

Item 1:

From: Permanent Secretary <PermanentSecretary@gov.scot>

Date: Tuesday, 17 Mar 2020, 6:41 pm

To: Evans L (Leslie) [Redacted – S.38(i)(b)]

Cc: Permanent Secretary <PermanentSecretary@gov.scot>

Subject: Perm Sec Daily Update - 17/03/2020

Questing Testing/IndyRef (CG) FOR INFO - You'll recall the Electoral Commission asked SG for comments on UKG's letter on Questing Testing for IndyRef2. SG have responded stating "we do not consider that the correspondence raises relevant considerations." Also included a line to reflect COVID-19, cleared by Mr Russell/Liz Lloyd – "Of course we are also mindful of the wider context in relation to COVID19 at this particular time. Accordingly if the Electoral Commission agrees to undertake testing, as we believe it should, we would then concur with any decision by the Commission to postpone actual testing until such time as it was appropriate to do so in the light of current public health concerns and the need to avoid unnecessary contact for the duration of the Coronavirus crisis." They anticipate media queries on what this means for plans for a referendum in 2020 in response to this letter and/or the Electoral Commission's decision tomorrow on Question Testing.

[Redacted – out of scope]

Thanks,
The Team

Item 2:

From: [Redacted – S.38(i)(b)]

Sent: 25 January 2020 18:29

To: Permanent Secretary <PermanentSecretary@gov.scot>

Subject: Complaint

Dear Permanent Secretary,

Please explain why you are using taxpayers' money to create a case for Scottish independence.

It's bad enough that my tax finds its way directly to the Scottish Government rather than Westminster. But surely you must agree this is a matter that should be directly funded by the SNP, given that:
1. the Scottish Government has been refused permission to hold a referendum; 2. a minority of Scottish political parties support it; 3. Court action designed to prevent a referendum taking place is imminent.

Kind regards,

[Redacted – S.38(i)(b)]

Item 3:

From: [Redacted – S.38(i)(b)]

Sent: 21 February 2020 20:16

To: Permanent Secretary <PermanentSecretary@gov.scot>

Subject: Re: Complaint

Dear Permanent Secretary,

If you are going to delegate responsibility for dealing with your mail, then please at least delegate it to someone who actually answers the questions.

I asked you a question (below) - and none of the points raised have been dealt with.

The current Scottish Government (Government in name only) was not elected on the basis of the manifesto pledge quoted. This was a SNP manifesto pledge, and the SNP does not hold a majority. Perhaps you can show me where this was stated in the Green Party's manifesto? But let's also dissect the pledge and show it up for what it is. Notwithstanding what 'We believe' - whoever 'We' is, the Scottish Parliament (or should that be 'Government') does NOT have the right to hold a referendum because this is a reserved matter that has already been refused by the UK Government. But the pledge goes on to quote two alternative circumstances. Circumstance 1 relating to the preferred option of a majority of Scottish people is unchanged, based on the majority proportion of the Scottish electorate voting for Unionist parties in 2019. Fair enough, because of the word 'or' you can conveniently ignore this, BUT the 'or' circumstance factually doesn't even exist. Scotland has not been taken out of the EU, because Scotland was not - and never has been - a member of the EU. Nor will it ever be in the future because the EU will have destroyed itself long before Scotland could ever get its deficit to a qualifying level.

As [Redacted – S.38(i)(b)] notes in his next paragraph, it was a UK-wide referendum. So in stating that he has totally destroyed his own argument, along with the SNP's entire manifesto and reason for existence.

The motion voted on, on 29 January, recognises a 'sovereign right' that doesn't exist. That (fictitious or aspirational) right has also been rejected by the UK Government, so rather than continue at length, I will reiterate the fundamental question I asked to be dealt with:

Why is **taxpayer revenue** being used to fund what is merely a SNP vanity project? Our hospitals and police stations are crumbling, the education system is broken, the country has a major drugs problem, ministers get themselves involved in all sorts of unsavoury activities, or take out super-injunctions - presumably again at the taxpayers' expense - yet the SNP continually ignores these issues and sweeps its own 'dirt' under the carpet. Furthermore, it has proved itself incapable of taking on the welfare system, deferring this until 2024 earliest, so how could anyone in their right mind think that this failed administration could run an independent country?

Anyway, I shall console myself in the knowledge that (1) I probably feature on your list of known troublemakers(!), and (2) if Scotland were to ever become independent I can at least move to England. In fact, today's disgusting announcement that some prisoners are to secure the right to vote may just accelerate that decision.

Kind regards,

[Redacted – S.38(i)(b)]

REASONS FOR NOT PROVIDING INFORMATION

Section 38(i)(b) - personal information

An exemption under section s.38(1)(b) of FOISA applies to some of the information you have requested because it is the personal data of a third party, i.e. names and contact details of individuals, and disclosing it would contravene the data protection principles in Article 5(1) of the General Data Protection Regulation and in section 34(1) of the Data Protection Act 2018. This exemption is not subject to the 'public interest test', so we are not required to consider if the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in applying the exemption.