We joined because there were many challenges like protecting the environment better dealt with collectively, to obtain the economic advantages from trading with each other, and to use the combined weight of all the member states to negotiate more effectively with other countries.

Similarly we are in NATO because it provides us with collective defence against external attack.

In return we accept the obligation to come to the defence of an ally under attack even if it is a massive erosion of sovereignty.

Every time the Westminster Parliament decides that the UK should sign up to an international convention, we accept some loss of sovereignty because of the benefit to our country of belonging to particular agreements, such as the UN Conventions against Terrorism.

It is wrong to assume that leaving the EU would recover our country.

Rather it would deny us the established economic benefits, and expose us, alone, to negotiate with others. Like all countries our freedoms would also be limited by market forces.

Outside the EU, I am sure we could negotiate a free trade agreement with the EU.

But that would only mean that there would be no customs duties on our exports to the EU member states.

More important is access to the single market which currently necessitates us conforming to the common regulations which we have been party to their agreement.

The single market prevents any impediment to British exports.

It means that if the product manufactured in Cardiff meets the regulations of the Single Market, then it can be exported to 27 other countries without any red tape.

Outside the EU we would still have to meet those regulations, and as they evolved, we would not be participating in the decisions. This would be particularly detrimental to the services sector like insurance.

Norway is now in that position. To get access to the single market, it has to abide by all its rules. Moreover, although not a member, it is the tenth largest contributor to the EU budget, and has to accept free movement of peoples from EU member states.

The UK, outside, can only have access to the single market on the terms determined by the EU, when we would have no say.

Is that the recovery of our own country which Brexit wants. Too much Tosh is being heard from the irrational Toff leading the Brexit campaign.

Britain over the last three years has made a net contribution to the EU budget of 19 million per day, or 136 million per week. Of course these are not the figures quoted by Brexit.

Much of the money returned from Brussels supports academic research across the UK and regional aid, as in West Wales and the Valleys.

Brexit supporters argue that outside the EU, Westminster would be free to decide how to spend all the contribution currently made to the EU.

The wild promises to reduce tax on petrol, to aid farmers and so on already seem to be taking up more than the gross sum sent to Brussels.

But could Pembrokeshire, if the UK leaves, rely on Westminster to deliver the same support? History suggests emphatically not. Similarly Welsh Universities would end up severely disadvantaged.

We live in an increasingly insecure world. Syria, the Middle East, terrorism, North Korea, extremism of all sorts are bound.

This is not a moment to cast off into mid Atlantic and leave relations which have served us well.

In the United States, a special relationship with the UK is seldom spoken of.

I would not wish to rely solely on the United States after the next Presidential election.

To paraphrase Churchill ''there is only thing worse than negotiating with EU partners, and that is having no EU partners with whom to negotiate".