

[News story: National Apprenticeship Week 2017 – as it happens](#)

Monday, 6 March

National Apprenticeship Week launched today with Secretary of State for Education, Rt Hon Justine Greening MP addressing an audience of almost 100 apprentices and employers attending at Barclays at Canary Wharf.

Two inspirational apprentices from Barclays gave an account of their apprenticeship journey, alongside Lucy Wilkins – a 10 year on case study from Somerset County Council and Chris Achiampong from IBM (and star of the Get In Go Far campaign).

National Apprenticeship Week 2017 launch event at Barclays HQ, Canary Wharf, London.

There was also a BBC You're Hired event at BBC Broadcasting House to discuss apprenticeships in the creative industries and what needs to be done to create more opportunities. Hosted by BBC News' Reeta Chakrabarti, guest speakers highlighted how important apprenticeships are for business and how, certainly in the creative industries, they need to be made more inclusive to attract candidates of all backgrounds.

BBC You're Hired event

Royal Mail is supporting the week with a special postmark, which will be applied to millions of items of UK stamped mail nationwide. The postmark will appear on stamped mail between Monday 6 and Friday 10 March.

Our hashtag #NAW2017 was also trending on Twitter today.

Get involved

Full details of the events happening across England can be found on the [events map](#).

Events and activities for the week will be shared on [Twitter](#) and [LinkedIn](#) over the week, and event images will also be made available on [Flickr](#).

[Never mind indyref2: SNP must own up](#)

[to the lies of indyref1](#)

- [Home](#)
- [All News](#)
- Never mind indyref2: SNP must own up to the lies of indyref1

7 Mar 2017



Nicola Sturgeon and John Swinney are being urged to “come clean” over the SNP’s claims of an oil “bonus” after independence, after a close ally admitted this week it was made up.

The head of the SNP’s Growth Commission Andrew Wilson admitted that oil formed part of the “basis” of the SNP’s figures for independence – and was “baked in” to their assumptions.

His comment has exposed the SNP’s previous position, which repeatedly stated that oil would be a “bonus” that could be used to top up spending on the NHS, education and other public services in Scotland after independence.

Former First Minister Alex Salmond – one of the most enthusiastic proponents of the myth – has so far failed to speak out over Mr Wilson’s comments.

The Scottish Conservatives are today publishing a dossier of quotes from Nicola Sturgeon and John Swinney from the referendum campaign on oil.

Both claimed that an oil “boom” was coming – with Mr Swinney even saying that an oil fund could be set up on day one of an independent Scotland.

Scottish Conservative shadow finance secretary Murdo Fraser said:

“Never mind bringing forward plans for a second referendum, the SNP needs to own up to the lies it told in the first.

“Andrew Wilson has admitted that even the SNP knew its claims about an oil ‘boom’ were rubbish.

“Nicola Sturgeon and John Swinney should now come clean.

“Time and again during the referendum campaign the nationalists told people in Scotland that we’d be rich thanks to the ‘bonus’ we’d get from a second oil boom.

“They now must stop hiding and – as Mr Wilson has done – admit they tried to deceive people.

“We can only be grateful that two million Scots saw through it and kept our union of nations together.”

Pre-Referendum quotes on oil

Nicola Sturgeon

- **Nicola Sturgeon said that independence would bring a 'second energy bonanza'.** 'A no vote means Shetland's natural wealth continues to flow to London, with a Yes vote Shetland can reap the benefits of a second energy bonanza' (*Scottish Energy News*, 27 August 2014, [link](#)).

- **Sturgeon said that it was 'Project Fear' to argue that Scotland is better able to manage the fluctuations in its oil industry as part of the UK.** 'According to Project Fear, small nations can't manage oil. Someone really should tell Norway with its £470 billion oil fund' (*Nicola Sturgeon Twitter*, 2 September 2013, [link](#)).

- **She said that there were 'boom years ahead'.** 'Oil Analysis shows boom years ahead' (*Nicola Sturgeon Twitter*, 11 March 2013, [link](#)).

- **She failed to listen to warnings that the oil price could fluctuate.** 'Let us hear no more from #no about oil being a problem' (*Nicola Sturgeon Twitter*, 9 January 2014, [link](#)).

- **Sturgeon claimed that Scotland could establish a 'national energy fund' with oil revenues.** 'Shetland showed the rest of Scotland the way when it established its oil fund in 1976. That charitable fund has grown to £200m and the investment it has made in Shetland communities is here for all to see. Independence means the rest of Scotland can take the same approach and invest in our future through a national energy fund, but it also means a new opportunity for Shetland communities to benefit from the industry off their shores' (*BBC*, 27 August 2014, [link](#)).

- **She described oil revenues as a 'massive advantage' that other countries would give their 'eye and teeth for'.** 'And yes we have oil and gas in abundance. And I'll let you into a wee secret – having oil and gas reserves worth £1.5 trillion is not really a problem. It's not the sum total of our economy, but it's a massive advantage that other countries would give their eye and teeth for. And it's high time Scotland started getting the benefit of it' (*Daily Record*, 24 March 2013, [link](#)).

- **She also said that setting up an 'oil fund' was one of her six reasons to vote Yes** (*Glasgow Evening Times*, 19 March 2014, p4).

John Swinney

- **John Swinney said that Scotland was on the verge of a 'massive oil boom' and that it could not 'afford to be independent'.** 'Crucially, at the same time as this expected surge in price, the North Sea is experiencing a renewed boom, as underlined in the recent report from industry body Oil & Gas UK which says that the additional investments which have been ploughed into the sector in the last couple of years will generate an extra £3bn in

revenues in 2017 when these new developments will be coming on stream. Taken together, this surge in investment and the rising price of oil mean that the early years of an independent Scotland are timed to coincide with a massive North Sea oil boom.... The question every voter in Scotland must ask themselves between now and the autumn of next year is whether, given all these facts, Scotland can afford not to be independent.' (*The Sunday Herald*, 10 March 2013, [link](#)).

- **At the same, a leaked SNP Government briefing paper warned Swinney of the 'volatile' nature of oil tax revenue.** The paper said 'North Sea tax receipts have been more volatile than onshore receipts... Given the relative importance of North Sea revenues to Scotland's public finances, these downward revisions have resulted in a deterioration in the outlook for Scotland's public finances... In an independent Scotland this will have important implications for budget setting and estimating public sector borrowing requirements... However, this would, on present assumptions about on-shore tax revenues, require some downward revision in current spending.' (*Better Together, Leaked Scottish Government briefing to John Swinney*, 6 March 2013, [link](#)).

- **He also hailed the oil 'bonus' that Scotland would receive from independence.** 'North Sea oil is a bonus, not the basis for Scotland's economy, and with up to 24 billion barrels of oil left worth an estimated £1.5 trillion, it will continue to contribute to the wealth of Scotland for a long time to come' (*Herald Scotland*, 3 September 2013, [link](#)).

- **He said oil would provide an 'economic bonus' only made possible by Scotland becoming independent.** 'If we pursue the policies that only an independent Scotland will be able to pursue then we can deliver an oil fund from the point of independence and secure an economic bonus that can only be delivered by independence' (*BBC News*, 25 May 2014, [link](#)).

- **A spokesperson for Swinney, even after the Referendum, said that they expected the oil price to recover and that claims otherwise were 'clearly ridiculous'.** 'Oil is a bonus, not the basis of Scotland's economy – and most independent forecasts expect the price to rise again next year, with OPEC predicting a price of \$110 per barrel for the rest of the decade and around \$100 in real terms in the long-run. Labour's calls for an inquiry are clearly ridiculous. At time of the Scottish Government's publication in March last year, the \$113 price assumption was the average price over the previous two years.' (*The Telegraph*, 17 December 2014, [link](#)).

Alex Salmond

- **Alex Salmond said that Scotland was moving into a 'second oil boom'.** 'This bulletin shows the impact that increases in investment could have on production and revenues, and examines a range of scenarios. It demonstrates that, when the expected increase in production to two million barrels a day is taken into account, there can be little doubt that Scotland is moving into a second oil boom' (*BBC*, 11 March 2013, [link](#)).

- **Salmond said that oil was a 'huge bonus'.** 'If oil is taken out of

the equation, then Scotland's economic output per head is almost identical to that of the UK. The benefit we get from oil and gas will be a huge bonus' (*The Sunday Times*, 21 July 2013, [link](#)).

• **He said that Scotland could create 'an oil savings fund' as soon as it became independent.** 'Scotland in strong position to start an oil savings fund from the point of independence' (*Alex Salmond Twitter*, 28 May 2014, [link](#)).

HSL: Site and Transport Safety – Birmingham, 22 Mar 2017

[Book Course](#)

HSL is to run a 1 day course on Site and Transport Safety – BIRMINGHAM.

22 March 2017

PLEASE NOTE – THIS COURSE WILL BE HELD IN BIRMINGHAM

Introduction

Vehicle movements and loading and unloading vehicles can be some of the most dangerous activities carried out on a worksite.

This course will help you understand the legal requirements of both road traffic law and workplace safety law, how and why things go wrong, and how you can take practicable steps to reduce risk in your business.

Course includes

- Background for load securing
- Legal principles and UK and European requirements
- Use of the vehicle structure for load securing
- Lashing loads for safe road transport
- Responsibility and communication in the transport chain
- Working at height and fall prevention
- Vehicle/pedestrian separation and preventing incidents
- Risk assessment and systems of work for loading and transport

Who should attend?

Site managers and transport managers working in general haulage, retail, warehousing and distribution.

Cost

The cost of this course is £525 per person (includes course notes, certificate of attendance and lunch/refreshments).

Venue

[etc. venues](#)
[Maple House,](#)
[150 Corporation Street](#)
[Birmingham,](#)
[B4 6TB](#)

[Book Course](#)

Please note the invoice option is not available within 4 weeks of the course date, or for overseas customers. If you are selecting the invoice option for payment, it will be mandatory to input a purchase order/reference number as we are unable to process booking forms without this.

For further dates and additional information email: training@hsl.gsi.gov.uk or contact the Training & Conferences Unit at HSL directly on +44 (0)1298 218806.

[Back to Health & Safety Training Courses](#)

[Back to the top](#)

[This report is a damning indictment of how this Tory Government treats refugees – Diane Abbott](#)

Diane Abbott MP, Labour's Shadow Home Secretary, speaking in response to the launch of a UK report from the Refugee Council, said:

"This report is a damning indictment of how this Tory Government treats refugees.

"The complex, arbitrary and hostile processes they have introduced have created a bureaucratic mess, with a backlog of almost 25,000 cases.

"Ministers urgently need to implement a streamlined system that assesses claims fairly

and
in a timely way, and treats asylum-seekers humanely.”

[Looming Brexit bill defeat in the House of Lords highlights importance of ‘Dublin Case’](#)



7 March 2017

Keith Taylor MEP: ‘The ability to revoke Article 50 means that no option is off the table, including the option to remain in the EU if MPs, and the people they represent, believe the exit deal is not in Britain’s best interests.’

Keith Taylor, Green MEP for the South East, is highlighting the importance of the so-called ‘Dublin Case’ as the Government looks set for [another Brexit bill defeat](#) by the House of Lords today on giving Parliament a meaningful vote on the terms of leaving the European Union.

The amendment likely to be passed by the Lords rejects Theresa May’s plan to present MPs with a Hobson’s choice: accept the Government’s exit deal or crash out of the European Union without any deal. Instead, cross-party Lords are demanding MPs be given the ability to reject whatever deal Number 10 strikes with Brussels without the UK having to leave with no deal at all; a ‘meaningful vote’.

The so-called ‘[Dublin case](#)’ seeks legal clarity over the question of whether, once triggered, the UK can [unilaterally revoke Article 50](#). Mr Taylor is one of three Green politicians acting as a plaintiff in the case. Other plaintiffs include Green Party England and Wales Co-leader Jonathan Bartley, Green Party Northern Ireland Leader and [recently re-elected](#) MLA Steven Agnew and Director of the Good Law Project Jolyon Maugham QC.

Keith said:

“Today’s looming defeat of the government by the House of Lords is entirely sensible and welcome. And it begs the same question that the Dublin Case seeks an answer to: can the UK unilaterally revoke Article 50 once it’s been triggered?”

“Without an answer to the question, it is difficult to see how our sovereign Parliament can be given any hope of a meaningful vote. The ability to revoke Article 50 means that no option is off the table, including the option to remain in the EU if MPs, and the people they represent, believe the exit deal

is not in Britain's best interests.”

“As Greens, we are clear on the need for a ratification referendum at the end of the two-year negotiation process. The EU referendum should have been the start of a democratic process, not the end. The [people must have the final say](#) on the deal negotiated on their behalf.”

“If ‘taking back control’ is to mean anything, it should mean we have a right to think again and change our minds when we see what Brexit really means as opposed to what we were told it meant during the referendum.”

[Tweet](#)

[Back to main news page](#)

[Let's block ads! \(Why?\)](#)