

What constitutes a lawful Parliament?

Albert Burgess

In the beginning our forefathers set up Parliament as a tri-partite agreement, this was done using the common law. The House of Commons have originated all legislation after blackmailing King Henry V who needed a tax raised, the House of Commons made it conditional on being solely responsible for starting all legislation. So since 1420 all legislation has originated in the House of Commons.

The legislation is then passed to the House of Lords who strictly in accordance with their collective conscience they approve it send it back for amendment or reject it.

If it receives the House of Lords approval it is sent to the King as a petition for his approval. Strictly in accordance with his conscience the King will grant or refuse the Royal assent, if the King refuses the assent he cannot be asked to give his reasons.

In 1609 the House of Commons as a part of their power grab wrote to tell the House of Lords they were the Knights Burgess's and Barons of the high court of Parliament. The House of Lords correctly wrote back saying they would never accept them as Barons and without the House of Lords they were no court at all.

In 1667 the House of Commons told the House of Lords as an extension of their power grab they could not amend a money bill. A ten-year argument ensued until in 1677 the House of Lords in a moment of madness gave

way. There is no constitutional justification for this and it is only a convention with no force of law.

This came back to haunt us in 1909 when Asquith's government put forward a budget part of which would give the common man a pension, the House of Lords believing they could not amend it and knowing the common man could not afford the extra tax on top of the tax he was already paying, rejected the budget. Asquith told them he was putting a bill forward to remove their right to reject a bill. The House of Lords said they would not pass the bill. Asquith said he would put five hundred new Peers into the House of Lords who would vote for its abolition if they did not agree to his bill. (Blackmail) In another moment of madness the House of Lords gave way and approved the bill. Now the bill was placed before King Edward VII who refused the assent on the grounds the bill was unconstitutional and removed a protection from his subjects, Asquith was ordered to go to the country, he and his ministers toured the country telling the common man those rich Lords with their large estates would not let the common man have a pension. The Lords felt it was beneath them to tour the country saying look boys and girls the reason we rejected the budget was because we knew you could not afford the extra tax to pay for it. Asquith was returned. The Bill was written into the Kings speech when he reached it he said the only reason I am

doing this is because my ministers say I have too. But the King could refuse the assent again shortly after this the King fell ill and died. On coming to the Throne King George V was told was told by a minister he kept all his prerogatives but could not use any of them without the backing of a minister, so in two fell swoops the House of Commons had neutered the House of Lords and usurped the Royal Prerogative. So in 1911 the House of Commons committed two acts of treason and Parliament ceased to be legally/lawfully constituted.

To overawe the House of Lords right to conduct their own business their own way constitutes treason contrary to Sec 3 of the 1848 Treason Felony Act.

To usurp the Royal Prerogative is to imagine the death of the King as a fully sovereign King contrary to the 1351 Treason Act.

As laws can only be made by a legally constituted Parliament and as it ceased to be legally constituted in 1911 with the 1911 Parliament Act no legislation since 1911 is lawful. And has no force of law.

As the Royal Prerogative was usurped in 1911 and the Royal Prerogative by common law must be given by the King personally, and as the Royal Assent has not according to a report by the House of Commons library been given in person by the Sovereign since 1854 no legislation

Continued on page 2

INSIDE: Why we must stay steadfast in Brexit negotiations p 3 – Time to talk up Brexit benefits p 3 - Striking a balance p 4 – How are Brexit negotiations going? p 6 - UK economy still doing well p 7 – Winning contracts p 7 - EU marches on with centralisation p 8 – Cheaper food outside the EU p 8 - Lesson for UK prosecutor p 8 – Brexit in name only p 8 - Letter p 9

What constitutes a lawful Parliament

Continued from page 1

since then has the force of law. And Sec 3 of the 1848 Treason Felony Act cuts in. No act of Parliament brought in by breaking the common law rules Parliament was formed by has any legal authority. Parliament cannot alter the common law, because it was by the common law that Parliament was formed so the common law governs the actions of Parliament. As a result all bills passing through Parliament are required to follow the spirit of the common law.

Sir Edward Coke CJ ruled Parliament may some times pass a law which is repugnant, against common right and reason or is impossible to perform in which case the common law will intercede and strike it down.

There is another type of higher law that which is a contract between the King and the subject these form major parts of our English Constitution. These comprise Magna Carta 1215 which King John signed after being confronted by the Estates of England at Runnymede; the Estates of England constitute the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal and the commonality of England. Thousands of the freemen of England attended at Runnymede, because King John was oppressing them using foreign mercenaries. Magna Carta 1215 was not new law; it was a restatement of existing law. Magna Carta 1215 was no more than King John agreeing to rule us according to our existing law. Magna Carta 1215 states you cannot be fined unless you have been found guilty of an offence in a court of law. Sec 39/40 applies.

The Estates of England were asked to assemble by King Edward III in May 1366, who had had monies demanded by the Pope on the justification of a debt to the Pope by King John in 1213 when he surrendered England to the Pope and rented it back as a vassal King to the Pope. The Estates of England Ruled England did not belong to King John it was not his to give away, John only held England for those who followed on. The Monies were not owed because

King John broke the law. 2 Stubbs 435. Select Documents of English Constitutional Law. Adams and Stephens, Macmillan 1921. In light of the above constitutional law the paying of monies out of this Kingdom to foreign powers for any purpose are illegal and constitutes theft from Her Majesty's subjects. Tax monies, are only permitted to be raised in this ancient Kingdom to fight wars or improve the Kingdom for Her Majesty's subjects. Paying monies to the EU or as foreign aid is outside the custom and practice of England for the raising or dispersal of tax monies raised from the Queens subjects. Parliament are their as advisors to the King that is their roll. England's Kings are the supreme governors of England the King rules Parliament assists. Politicians and Peers are subjects of the King as subjects they are subject to the rule of the King the King is not subject to the rule of Parliament. On the 8th March 1784 after a twenty year running fight with Parliament as to where ultimate sovereignty lay, with the lawfully anointed King or with the elected House. After a speech by William Pitt the younger in which he asked is it better to be ruled by one despot than by three hundred and fifty despots none of whom can agree. The King won the vote so by English common law and by Parliamentary vote Queen Elizabeth II is the supreme governor of England from where all her other titles, pre-eminences and superiorities flow. Hume and Smollett History of England vol III Dec 1880 p 90/92.

The Estates of England met again in January 1689 after King James II had fled with his Family to France having been ruling us outside the rule of English Law; at the request of Prince William of Orange a meeting of the Estates of England was called King James II having prorogued Parliament before he fled to France. Without a Parliament the Estates of England is the only body capable of taking decisions of national importance, the Estates of England drew up the 1689 Declaration of Rights this was shown

to Prince William and Princess Mary of Orange. They were offered the Crown of England subject to them accepting the terms of the Declaration of Rights. They accepted the terms the Crown was being offered on. Immediately, King William III called a Parliament but decided against an immediate election he appointed the Estates of England as his first Parliament, the first thing they did was put the Declaration into law as the 1689 Bill of Rights. The Declaration and Bill of Rights outlaw excessive fines that all promises of fines or forfeiture of particular persons are illegal and void. This was a reissue of our existing ancient law.

Today this unlawful assembly calling itself a Parliament are issuing excessive fines, £1,000 seems to be the figure they have settled upon for the common man this is clearly excessive when you compare it to his monthly wage. The threats of excessive fines for failing to return a tax assessment form, or not having a TV licence or a whole series of motoring or other fines. Are illegal and void. This is particularly odious when you consider the purported Parliament is not constituted as our constitutional arrangements of a lawfully constituted Parliament demand every piece of legislation since the 1911 Parliament Act was applied is illegal and pernicious. The question we must ask ourselves is, is this ancient Kingdom ruled by the rule of law, have the common and constitutional arrangements and the custom and practice of our Parliament been broken thus making any decisions made by Parliament void and of no effect.

Books used for research;

Rights of the Kingdom or, Customs of our Ancestors Touching the Duty Power, Election, or Succession of our Kings and Parliaments, our True Liberty, Due Allegiance Three Estates, their Legislative Power, Original, Judicial, and Executive. John Sadler 1682. EEBO Editions Hume and Smollett vol III 1880 p90/92

Select Documents of English Constitutional History Adams and Stephens 1921. Macmillan - King Edward VII Vol 6 Gresham Publishing Company

Why we must remain steadfast in Brexit negotiations

Unlike many of his fellow conservative members of parliament Daniel Kaczynski MP, has expressed in a recent article the real situation for the UK.

“Today Great Britain stands at a crossroads; it is here where we must decide whether we will stand strong and boldly go forward or whether we will cower before a group of un-elected bureaucrats thrust out from power in their home countries.

Our Brexit negotiations have featured heavily in the news recently over the Government’s supposed plan to stay within the customs union past 2021. How we react to this will not only determine the future of our Brexit negotiations but also our negotiations with other nations post-Brexit. If we appear weak then future trading partners will view us as a pushover and our standing on the world stage will become more questionable.

Britain must remain steadfast in her negotiations and not allow any extension of the transition period. An extension will leave our nation, as Jacob Rees-Mogg so eloquently stated, in a perpetual Brexit purgatory where we are neither out nor in the EU. If we acquiesce to the EU then we will likely follow the same route of European countries that had referenda on

particular issues and then were either forced to vote again or their results ignored. Make no mistake; the customs union is the EU’s method of keeping us tied to them and trying to ensure as soft a Brexit as possible or, if possible, stop Brexit happening altogether. This will be a betrayal not only of the 17.4m people who voted to leave the EU but also of Eurosceptic Europeans who are looking to the UK for guidance.

Brexit has given Britain the opportunity to be a beacon of hope for the millions of people on the European continent who agree with us yet, at this moment, have no voice and we must not squander this one-in-a-lifetime chance. If we accept the EU’s demands regarding the customs union then we will be sending a message to other countries in Europe that there is no realistic way out of the EU; essentially proving that the EU is one giant Roach Motel where you can check in but you can never check out.

A perfect example of this is Poland where the EU is trying to force the Polish people to adopt the Euro as their currency despite there being a mere 15% support for it. If we can stand firm and refuse to bow to the European Union’s demands then we can act as a perfect example to Poland and other European countries that have their own

grievances with the EU but need a figurehead to mimic and rally behind.

To those who say that we cannot negotiate a good deal and we must accept whatever the EU offers us I would remind them that Britain has always been a nation that has faced impossible odds and won. In 1984 Mrs Thatcher went to Fontainebleau and achieved what many had said was unachievable; she went to the EU negotiating table and she won. She succeeded where all had expected her to fail and achieved a permanent rebate for the UK; in doing so she demonstrated that the EU can and should be negotiated with in a tough, direct manner. This is a lesson that we should take great care to not forget for Europe’s sake as well as our own.

Just after the 2016 referendum Peter Hitchens stated that he feared that we would not truly leave the European Union; he used the line ‘I fear we may go from one foot in to one foot out.’ This is something that the Government must ensure does not happen because, if it does, we will have to ask ourselves if Brexit was even worth it. If we choke at this point in the negotiations we will appear weak to Europe and the wider world, our post Brexit trade will suffer and the Elites in Europe will have won. This cannot be allowed to happen.”

Time to talk up Brexit benefits

On the eve of the second anniversary of the EU referendum, the independent Labour Peer, Lord Stoddart of Swindon criticised the Government for its: “negativity and failure to make clear the many benefits the United Kingdom will enjoy outside of the European Union. The British people had a vision of a positive future outside of the EU, when they bravely voted for Brexit on 23rd June 2016. It is about time the Government did too!”

Lord Stoddart of said: “It really is very disappointing that it has to be the

American Ambassador who is reminding us of what a great country we are and of the optimistic future we can look forward to outside of the EU. He is absolutely right to be dismayed at the defeatism we, as a nation, are exhibiting towards Brexit. It is high time that our rather negative Government, which seems to regard the negotiations with the EU as some sort of damage limitation exercise, started being a cheer leader for the benefits of leaving the EU, not least the £10.5 billion net and rising that we will no longer have to pay to be in this

failing economic bloc.

“The passage of the European Union (Withdrawal) Bill through both Houses of Parliament last month (June 18th-22nd) was hugely significant because it means that the European Communities Act 1972, which made the EU supreme over Westminster, will be repealed. In other words, despite the endless anti-democratic wailing of the Remain brigade, there is no going back, we are leaving the European Union and re-establishing the supremacy of our own Government and Parliament. Not before time!”

Striking a balance

Open Europe's report of June 4th,

"Striking a Balance: A blueprint for the UK-EU future economic relationship."

The following is an extract from an article published on the *Open Europe* web site;

"... The debate at the moment is polarised between hard-line leavers who refuse to accept giving up any sovereignty whatever the economic costs, and extreme remainers who want to either reverse the referendum result or at least recreate the entire structures of the EU from the outside. This is not where business or the public are. A sensible compromise recognises that giving up a little sovereignty can deliver good economic benefits, but there are diminishing returns in asking for more.

The UK economy is strongly services dominated (around 80% of our economy) – we cannot simply be a rule-taker in key industries such as financial services. The approach on services therefore should be about managing divergence....

The majority of our services trade is with the world beyond the EU, and even in some areas where the Single Market in services is most developed – for example financial services – only 36% of our exports are to the EU. There is also an increasing uncertainty cost of pursuing a deal which is unlikely to be negotiable.

On goods we take a different approach. The Single Market in goods is far more developed than services and was a significant achievement of British EU membership. We believe it makes sense broadly to maintain alignment with its rules. The EU is our most important goods' market and the most highly-regulated sectors – electrical, automobiles, and chemicals – are the areas which we trade most with the EU and are growing the fastest. Although there might be some benefit from regulatory divergence, we judge that the Government should commit to maintaining the *acquis* on goods. There should be an assumption that future goods regulations are followed by the UK, but this process

would not be automatic. It would be open to the UK, as a third country, to decide not to follow a particular new regulation, knowing that this could affect market access and ultimately potentially the broader agreement....

In this report, *Open Europe* sets out a model for the UK and EU's future economic relationship, which we believe offers a pragmatic way through the Brexit deadlock. Open Europe's model lies between the so-called Canada and Norway arrangements framing the UK political debate.

Our proposal is that the UK should seek to remain close to the EU in terms of goods regulations. After all, as a member the UK was a key supporter of the Single Market, which replaced the European Common Market, in the late 1980s. In return for the UK keeping broad alignment with the EU's rules, it would be reasonable for goods to continue to be freely traded with Europe. The UK should commit to maintaining the existing '*acquis*' of rules over goods regulation, and will need a process to determine how to apply future regulation, which must not be simply automatic. Switzerland's experience of alignment with EU goods rules illustrates that this does not necessarily mean full harmonisation with detailed EU rules in all goods sectors, only those that are already highly regulated. There is scope for flexibility for many products and, as a "third country", the UK would be open to decide not to apply a new EU regulation, but this could prompt retaliation from the EU and might have an effect on market access.

When it comes to services, given this is where the UK's comparative advantage lies, we do not believe the UK can be a long-term rule taker from the EU. Although, it should be possible to seek a more secure relationship than the existing equivalence regime for financial services, overall it will be for both sides to manage mutual divergence in services regulation.

Seeking a deeper deal would likely mean accepting wide-ranging level playing field rules. We believe that the UK must be able to regulate its wider economy, and that so-called level playing field requirements must be minimised as they would limit the Government's ability to regulate areas including employment, taxation and the environment. It would not be sustainable for the EU to have control over such policy areas after Brexit.

Giving up some control – or sovereignty – over goods regulation, is a price worth paying for strong market access. Manufacturers in highly regulated industries often follow EU rules anyway, in some cases even in the United States. But seeking to replicate the patchy Single Market in services would require the UK to give away too much control over its economy, for too little gain.

Proposed bespoke UK-EU model

The UK and EU should agree an extensive Free Trade Agreement which takes as its starting point zero-tariff and zero-quota trade across all goods lines, with maximal customs cooperation (Open Europe's suggested model in 'Nothing to Declare' is roughly equivalent to the Government's Maximum Facilitation option; as an alternative the Government is considering creating a Customs Partnership with the EU).

The UK-EU agreement should be part of an overall partnership or association agreement – which creates a framework for managing UK-EU relations with chapters covering fields from trade to security. The UK and EU should not pursue a complex network of separate bilateral agreements of the sort which Switzerland and the EU have formed. However, the relationship will need to be flexible and will inevitably need to be able to evolve over time.

* The UK should not seek to remain

Striking a balance

part of the European Economic Area (EEA) Agreement, which would provide ongoing membership of the Single Market. Nor should the UK seek to form a new customs union with the EU.

* The UK and EU should agree to “managed alignment” over goods standards and regulations in return for the UK’s Swiss-style participation in the Single Market for goods. A broad-spectrum enhanced mutual recognition agreement would mean most goods manufactured by one party would be considered pre-authorised for sale across others. In highly-regulated sectors the UK may need to agree to continue to follow EU regulations. This process would not be automatic and it would be open to the UK Parliament to diverge from the EU’s regulatory framework, but if this divergence could not be resolved via negotiation or legal means, market access to the EU could be affected.

* As the European Commission itself has said, customs checks represent only a fraction of procedures that take place at a border – the majority of these are regulatory controls on goods, or checks on agriculture and food. Under our model, where the UK agrees to accept and apply EU rules on goods in domestic law, there is high potential for mutual recognition of regulations to avoid the need for border checks. This, together with a comprehensive customs facilitation agreement that moves customs procedures away from the border, provides a strong basis for maintaining an open border on the island of Ireland.

* Our analysis has primarily concentrated on manufactured goods rather than the agriculture and food sector. The choices that the UK makes on its alignment with EU rules on agriculture will have significant implications for finding a solution to the Irish border and how much flexibility the UK has in trade negotiations with non-EU countries. *Open Europe* will address these issues in future work.

* On services the UK and EU should agree to “managed cooperation”, recognising that the UK could not be a rule taker in these areas. The ambition should be a high level of regulatory cooperation, including a combination of mutual recognition and enhanced equivalence. Both sides need the freedom to choose separate rules over services and this will inevitably lead to the loss of Single Market-style rights in some sectors.

* Although a wide-ranging mutual recognition agreement for financial services would be ideal, an expanded equivalence regime would seem more achievable politically at this stage. This would necessitate a framework for regulatory cooperation, and lengthy lead times for disputes to be addressed before equivalence or market access could be withdrawn by either party. Higher levels of access would necessitate the UK accepting wider EU level-playing field demands which is undesirable.

* The UK is not likely to deviate significantly from its existing socio-economic norms, will probably retain the majority of the EU *acquis* as a non-member, and is likely to remain within the spectrum of European-style economies. However, the UK should not commit to following future EU rules as part of a level playing field agreement. Such a commitment could mean the UK Government giving up control of the regulation of significant areas of its economy, including over employment and labour regulations, environmental standards, and corporate and other taxation policies. It is likely that any dispute resolution mechanism included in the agreement will be available to either party if they feel the other side is seeking an unfair competitive advantage through lowering standards.

* As a non-member the UK should be able to achieve a good level of access to the EU’s markets, and vice versa, through the relationship detailed above. Obtaining fuller access, especially on services, would entail a much greater loss of control,

encompassing not just trade but also the wider UK domestic economy. There are diminishing returns available to a more integrated relationship than the model Open Europe proposes.

* On data the UK should seek an adequacy agreement with the EU but should not commit to follow in lockstep with EU data rules. Again, this cross-cutting sector is too important for our future economy for the UK to be a simple rule-taker.

* Unlike the EU’s relationship with Switzerland, there will need to be a joint mechanism for dispute resolution and investor protection. This cannot simply be via the European Court of Justice. For some sectors – particularly where the UK agrees to continue to follow or approximate EU law, such as goods – it may make sense for certain disputes to be handled by the UK docking into the EFTA Court (a separate court with which the EU already works) and appointing a judge to that body, or by a new institution with similar characteristics. In other areas, where UK-EU cooperation more resembles a traditional FTA and is not based on EU law, the remit of the EFTA Court would not necessarily apply and dispute resolution with joint committees or via ad hoc arbitration would be more appropriate.

* In areas where the UK voluntarily commits to follow EU regulations, or to participate in EU agencies on an associate membership basis, the UK will need to accept an indirect role for the ECJ. However, a direct role should remain a UK red line.

* We have not explicitly examined the trade-off between preferential access to the Single Market and any requirement to accept the free movement of people. This would be a matter for negotiation and compromises might include preferential, reciprocal schemes for UK and EU nationals. There is no inherent reason why close UK-EU integration for trade in goods requires the complete free movement of labour. Source: openeurope.org.uk

How are Brexit negotiation going?

Questions and answers on Labour and the Brexit negotiations

We have pleasure in reproducing an extract from the May Bulletin issued by Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign run by John Mills who has financially supported the Labour Party. In this list of questions and answers he sets out plainly and clearly the problems and ways to negotiate a successful Brexit with the EU.

What is wrong with the UK being in the Customs Union while not a member of the European Union?

There is a long list of problems with the UK being part of a Customs Union with the EU 27 but not a full EU member. First, this is not an outcome which is compatible with the spirit of the result of the 2016 EU referendum and it is therefore very likely to be regarded as a sell-out by a large section of the electorate. Second, it would be highly unsatisfactory for the UK, the fifth or sixth largest economy in the world, to have its trade relationships with rest of the planet determined by people over whom the UK would have no control. Third, being in the EU Customs Union would preclude the UK from being able to conclude trade treaties with the world outside the EU, where 80% of the growth in the coming years is expected to take place. Fourth, the EU external tariff artificially raises the costs of many of the items, such as food, clothing and footwear, which feature disproportionately highly in the budgets of poorer people. Fifth the EU's external tariff discriminates strongly against undeveloped and developing countries, providing protection to inefficient EU producers at the expense of much poorer people in the Third World.

What about the border in Northern Ireland?

To overcome an impasse in the UK's

Brexit negotiations in December 2017, the UK conceded that, if no other way could be found of eliminating the need for a hard border between Northern and Southern Ireland, arrangements would be made which effectively made the whole of Ireland a unified customs area. Remainers plus the Irish government and the EU have now said that the only way for this outcome to be accomplished is for the whole of Ireland to remain in the Customs Union, which means that there would have to be a customs border between Northern Ireland and the UK mainland if the UK was to be outside the Customs Union. This is clearly a completely unacceptable outcome, driving Remainers to conclude that the only solution is for the whole of the UK and Northern Ireland to remain in the Customs Union. This approach, however, ignores all the possibilities there are for overcoming the Irish border problem using the latest technology.

How could the Irish border problem be overcome?

Claims that there are no technological solutions to the border between Northern and Southern Ireland are not borne out either by practical experience elsewhere or by what we are told by experts in the field. 23,000 lorries a day on average cross the Swiss border using pre-clearance and trusted trader systems and two million people each day cross into or leave Switzerland. Similar arrangements apply between the USA and Canada and have recently been shown to work between Norway and Sweden. HMRC in the UK and its equivalent in Eire have both said that electronic systems would be workable as indeed was confirmed by a report produced for the European Parliament. The reason why these obviously sensible ways of resolving the Irish border problem are not being pursued

is that the EU and the Irish government see putting difficulties in the way of a technological solution as a way of putting pressure on the UK to submit control of much of trade to EU dictates whether or not we are in the EU – not least because, if we are in the Customs Union, it would entail us submitting to almost all of the Single Market regime.

Where does this leave us more generally on the Brexit negotiations?

Unfortunately, the disputes over the Customs Union and the Irish border have become all too symptomatic of the way that the Brexit negotiations generally have been going. Time is running out as problems remain unresolved and the March 2019 deadline approaches. Substantive talks on trade have been parked, pending agreement being reached on other issues. The UK is deeply split. On the one hand are those who supported Leave, and who thought they were voting for the UK to be outside the Customs Union and the Single Market with a trade deal broadly similar to the one negotiated between the EU and Canada. On the other side are Remain voters, many of whom, while paying lip service to the outcome of the Referendum, are doing their best to create conditions similar to those which would have prevailed if the Referendum had never taken place. Indeed, a sizeable minority are actively campaigning to have another Referendum to reverse the result of the last one. The resulting lack of clarity about what the UK is really trying to achieve is gravely weakening the UK's negotiating position,

What might we be heading for?

The danger implicit in the way the UK's Brexit negotiations are currently going is that we finish up with the worst of all worlds – still in the Single

How are Brexit negotiation going?

Market and the Customs Union and possibly the European Economic Area – but outside the European Union. We would then still be paying in large sums of money net every year, subject to a wide measure of control by the European Court of Justice, with no control over our borders, unable to make our own trade treaties and still subject to the Common Agricultural and Fisheries Policies – all with no voting control over any of the way they evolve. This would be substantially worse than being in the EU, as we still are now, where at least we are voting members and therefore in a position to influence how events develop. This is, however, certainly not what the 2016 Referendum decided what our future should be, remembering all the assurances we were given by our leading politicians and by the Commons – with a huge majority – that the decision on our future relationship between the UK and the EU, taken by during the Referendum, would be taken as binding and acted upon accordingly by Parliament. Nor would this kind of fudge provide a stable future outcome for future years. It would be so unsatisfactory for the

UK that Euroscepticism and all the battles which have been fought during the last forty-odd years would continue. It is surely in everyone's interest – the EU's as much as ours – that the outcome of the Brexit negotiations should be one with which all concerned can live reasonably happily in future.

What can be done to bring the Brexit negotiations to a more satisfactory conclusion?

Events since the Referendum, not least the outcome of the 2017 general election, have put the UK in a difficult position, allowing those who never wanted a Leave outcome to undermine the UK's negotiating stance to the extent which has brought upon us our current difficulties. It is now urgent that as much clarity as possible is restored to the UK's negotiating stance....

Where does this leave the Labour Party?

Understandably, the Parliamentary Labour Party wants to make life

difficult for the government. Oppositions are there to oppose. The stakes on the Brexit negotiations, however, have now, become very high, with key national interests at issue, which it is crucial that Labour should avoid compromising for short-term party-political advantage. The country now needs to unite round obtaining the best possible Brexit result. We cannot afford to run the risk of a really poor outcome as a result of our politicians – and particularly those in the House of Lords - constantly weakening the UK's negotiating position by claiming to accept the result of the 2016 Referendum while in practice doing their best to subvert it. Labour must also avoid forgetting the strength of feeling there is both in support of Brexit and for respecting the results of the 2016 EU Referendum among large numbers of traditional Labour voters. In the best interests of both the country and Labour's own future, now is the time when a coherent national negotiating stance is line with the referendum outcome needs to be maintained.

Source: www.lesc.org.uk

UK economy still doing well

Yet again regardless of the pro-EU lobby doom and gloom warnings for the UK economy the real figures are much better.

The UK's public sector borrowing fell to £5 billion in May, down £2 billion from a year earlier, official figures show. The fall was bigger than expected and brings borrowing for the financial year up to May at £11.8 billion, £4.1 billion less than in the

same period in 2017.

At the same time Office for National Statistics (ONS) revised down it figure for government borrowing in 2017-18 to £39.5billion.

This is the lowest annual level of borrowing in 11 years.

Furthermore, the UK's economic growth has been revised up for the fourth quarter of the year after construction data was found to be

stronger than earlier estimates.

Growth for the three months to May was 0.3% according to the ONS compared with the previous 3-month period.

There was even more good news for the economy as separate ONS data showed the service sector grew by 0.3% in April. That was the fastest monthly growth for the sector since November 2017.

Winning contracts

British defence giant BAE Systems has won a multi-billion pound contract from the Australian government to build nine new warships, marking a significant victory for British military exports. BAE beat

Italian and Spanish rivals to win a large slice of the £19.6 billion (A\$ 35 billion) spending programme.

The ships will be based on anti-submarine frigate that BAE is building for the UK's Royal Navy.

However, the new warships will be built in Australia by a local workforce. The UK could learn from contracts being awarded to foreign companies but constructed in the UK by a UK workforce.

EU marches on with centralisation

At the beginning of May the European Commission announced its proposal for the new Multi-Annual Financial Framework (MFF) covering the period 2021-2027.

* Migration and border management spending increase from €12.4 billion. to around €33 billion.

* Creating a 'European Peace Facility', an off-budget instrument estimated to need €10 billion.

This is said to be needed to support military operations and capacity building under the Common Security and Defence Policy.

* Increasing funding for the security, defence and military mobility spending. The reason stated being that

of 'external threats that no member state can meet on its own', €27 billion would be set aside to 'enhance the [EU's] strategic autonomy' and step up its security and defence capacities, including via the European Defence Fund.

* To merge the existing Neighbourhood Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI).

Including in this would be the European Development Fund (EDF), which is presently outside the EU budget.

It is proposed that the NDICI would have three main areas; rapid-response, geographical and thematic. It would also include 'capacity building for

security and development' i.e. training and equipping the military.

* A flexibility cushion to address 'migratory pressures, as well as stability and security needs, and unforeseen events'.

While many of these measures may sound harmless it appears the EU is going even further down the road of creating a fortress EU within Europe. This could have far reaching problems for the member states who will have to provide finance and follow even stricter guide lines over migration. The migration issue has already caused a breakdown of the EU version of solidarity of purpose.

Cheaper food outside the EU

According to the Taxpayers Alliance one benefit from leaving the EU customs union and therefore its Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) would be cheaper food.

The point made is that the tariffs placed on food imports as a result of the CAP of the EU increases food prices for UK consumers. A paper written by Halligan & Lyons for Policy Exchange calculated that food prices

in the UK are approximately 17 per cent more expensive as a result of the common external tariff.

This figure has been corroborated by Dr Kristian Niemietz of the Institute of Economic Affairs who found that food prices inside the EEA were 17 per cent higher than the market price. Furthermore, an examination of the data provided by the World Trade Organisation reveals that there are high

tariffs placed on certain food products which are imported from outside of the EEA.

These tariffs, combined with farming subsidies, and the EU's food standard regulations, increase food prices for UK consumers substantially.

Leaving the EU would allow the UK to abolish tariffs on food products and to remove other barriers to trade which increase the price of food.

Lesson for UK prosecutor

Yet another source of finance for the UK exchequer is available or is this part of the hidden price of Brexit negotiations?

Car giant Volkswagen has been fined £880 million (€1 billion) by

German prosecutors over its diesel emission scandal.

The Braunschweig public prosecutor found Volkswagen had sold more than 10 million cars between mid 2007 and 2015 and that had emission-

test-cheating software installed.

The car firm said, it did not plan to appeal against the fine.

Volkswagen also said it had "admitted responsibility for the diesel crises".

Brexit in name only

A statement issued by Barry Legg chairman of the Bruges Group, following the Friday 6th July so-called agreement made by the Conservative Party at Chequers sums up the feelings of most eurosceptics.

"Theresa May has decided to pursue

a policy of Brexit in name only (BRINO). This arrangement will be worse than our current membership of the European Union as we will then be a vassal state.

If this policy is implemented the electoral consequences for the

Conservative Party will be dire....

The decision of the British people to leave the European Union must be honoured. In many cases an appeal to a Member of Parliament's self-interest is the most effective way of influencing him or her."

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

The British Politician

I'm a British politician
don't cha know, don't cha know,
And it's been my life's ambition,
don't cha know don't cha know.
For to join the ruling classes and
make laws for all the masses,
So they'll know who are the bosses
don't cha know, don't cha know.

Now the job is very clear,
we must listen but not hear
For you know not what you do,
don't cha know
We are on an epic mission of
reversing your decision,
If it doesn't suit *our* purpose
don't cha know, don't cha know.

Our idol's Tony Blair, he's a man
who doesn't care
*What the British public think
of any thing*
He says your wit is busted and that
you just can't be trusted
We just don't bother *what* you think,
so there!

That is why we favour strangers,
and we care not for the dangers
That this influx might just have,
upon the Nation
We have booked our place in hist'ry
so it shouldn't be a myst'ry
Why we *won't* allow you oik's above
your station

Now we're part of the elite,
we just can't accept defeat
So we have to make you people
toe the line don't cha know
You're not fit to kiss our feet
so we're turning up the heat
But we'll turn it *down* again
from time to time

Now we've made a bold decision
and we've broken with tradition
We disparage normal marriage
from now on
We will change the way you think
and we'll throw you all in clink

If you do not toe the line
and tag along

We care not if you're sad, some kids
don't have Mum *and* Dad
Gone for ever are those childhood,
halcyon days

I am British, democratic,
not some mad insane fanatic
So I trust that you will
do as you are told

If you dare express your thoughts,
you may find yourself in courts
Which are secret, no reporters;
you *still* bold?

Yes we *are* a bunch of swells,
and we're in it for our *selves*
We're ensconced inside our
private Iv'ry Towers

I'm afraid I have to tell, that
you've missed the warning bells
'Cause it's ceased to be *your* country
now it's *ours*

But as polling day comes 'round you
will find us on the ground'
Listening to all you have to say,
don't cha know?

But you really do not get it,
what *you* want well just forget it!
Cause *we* are used to getting *our* own
way, don't cha know don't cha know?

J.ALAN HEYWOOD

EU citizenship

Dear Sir,
The mainstream media make much
about the number of UK citizens
obtaining EU citizenship.

The pro-EU lobby see it as UK
citizens wishing to remain in the EU.
However, the real reason these ex-Pats
are chasing after EU citizenship is a
direct result of the EU's inability to
give any kind of protection to UK
citizens currently living and or
working in the EU-27.

The EU and the pro-EU lobby
constantly complain about the

protection for EU citizens living in the
UK. The reality is very different the
UK has already effectively given this
assurance and created an easy way for
EU citizens to remain in the UK after
Brexit.

It is time our media stop siding with
the EU and support the Brexit
referendum decision and its
implementation by the UK
government.

SANDRA PIKE
London

Second Referendum?

Dear Sir,
We constantly hear from Tony Blair
and his pro-EU lobby that the UK
should hold a second referendum.

The idea comes in different forms;

1. To force the government to offer
the MP's a final vote on whether they
accept the agreement negotiated and
reached by the government and the EU.
The problem with this is two fold
firstly, if this offer is made then the EU
just have to offer an agreement that the
UK cannot accept. This would then be
a victory for the EU and the UK would
remain a reluctant member. Secondly,
the EU would not need to make an
improved offer, as they wish the UK to
remain a paying in contributor to the
EU project.

2. Simply to trick the UK citizens
into the project fear world where big
business and the political elite remain
above the control of the electorate and
the final removal of democracy in the
UK.

Should the above fail the final hope
for the pro-EU lobby is that they use
the time factor and hold-up
proceedings until boredom sets in. At
this point the EU situation of forcing
referendum decisions to be taken again
and again until the result they require is
attained. This is the well tried and
tested EU system of control.

RICHARD BRAZIER
Surrey

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Treason

Dear Sir,

In a letter to Chuka Umunna, Anne Soubry, Sir Vince Cable and Nick Clegg I wrote the following,

I think you should do your homework about TREASON, especially The Primacy of Parliament:- To hand over the power of our Parliament/Country to a foreign power, in this case the EEC/EU, unless defeated in war, is an act of **HIGH TREASON. Edward Heath did just that and every Government since has committed High Treason when signing a new Treaty. Now, with the chance of correcting these Treasonable Acts**, you, **and your partners in crime**, are doing your best to uphold these crimes. Therefore, **You are also Guilty Of High Treason.**

Replies not yet received.

PAUL BRISTOW

Somerset

The Lords debate

Dear Sir,

In April 2017 you published a letter from me in which I called for the abolition of the un-elected House of Lords and its replacement by an Elected English Parliament. In the year that has since past the behaviour of many members of the House of Lords has become even more arrogant and destructive. Through their votes they have been striving to wreck the chances of our country achieving a smooth exit from the EU. They have been aiming to weaken the government's resolve and to embolden the EU bureaucrats in their disruption of our exit negotiations. These peers have openly revealed their treasonable mentality towards our nation.

I was therefore please to read in the May 2018 '*eurofacts*' that the eminent patriot and democrat Lord Stoddart of Swindon, had declared the House of

Lords is 'completely unrepresentative and unfit to act as a legitimate second chamber'. He also proposed three possible solutions to this unacceptable breakdown of our constitutional order. Two of them involved the abolition of the House of Lords. It has become urgent that we, Brexiteers, support Lord Stoddart's observations by campaigning vigorously for the abolition of this House of Saboteurs and Traitors.

In the June 2018 '*eurofacts*' Don Briggs looked at the implications of the three reform options Lord Stoddart put forward. He correctly pointed out that replacing the House of Lords with another appointed body would not be a solution. The appointment process would be corrupted by the same politically-motivated clique who have contrived to bring our system of government into public contempt. Don Briggs also pointed out correctly that Lord Stoddart's third option - to abolish the House of Lords without creating a second chamber - would threaten to leave us without a system of checks and balances in our constitutional arrangements.

The validity of this argument shows that we must balance the House of Commons of the United Kingdom with another elected chamber. The obvious body to fill this function would be a House to represent the English people - an English Parliament. Over the years since the Brexit vote we have seen narrow-minded Scottish and Irish Nationalists exploiting the constitutional imbalance that has given them representative assemblies yet denied one for the English. We desperately need an equivalent voice for England.

I do not expect the voting for an English Parliament to replicate the stale pattern with which we have become all too familiar in the pan-British Westminster elections. When

people are asked for reasons why they have voted for either the Labour or Conservative parties, they often reply that they have given their votes not out of enthusiasm for the party of their choice but simply out of fear of what the other party might do. Labour, bereft of its Scottish and Welsh heartlands, could hardly threaten to capture a majority in an English Parliament. Without any such prospect to alarm them, the motivation of Conservative voters would collapse. With both Labour and the Conservatives in retreat, we would find ourselves with the possibility of hearing new political voices, voices that took seriously the opinions and values of the majority of our people. The corrupt, cynical and self-indulgent elite that rules over us might at last be swept away.

GEOFFREY LITTLEJOHNS

Nottinghamshire

Brexit games

Dear Sir,

The loss of David Davis and Boris Johnson is a further sign that politicians who accept the will of the electorate are not consider important.

Clearly we are seeing that big business and corporate interference in the running of this country is treated with a higher priority than that granted to the electorate.

Voting for any of the many parties is now pointless as they have shown us that will only further their own agendas and ignore the requirements of the electorate. Those who thought UKIP was now unnecessary will have to reconsider their position.

The EU can now just continue to dictate to the UK and our elected politicians will just roll-over and grant them as much power, influence and UK taxpayers' money as they wish.

DEBORAH CLARKE

Essex

Wishing you a happy summer recess, next *eurofacts* 14th September

MEETINGS

The Economic Research Council

Tuesday **11th September**, 6.30 pm

"Egalitarian Capitalism"

Gavin Oldham, *Founder of The Share Centre*

PUBLIC MEETING

Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London

Admission by ticket

(Non-ERC members £15 - Students £10) via: www.ercouncil.org

Liberal Democrats Party Conference

15th - 18th September

Brighton Centre

UK Independence Party Conference

21st - 22nd September

ICC Birmingham

Labour Party Conference

23rd - 26th September

ACC Liverpool

Conservative Party Conference

30th September - 3rd October

ICC Birmingham

FRINGE MEETING

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Monday **1st October**, 1.00 - 2.30 pm

Further details and speakers to be announced

FRINGE MEETING

The Birmingham and Midland Institute, Margaret Street, Birmingham B3 3BS

Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

During **November**

Further details and speakers to be announced

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London SW1A 1LR

Admission charge to be announced. Will include lunch and refreshments.

FREE Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of the UK-EU relationship.

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175

or

Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Parliamentary Government Summer recess starts **24th July**

UK Parliamentary Government Summer recess ends **4th September**

EU Summit **Mid October**

UK budget **November**

2019

Romania takes over EU Council Presidency **1st January**

Official date for completion of Article 50 negotiations between the UK and the EU and start of 'Transition' due to end in December 2020 **29th March**

EU post-Brexit Summit Sibiu, Romania **May**

EU MEP elections **23rd-26th May**

Finland takes over EU Council Presidency **1st July**

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Constitution Group

www.britishconstitutiongroup.com

British Future

www.britishfuture.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaonline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk

Change Britain

www.changebritain.org

Concordance

www.concordanceout.eu

Conservatives for Britain

www.conservativesforbritain.org

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

English Constitution Group

www.englishconstitutiongroup.org

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.ccc.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Futurus

www.futurus-thinktank.com

Get Britain Out

www.getbritainout.org

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

GrassRootsOut

www.grassrootsout.co.uk

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

Leave.eu

www.Leave.eu

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The Taxpayers' Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Seizing the moment

by John Ashworth. **£4.00**

The opportunities for UK fisheries after Brexit with the restoration of the 200nm/midline resources zone.

Clean Brexit

Why Leaving The EU Still Makes Sense Building a post Brexit economy for all by Liam Halligan & Gerard Lyons.

£20.00

Economists explain why the UK should embrace Brexit and the benefits that will flow for the UK and Europe.

The Betrayal of British Industry

by J. Brian Heywood. **£3.00**

How government has failed to protect the UK industrial sector from foreign companies, putting at risk the long-term economic prosperity of the UK

The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanisms of the European Union

by Bob Lyddon. **£8.00**

How the UK's exposure to the EU is over £80 billion and maybe more.

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK only)

www.junepress.com

Special Offers

Europe's Road to War

by Paul-Marie Coûteaux MEP

£6.99 - Pbk 1999 - 132 pp

The history and track record of the "collective security" and the EU's "CFP" **(NOW ONLY £2)**

A Life Mayhem Money and Unintentional Treason

by J. Brian Heywood

£9.99 -2007 - 259 pp

This novel shows how easy it is for good intentions to be used by anyone with ambitions for a world government. **(NOW ONLY £4)**

Why Did Britain

Take The Wrong Path?

by Christopher Hoskin

£9.99 - Pbk 2009 - 270 pp

How and why the UK lost its way and ended up with a fear of self-government and gave up democracy. **(NOW ONLY £5)**

Britain Held Hostage

by Lindsay Jenkin

£11.99 - Pbk 1998 - 339 pp

The how and why of the EU explained and exposed. **(NOW ONLY £6)**

The Last Days of Britain:

The Final Betrayal

by Lindsay Jenkins

£14.99 - Pbk 2001 -302 pp

Clear evidence of how our country is losing its sovereignty. **(NOW ONLY £7)**

The Missing Heart of Europe

by Thomas Kremer

£11.99 - Pbk 2004 254 pp

Can nations survive in an integrated EU. A European businessmen's view of the likely impact of the divergent EU national cultures. **(NOW ONLY £6)**

A Life Most Ordinary

by Ken Wight

£7.99 -2016 - 177 pp

A UKIP activist reveals how his life in Slough has changed over the last 60 years especially with the rise of the EU. **(NOW ONLY £3)**

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK only)

Send Payments to The June Press Ltd

THE JUNE PRESS LTD, PO BOX 119, TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA Tel: 08456 120 175 Email: info@junepress.com

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| UK | £30 |
| Europe (Airmail) | £42/€50 |
| Rest of World | £55/\$95 |
| Reduced rate (UK only) | £20 |

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only. Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

Please send me the monthly *eurofacts* and the occasional papers.

I enclose my annual payment of £..... to *eurofacts*: PO Box 119 Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Name

Address

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| European Commission | 020 7973 1992 |
| European Movement | 020 7940 5252 |
| Federal Trust | 020 7735 4000 |

AGAINST "EU"

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Britain Out | 01403 741736 |
| British Weights & Measures Assoc. | 01738 783936 |
| Business for Britain | 0207 3406070 |
| CIB | 0116 2874 622 |

Conservativesforbritain
www.conservativesforbritain.org

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Democracy Movement | 020 7603 7796 |
| Freedom Association | 0845 833 9626 |
| Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign | 020 7691 3800 |

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| New Alliance | 020 7385 9757 |
| Fishing Association | 01224 313473 |

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

| | |
|----------------|--|
| British Future | www.britishfuture.org |
| Bruges Group | 020 7287 4414 |
| Global Britain | www.globalbritain.org |
| Global Vision | www.global-vision.net |
| Open Europe | 0207 197 2333 |

POLITICAL PARTIES

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Conservative | 020 7222 9000 |
| Rt Hon Mrs Theresa May MP | |
| English Democrats | 01277 896000 |
| Robin Tilbrook (Chairman) | |
| Green Party | 020 7272 4474 |
| Caroline Lucas MP and Jonathan Bartley | |
| Labour | 020 7783 1000 |
| Jeremy Corbyn MP | |
| Liberal | 01562 68361 |
| Mr Rob Wheway | |
| Liberal Democrats | 020 7222 7999 |
| Rt Hon Sir Vince Cable | |
| UK Independence Party | 01626 831290 |
| Acting leader Gerard Batten MEP | |

ISSN 1361-4134

