A The object of this response is to seek to assist the Committee by setting out an analysis of certain of the legal issues involved under the heading “The road to membership”. This response contains the author’s personal views only. These views are not expressed on behalf of, nor do they represent the views of any body or institution whatsoever. This response discusses legal issues only and does not consider political issues. The focus of this response is on potential legal obstacles to Scotland’s membership having particular regard to matters contained in Appendix A to the paper published by HM Government in 2013, which latter paper is entitled Scotland analysis: Devolution and the implications of Scottish independence. It adopts the Opinion contained in Appendix A.

B Appendix A is itself entitled Opinion: Referendum on the Independence of Scotland - International Law Aspects. The Opinion is that of the two most eminent Professors James Crawford SC and Alan Boyle. To paraphrase paragraph 4 of the Executive Summary to their Opinion they indicate that within the EU there is no precedent which covers the situation were Scotland to become independent, but contend as their preferred view that what they call “rUK” would be the continuator State of the UK as presently constituted so that its EU membership would continue with appropriate modifications as before. Scotland on the other hand would be required to accede to the EU as a new State.

C In my respectful submission Professors Crawford and Boyle fall into error in advancing the above contentions.

D In order to avoid falling into error in assessing the legal consequences of Scotland becoming independent, and in order the better for all parties to approach EU negotiations, one needs to be clear as to how, from both the constitutional and international law point of view the new State of Great Britain came into existence in 1707, and how legally, and with what effect upon the existing United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Great Britain, and the Union creating it, may now be brought constitutionally to an end.

E The author who has had perhaps the greatest influence of any constitutional lawyer in respect of the development of the theory of the largely unwritten British constitution, and who may in a manner of speaking be described as the “father” of the theory widely accepted today of parliamentary sovereignty, is Professor A.V. Dicey (1835-1922). It has to be said of course that his views as to the sovereignty of the UK Parliament have not in fact gone unchallenged, particularly in Scotland, as one learns for example from the judgement of Lord Cooper in MacCormick v. Lord Advocate 1953 SC 396. Apart from Dicey’s famed Law of the Constitution, (the 8th edition published in 1915 and later reprinted was the last to be edited by Dicey himself), he was co-author with Professor Robert S. Rait of what is in my submission the major legal work to have been written from a strongly pro-Union point of view on the Union between England and Scotland, namely Thoughts on the Union between England and Scotland which was published in 1920. In the Preface
to that work (at page v in the First Greenwood Reprinting 1971), having referred to the enactment of Acts of Union by the Parliaments of Scotland and England the authors stated:

“This statute abolished the separate Parliament of England and also the separate Parliament of Scotland, and brought into existence the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and, from a legal point of view, the United Kingdom of Great Britain.”

In similar terms the authors stated (at page 244 of the 1971 reprint):

“The Act of Union carried through by legal means an immense revolution; it created a new State namely the United Kingdom of Great Britain.”

F It is right to say that the Acts bringing into force the Treaty of Union between the two Kingdoms made no specific provision either for withdrawal from the Union or for remedy in the case of breach of the agreement which had led to the Union. In passing one may note that until the Treaty of Lisbon, there was no specific provision for withdrawal from the European Union or its predecessors either.

G It is however clear that the new Parliament of Great Britain incorporating as it did the respective sovereignties of England and of Scotland, and with members of Parliament representing both England and Scotland and their peoples, had and has the legal power to repeal the Union and restore the separate sovereignties of England and Scotland and of their sovereign. As referred to by Dicey and Rait (at page 298 of the 1971 reprint):

“... less than seven years after the passing of the Act of Union there was introduced into the House of Lords a Bill for repealing the Act; that so far as the number of votes went the proposal was all but carried ... “.

According to the National Archives transcript of the relevant record of the proceedings,1 the issue voted on (which failed by 4 votes, the voting being 67 in favour and 71 against) was:

“That leave be given to bring in a bill for dissolving ye Union for restoreing Each Kingdome to their Rights and Priviledges as atye time of the Union for Effectuall securing of her Maj[est]y in her Royall Powers and Authority over both Kingdomes & in asserting & confirming all her Royall Prerogatives & Effectually securing the Succession in the Protestant line in the Illustreous House of Han[n]over as the same stands Limitted & secured by severall Acts of Parliam[en]t in England & by the second Article of the Union Or any subsequent Acts made in the parliam[en]t of Great Britain for establishing astrict & perpetuall Alliance betwixt the 2 Kingdoms.”

H Of course 300 years have now passed since that attempt to repeal the Union failed. But writing in 1915 (Law of the Constitution, 8th edition, 1927

---

reprint, p. 141), Dicey referred to the possibility of repeal of the Union without in any way suggesting that either a new method would be required or a different effect achieved in terms of the restoration of separate Crowns and statehood:

“In England\(^2\) we have laws which may be called fundamental or constitutional because they deal with important principles (as, for example, the descent of the Crown or the terms of union with Scotland) ... But with us there is no such thing as a supreme law ... There are indeed important statutes, such as the Act embodying the Treaty of Union with Scotland, with which it would be political madness to tamper gratuitously; there are utterly unimportant statutes, such, for example, as the Dentists Act, 1878, which may be repealed or modified at the pleasure or caprice of Parliament; but neither the Act of Union with Scotland nor the Dentists Act, 1878, has more claim than the other to be considered a supreme law. Each embodies the will of the sovereign legislative power; each can be legally altered or repealed by Parliament ...”

I. It is my submission that the legal position remains today that if a simple Bill, appropriately updated but broadly along the lines of the failed 1713 Bill were to be enacted by the UK Parliament, the 1707 Union of England and Scotland which established the then new United Kingdom of Great Britain, would be brought to an end, and the original States of England and of Scotland would be restored under the sovereignty of Her Majesty the Queen with separate titles as borne by Queen Anne. There is no principle of public international law which could prevent such an outcome. Quite simply the relevant principles of public international law would be applied on the one hand to the United Kingdom of England and Northern Ireland (UKENI) and on the other hand to the Kingdom of Scotland, each Kingdom tracing its continuous and originally separate history down through many centuries.

J. Putting the Union of 1707 and the attempt to repeal it in 1713 into their historical context it is interesting to note that in 1713 also, a Treaty was entered into at Utrecht in the name of Queen Anne as Queen of Great Britain, as she had now become, for the cession of Gibraltar by Spain to Great Britain. That Treaty likewise remains binding to this day in its fundamental effect irrespective of the passage of many years since its conclusion.

K. Thirty-four years after the publication of Dicey and Rait’s *Thoughts on the Union between England and Scotland*, the Balfour Royal Commission on Scottish Affairs Report was presented to Parliament by Command of Her Majesty in July 1954. In Chapter 1 under the heading “Relationship with England” it was stated at paragraph 13 (ii):

“When it is advantageous for Scottish business to be dealt with by United Kingdom of Great Britain Ministers, there should be full understanding and recognition by these Ministers and by their officials that Scotland is a nation

\(^2\) The use of the word “England” when “Britain” or “Great Britain” was meant was common up to the 20th century.
and voluntarily entered into union with England as a partner and not as a dependency.”

In volume 1 of the Kilbrandon Royal Commission on the Constitution Report presented to Parliament by Command of Her Majesty in October 1973 consideration was devoted inter alia to separatism and what we might nowadays refer to as devolution. It was stated at paragraph 430 on page 134 of the majority Report (there was a separate minority report contained in volume 2):

“We therefore regard separatism as involving the division of Great Britain into three fully independent sovereign states - England, Scotland and Wales. Each would have complete constitutional control over all its internal and external affairs and its own direct links with the Crown and each would be separately represented at the United Nations and in the world at large. In practice the three states might choose to co-operate closely in various ways; but any proposals for self-government in Scotland and Wales which depended on such cooperation would not, by definition, amount to separatism.”

Evidently the position of the Principality of Wales which was incorporated into England centuries ago is a different one legally from that of the Kingdoms of England and of Scotland under the 1707 Union. What is clear however is that just as with the 1954 Royal Commission, the 1973 Royal Commission majority report looked on Great Britain as then constituted as containing the pooled sovereignties of England (which would include Wales), and of Scotland.

In March 1993 the Secretary of State for Scotland presented to Parliament by Command of Her Majesty a White Paper entitled “Scotland in the Union a Partnership for Good.” In his foreword the then Prime Minister John Major stated:

“This White Paper is about the Union with Scotland. That Union is almost 300 years old. As I have said before, no nation could be held irrevocably in a Union against its will ... The Act of Union in 1707 was a remarkable political development. The union it enshrined is an enduring achievement which is to the credit of our people.”

It is clear from the above that the then Prime Minister was confirming Scotland as a nation and further confirming the enduring nature of the Union. Implicit was the assertion by the UK Government through the then Prime Minister, that the Union continued upon the same legal basis with which it had started and upon the basis that the Scotland which had joined the Union would, should the Union end, be continued by the same Scotland.

The United Kingdom Government White Paper of 1993 indeed takes the matter further. At paragraph 10.3 at page 38 it is stated:

“And if the Union is to flourish in the future a more concerted recognition of Scotland’s status as a nation will be necessary. It should be a mark of Scotland’s self-confidence in her own status as a nation that she shares her
sovereignty with the other parts of the United Kingdom. But the willingness to share that sovereignty must never be taken for granted."

O In my submission the United Kingdom Government was entirely correct in this assertion of Scotland’s status as a nation and in its recognition that Scotland was indeed a sovereign nation which was entitled in the exercise of its sovereign will to leave the Union. Equally clearly the United Kingdom Government was not contending in 1993 that Scotland would become a “new State” should it leave the Union. It is paradoxical, Scotland’s ancient status having been highlighted since 1993 by the restoration of its Parliament, that Professors Crawford and Boyle’s preferred theory in 2013 is the “new State” theory.

P I turn to deal further with the legal implications of Scotland’s representation in the UK Parliament.

In January 1999 a Bill entitled the House of Lords Bill was introduced by the UK Government in the House of Commons. The basic object of the Bill was to restrict membership of the House of Lords by virtue of a hereditary peerage. In July 1999 the House of Lords passed a motion, despite the objection of the UK Government, referring to the Committee for Privileges the question whether the Bill if enacted would “breach the provisions of the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland.” The issue before the Committee was not as such one involving the potential repeal of the Union. The Second Report of the Committee’s proceedings (to be found at http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld199899/ldselect/ldprivi/108i/10801.htm ) contains inter alia the Opinions of three of the Law Lords on the fundamentals of the Union namely Lord Nicholls of Birkenhead, Lord Slynn of Hadley and Lord Hope of Craighead. With all due respect to the Opinion of Professors Crawford and Boyle in this field, the Opinions of the Law Lords, albeit not delivered in the course of a case, carry in my view more authority. Clearly the Law Lords were dealing with a narrow issue unconnected as such with the specific issues being considered by this Committee of the Scottish Parliament but they lay firm analytical foundations, confirmatory in my submission of the UK Government’s views as to Scotland’s sovereignty as expressed in 1993, but now seemingly departed from in Scotland analysis: Devolution and the implications of Scottish independence.

Q I will only briefly cite extracts from remarks made by each Law Lord. Thus Lord Nicholls stated:

“ In 1706 England and Scotland were two distinct states. England was ruled by Anne as Queen of England, and Scotland was ruled by Anne as Queen of Scotland. Each state had its own Parliament. On 1 May 1707 the two states were united into one state by the name of Great Britain. The new state had a single monarch, in the person of Queen Anne, and a single Parliament.

As to whether there was or was not a treaty:
“I do not consider it is necessary to decide whether any such treaty, binding in international law, came into being before the union took place. Nor is it necessary to investigate whether, if there were such a treaty, there still subsists any treaty right or obligation which is currently justiciable, either under international law or domestic law. For present purposes it is sufficient to note that, especially in the Scottish Act of Union, the articles of union are referred to as articles of the ‘Treaty of Union.’ ... The inescapable fact, and this is what matters, is that the union took place on the basis of articles thus described.”

Later he stated:

“... There is room for argument that the treaty of union would be breached if Scotland ceased to have adequate representation in both houses of the United Kingdom Parliament. If that politically unthinkable event should ever happen, there would be scope to contend that this constituted a breach of a condition implicit in the Treaty.”

Lord Slynn in turn stated:

“Whether there was a Treaty is a matter of interesting debate amongst academic lawyers. For my part, I would accept that there was an international treaty between England and Scotland (as it has often been called in the past), but since neither state has existed as such since 1707 there is no party to the treaty which could enforce it.”

He added with specific reference to Scotland’s representation in Parliament:

“... unlike members of the House of Commons, it does not seem to me that the sixteen peers were to represent the people or the nation of Scotland but, if truly representative at all (rather than selected from the peerage of Scotland) they represented that peerage.”

Lord Hope expounded at greatest length on the nature of the Union giving examples to show that the phrase “Treaty of Union” is still in common use. Having indicated that the nature of the union agreement was an issue which the committee did not need to resolve he stated:

“It is sufficient for present purposes to say that, leaving aside the question whether or not it is right to regard the treaty as having been executed when the Union Agreement took effect on 1 May 1707 and the two states which had entered into the treaty went out of existence, the argument that the legislative powers of the new Parliament of Great Britain were subject to the restrictions expressed in the Union Agreement cannot be dismissed as entirely fanciful.”

He went on to deal with what Lord Slynn had referred to as the representation of the people or nation of Scotland and stated as to the relevant Article XXII:

“Taken as a whole, the purpose of the Article appears to have been this: first, to settle the number of peers of Scotland who were to sit with all the Lords of
Parliament of England in the House of Lords; secondly, to settle the number of members who were to sit on the part of Scotland with the Commons of the existing Parliament of England in the House of Commons; and, thirdly, to make the necessary arrangements for the first meeting of the new Parliament of Great Britain.”

He went on to state:

“On the whole it seems to me that the argument that the effect of the Union Agreement was that the peers of Scotland were to represent Scotland in the Parliament of Great Britain is less than convincing ... The better view is that the function of the Scottish representative peers in the House of Lords was to represent the peerage of Scotland in the new Parliament.”

He continued by observing that the expression “the Representatives of Scotland” employed in Article XXII referred to those who were to sit in the House of Commons:

“So far as the people of Scotland and their representation in the new Parliament of Great Britain was concerned, therefore, this is to be found in the arrangements that representatives of Scotland were to sit in the House of Commons.”

R The collective Opinion of the Law Lords is in my submission to make it clear that Scotland and its people were from the beginning, by virtue of the Union Treaty and Acts, to be represented at least in the House of Commons of the Parliament of Great Britain. Accordingly today’s Scottish members of the House of Commons inherit the role of representatives of Scotland and its people. As members of the British Parliament created in 1707 they are not simply representatives of a region of “North Britain”. Such representation of Scotland and its people, notwithstanding changes that have occurred, not least resultant upon devolution, has of course continued to this day, providing in conjunction with the continuity of the Crown the legal chain of continuity between the Sovereign State of Scotland in 1707 and the now potentially re-emergent post-referendum Kingdom of Scotland.

S One possible difficulty facing future EU negotiations in the event of a “yes” vote, is exacerbated by unequal devolution throughout the UK. In the event of a “yes” vote in the referendum it is anticipated that negotiations with the EU will commence prior to the required Act of Parliament being enacted repealing the Act(s) of Union. Until the Union is brought to an end constitutionally in this manner the UK Government will continue to be responsible for all parts of the UK including Scotland save as to devolved matters which do not at present include EU negotiations. Likewise there has been no devolution at all for England so that the UK Government will be required to act on behalf of the future new UKENI as well as for the UK of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and its components including Scotland. Clearly there are potential problems of conflict of interest. Were EU negotiations to be added to the list of devolved matters following a “yes” vote
in the referendum this would at least provide a means of mitigating such conflict of interest.

There is a further difficulty which arises directly out of the “rUK”/new Scotland theory developed by Professors Crawford and Boyle in so far as EU Membership is concerned. In order to comply with this theory UK/rUK negotiators would upon analysis be maintaining that whereas Her Majesty the Queen had retained her “rUK” Crown and sovereignty and EU membership, she had seemingly lost her original Crown of Scotland. Accordingly her Majesty the Queen would continue as Head of State of “rUK” enjoying membership of the EU, whereas in her capacity as Head of State of “new” Scotland she would in a manner of speaking be “shown the exit” by the EU at the invitation of her UK Government negotiators and become in consequence Head of State merely of an applicant State in her brand new Scots capacity.

There is in my submission a fundamental flaw in the thesis proposed by Professors Crawford and Boyle as all that would be required to avoid Her Majesty the Queen losing her ancient Scots Crown would be an Act of Parliament ending the Union upon terms just as envisaged in 1713 restoring each Kingdom and confirming Her Majesty the Queen’s continued sovereignty over them. As indicated above this would be fully compliant with the principles of Public International Law.

As stated in the 9th edition of Oppenheim’s International Law, (1992) volume 1, paragraphs 445 and 448 at pages 1033 and 1035:

“The highest organ of the state, representing it, within and without its borders, in the totality of its relations, is the Head of State. Such Head is the monarch in a monarchy ... In every monarchy the monarch appears as the representative of the sovereignty of the state, and is therefore a sovereign himself. International law recognises all monarchs as equally sovereign, although their constitutional positions under the constitutional laws of their different states may vary considerably.”

One can see that if in fact the UK continues to advocate the doctrine preferred by Professors Crawford and Boyle unintended consequences could include the resurrection of the controversy as to the Royal title of Her Majesty the Queen which was considered in the case of MacCormick v. Lord Advocate already referred to.

Professors Crawford and Boyle derive support (see Appendix A, paragraph 163) for their preferred thesis that Scotland would be treated as a new State in relation to the EU and accordingly required to become an applicant State for membership of that body, from certain statements made by EU officials which might appear to support this point of view. Returning to the Balfour Royal Commission observation that UK ministers and officials should understand and recognise that Scotland is a nation that had entered into Union with England as a partner the question does arise as to whether there is not a duty on behalf of the UK Government to point this out to the European officials concerned, who may well not be aware of these facts and of the fact
that her Majesty the Queen is Head of a State which incorporates the pooled and equal sovereignties of England and of Scotland. By the same token were negotiators wearing their “rUK” and/or UK “hats” to indicate to EU officials that “rUK” is to be treated as the continuator state and Scotland as a new state this could well be viewed again as in conflict at least with the spirit of the Balfour Royal Commission Report.

In the past the United Kingdom has been vigilant in its protection of the rights of the Sovereign Head of State of the UK. Thus in 1866 the British Foreign Office was concerned at the effect of the annexation by conquest in that year of the Kingdom of Hanover by Prussia, upon the contingent right of Queen Victoria to succeed to the throne of Hanover. The opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown was requested. They reported (see A. McNair, *International Law Opinions* vol. 1 (Cambridge University Press, 1956), pp. 27-28):

“... that it does not appear ... that Her Majesty has any interest in the question now pending between the King of Prussia and the Ex-King of Hanover except such interest as may be incident to the contingent right of Her Majesty to the Throne and Kingdom of Hanover ... We think that according to precedent a formal protest against any injury which the annexation of Hanover by Prussia may inflict upon the reversionary interests of her Majesty or her descendants should be formally made and tendered by her Majesty’s Representative at Berlin to the King of Prussia.”

V Her Majesty the Queen clearly has an “interest” in the equal sovereignties of England and of Scotland incorporated within the UK, each of which sovereignty may be restored as we have seen above by a simple Act of the sovereign UK Parliament. In my submission, in the event of a “yes” vote in the forthcoming referendum, the interests of Her Majesty the Queen as Head of State of the UK of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will require all parties whether within the UK or indeed in the EU, to respect the fact that she will become, assuming the constitutionally compliant legal process referred to above is followed for the repeal of the Union by Act of Parliament, Head of State of the equal sovereignties of, on the one hand the UKENI, and on the other hand the Kingdom of Scotland.

W The legal model proposed by Professors Crawford and Boyle gives rise to yet another problem. Section 1 of the Northern Ireland Act, 1998 states under the heading “Status of Northern Ireland”:

“(i) It is hereby declared that Northern Ireland in its entirety remains part of the United Kingdom and shall not cease to be so without the consent of a majority of the people of Northern Ireland voting in a poll held for the purposes of this section in accordance with schedule 1.

(ii) But if the wish expressed by a majority in such a poll is that Northern Ireland should cease to be a part of the United Kingdom and form part of a united Ireland, the Secretary of State shall lay before Parliament such proposals to give effect to that wish as may be agreed between her Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of Ireland.”
Were Scotland to resume its status as an independent country, and were Northern Ireland to cease in due course to be a part of the UKENI/rUK", the UKENI or “rUK” would no longer be an appropriate term to describe the state which remained. One would be left in fact with the State of England being the continuator of the England of Queen Anne. England would contain in turn within it the long since incorporated Principality of Wales. Whereas the term “rUK” utilised today may conjure up images of continuity, the utilisation of the familiar UK “label” should not be permitted to obscure what is in my submission the correct legal analysis of what lies behind the “label”. The term “UK” cannot be guaranteed to have an enduring life span bearing in mind the legislation already in place providing for referendums with legal effect both in Scotland and Northern Ireland. It is for this reason that it is respectfully suggested that the preferred legal model as proposed by Professors Crawford and Boyle which denies the existence of an “old” Scotland and therefore logically of an “old” England too, may in the not too distant future confront the “continuator” “rUK” with the identity crisis of not being entitled to call itself a “United Kingdom” at all.

In the White Paper Scotland’s Future at page 462 the Scottish Government has already indicated it would support what it calls “the rest of the UK” (UKENI) remaining a permanent member of the UN Security Council. This demonstrates how agreement will no doubt resolve problems which at present seem intractable. I agree with paragraph 5 of the Executive Summary of the Opinion of Professors Crawford and Boyle in so far as they anticipate that Scotland’s position within the EU as to membership is likely to be shaped more by agreement between the parties than by pre-existing principles of EU law. Where I differ is that in my view exactly the same will also apply to the other part of Her Majesty the Queen’s current UK, namely “rUK” or UKENI. In other words the UKENI on the one hand and the Kingdom of Scotland on the other will, assuming the matter is resolved pursuant to a legal as opposed to a political solution, either each be treated as new States by the EU and required to re-apply for membership, or each accommodated as component parts of an existing State member which is retaining the same Head of State and without need of fresh application.

Some final thoughts. Were the forthcoming referendum to be taking place for example in the Principality of Wales rather than in the ancient Kingdom of Scotland, and were Professors Crawford and Boyle’s Opinion to be appropriately amended so as to refer to Wales, I would almost certainly find common ground with the greater part of their views which admirably demonstrate the considerations relevant in international law where part of a state becomes independent from the remainder. The Opinion of Professors Crawford and Boyle does not however “work” as a useful legal tool when considering the living Union between the ancient Kingdoms of England and of Scotland reigned over by Her Majesty the Queen as Queen of Great Britain within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in right of such Union.
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