are to realise our full potential as a nation and deliver higher standards of living and greater financial security for the people of Scotland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Average Annual GDP Growth (Scotland)</th>
<th>Average Annual GDP Growth (UK)</th>
<th>Average Annual GDP Growth (Small EU)</th>
<th>Gap (Scotland minus UK)</th>
<th>Gap (Scotland minus Small EU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977-2007</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2007</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2011</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Scottish Government, ONS, OECD (Note differences may be due to rounding)

As Scotland’s Future argued, similar countries to Scotland have seen higher levels of economic growth for a generation and more. This is because they have the clear advantage of being independent and can make the right choices for their economy. If Scotland had matched the growth rates of similar, independent nations between 1977 and 2007, GDP per head in Scotland would now be 3.8 per cent higher, equivalent to an additional £900 per head.\(^\text{19}\)


\(^{19}\) Scotland’s Future, 43.
Academic analysis points to the fact small countries (defined as having populations of less than 20 million) have been particularly successful in recent decades. Small countries currently make up 9 of the top 15 advanced economies by per capita income\textsuperscript{20} and a majority of the top 20 positions in the UN's Human Development Index, with some examples in Table 3 below.\textsuperscript{21}

\textbf{Table 3: Selected countries on the UN Human Development Index 2012}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

David Skilling has identified a number of reasons why countries of Scotland’s size have been particularly successful.\textsuperscript{22} This includes a strong external focus on competing in the global economy and encouraging globalisation; a focus on areas of comparative advantage; strong emphasis on innovation and technology; and effective and efficient government.

Government and institutions can be structured more effectively, making our size an advantage, with shorter lines of communication and the ability to bring together key decision makers, allowing a quicker response to changing economic conditions. Greater social cohesion in smaller countries can also mean “more effective governance and a smoother path to social change or economic adjustment”.\textsuperscript{23} They
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\textsuperscript{21} Human Development Index 2012 Rankings. \url{http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/} Norway, New Zealand, Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Hong Kong, Iceland, Denmark, Israel, Austria and Singapore are ranked in the top 20. The United Kingdom is ranked 26th. Referenced in \textit{Scotland’s Future}, 621.

\textsuperscript{22} \url{http://www.davidhumeinstitute.com/images/stories/Spring_2013/Small-countries.pdf}.

\textsuperscript{23} Fitoussi & Laurent, “North by Northwest: What’s wrong with the French model and how can the
are “easier to run, and therefore better ruled: the smaller number of decision-makers and stakeholders lowers the transaction costs and coordination complexities of the policy-making process”.24

These advantages mean that, “small country performance has strengthened, relative to larger countries, over the past 15 years . . . Indeed, small developed countries will likely continue to be over-represented at the top of the various economic and social measures”.25

**Conclusion:** Looking to the future, if Scotland simply matches the long-term growth rates of other, similar independent nations – nations like Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland or Ireland (countries with no resource or population advantage over Scotland but with the ability to design policy for their specific economic and social needs) – we will see a substantial increase in our overall national wealth and living standards. That is the independence bonus open to Scotland, with a Yes.

**A Yes means we can make Scotland’s vast wealth and resources work much better for the people who live here**

As we identified earlier, Scotland’s economic output – the wealth we generate – is 99% the UK rate, if we exclude oil and gas, and 118% of the UK rate including offshore production. The average person in Scotland, therefore, contributes at least as much to the wealth of the UK as the average person in the rest of the United Kingdom. However, in terms of the wealth we own, in property, pension pots, investments and savings, the average person in Scotland has total wealth that is just 78.5% of the British figure, while the average person in Wales has 99.6% and the average person in England has 102.7%.26

Taking total wealth in the country and dividing it evenly among everyone, Scotland still comes out with a far lower share. This new mean figure would see the average person in Scotland with £84.45 compared to the £100 of the average person in Great Britain.27 We generate a fifth more in terms of economic output, but own, on average, a fifth less. Clearly, something has gone wrong for the people of Scotland. As we have consistently argued, Scotland has wealth enough to be a fairer nation. The crisis of the Westminster system is multi-layered and both social and geographic.

Since 1997, when New Labour came to office, the average person in London has gone from being 66 per cent richer than the rest of the country to being 91 per cent better off.28 Soon Londoners, on average, will be twice as rich as the rest of the
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26 These figures, of course, mask the appalling inequality within London. The crisis of the Westminster system is multi-layered and both social and geographic.
country. 29 This is due, in large part, to property wealth, with real estate in London's top 10 boroughs alone worth more than the property of Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland combined. 30

The Westminster wealth gap not only impacts on the wealth of people in Scotland as individuals, there is also a national cost. As the Fiscal Commission Working Group has shown, since 1980/1, Scotland has run an average net fiscal surplus of 0.2 per cent of GDP, compared to an average annual deficit for the UK of around 3 per cent of GDP, and yet, the benefit of this surplus has not flowed into Scotland’s economy or public services. 31

As Scotland’s Future sets out: “[t]he Fiscal Commission has also illustrated that, had Scotland had control of our own resources, and assuming no change in tax revenues or spending priorities, our relatively stronger fiscal position from 1980/81 would have allowed us to not only eliminate a per head share of UK net debt, but actually accumulate assets worth between £82 billion and £116 billion by 2011/12.

This would have equated to an asset of between £15,500 and £22,000 per head. In contrast, by the end of 2011/12, the UK had accumulated net debt of over £1.1 trillion, equivalent to a liability of £17,500 per head.” 32

Over the last five years Scotland’s public finances have been stronger than the UK’s to the tune of £12.6 billion. That is almost £2,400 for every person living in Scotland. 33 That is money that could have been used either to deliver additional investment in vital public services such as our police, schools and hospitals, or to support the economy and job creation, or to protect the most vulnerable from the worst welfare changes, or to reduce taxes or cut the amount we need to borrow.

In independence year, the financial year 2016/17, Scotland’s deficit is forecast to fall to between 1.6 per cent and 2.4 per cent of GDP with a historical share of UK public debt and to be between 2.5 per cent and 3.2 per cent of GDP on a population share of that debt. The Office for Budget Responsibility forecasts a UK deficit of 3.4 per cent of GDP in the same year 34 and the IMF estimates that the average deficit across the G7 economies will be 3.2 per cent. 35 On this forecast, the financial position for an independent Scotland in 2016/17 will, therefore, be better than for the UK as a whole. 36

32 Scotland’s Future, 70.
36 Scotland’s Future, 75.
In the years following a Yes, with full access to Scotland’s tax revenues and the ability to make different decisions on spending across government, we can deliver policies designed to provide advantages to people and job creators in Scotland.

The Committee can look to Scotland’s Future, Green Yes and the work of the Common Weal project for a wide range of policy proposals that could be taken forward by future Scottish Governments. It is not Yes Scotland’s place to recommend policy preferences – that is for the political parties. However, we would highlight the positive impact of higher levels of labour market participation, increased productivity and an expansion of exports.

Such advances could be delivered by policies designed to maximize Scotland’s international presence with a more effective overseas network, by policies designed to increase wages, especially for those on low incomes, and by initiatives such as a transformational increase in childcare and early years education provision in Scotland.

In addition to Scotland’s stronger financial position, the wealth we generate as a nation could be used more effectively to deliver real gains for the people of Scotland. For example, we could generate £600 million of savings from things like no longer paying for the UK’s nuclear weapons or no longer sending Scottish politicians to Westminster. That is £600m of people’s taxes in Scotland that could be better spent on policies like improved childcare, which would support the creation of as many as 35,000 jobs.37

As the Scottish Government has set out, increasing Scotland’s productivity performance by one per cent has the potential to boost employment by about 21,000. A 50 per cent rise in the value of Scottish exports could boost output by £5 billion and create more than 100,000 jobs in the long-term. And, an increase in Scotland’s economic activity rate of one percentage point would be equivalent to an extra 30,000 plus people in the labour market.38

**Conclusion:** It is by taking forward Scotland focused economic and social policies that we can begin to change Scotland’s economic trajectory, moving growth rates higher, encouraging more young people to stay in Scotland and raise their families here, maximizing labour market participation, getting the most out of untapped assets like our excellent international reputation, ensuring sustainable development and making best use of our wealth of resources and many comparative advantages.

**Final Remarks**
The starting point for an independent Scotland will be the framework set out in Scotland’s Future, but we would encourage the Committee to explore with all the political parties in Scotland their vision of economic and social policy with the full powers of independence. We have no doubt that the Scottish Labour Party, if it were the first government of an independent Scotland, would take forward distinct policies from the SNP and it would be of benefit to the wider debate if the Labour Party, in particular, was asked for details of its likely economic approach.

37 Scotland’s Future.
We would also encourage the Committee to look in detail at the work of the Fiscal Commission Working Group in relation to Scotland’s monetary policy. Yes Scotland commends the Working Group for their extensive analysis of monetary options, leading to their recommendation for an ongoing currency union or sterling zone.

Ultimately, the vote in September is a choice between two very different paths and two very different futures. On that day, the people of Scotland will have the power in their hands to change our country for good. We are confident that they will choose not to hand that power back to politicians in Westminster.

If there is no change and a No vote, then Scotland will see our working age population fall and there will be increasing strains on public services and on the sustainability of communities across the country. In contrast, only a Yes gives us the powers and opportunities we need to reinvigorate our economy and provide new hope for families and individuals. Only a Yes gives us the ability to choose a new path, and to take on the challenges we face with full control of our own destiny. We call on the Committee members to agree that the best option for our nation’s economy and society is, therefore, to have Scotland’s future in Scotland’s hands.

Yes Scotland would be happy to provide oral evidence to the Committee.

Yes Scotland
February 2014