

27th February, 2017

## "EU" Lords

If you are a Peer in the House of Lords, or MP in the House of Commons who has worked directly for the EU, for example, at EU Commissioner level, you also have to take an Oath of Allegiance to the EU, and another oath to the Crown, why are you even allowed to vote when there is clear conflict of interest on matter regarding the UK and the EU - the first oath, below, relates to the EU Commissioners, and is taken before the European Courts of Justice (ECJ); the second oath, below relates to those MP's or Lords, sitting in either the Commons or the Lords.

### **SOLEMN DECLARATION Before the COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION**

pursuant to Article 17 of the Treaty on European Union and Article 245 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Having been appointed as a Member of the European Commission by the European Council, following the vote of consent by the European Parliament

*"I solemnly undertake:*

*to respect the Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union in the fulfilment of all my duties;*

*to be completely independent in carrying out my responsibilities, **in the general interest of the Union;***

*in the performance of my tasks, neither to seek nor to take instructions from any Government or from any other institution, body, office or entity;*

*to refrain from any action incompatible with my duties or the performance of my tasks.*

I formally note the undertaking of each Member State to respect this principle and not to seek to influence Members of the Commission in the performance of their tasks.

I further undertake to respect, both during and after my term of office, the obligation arising therefrom, and in particular the duty to behave with integrity and discretion as regards the acceptance, after I have ceased to hold office, of certain appointments or benefits."

**For the British Oath of Allegiance, the following text applies.**

*"I (name of Member) swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors, according to law. So, help me God."*

**Clearly**, there cannot be any reconciliation between these two conflicting oaths when it comes to matters of conflicting interests of the EU, and the interests of the UK - it can only be a binary choice.

So why are those who have given an oath to the EU allowed to sit in our Parliament?

It is not possible - to maintain their position - if they act in the best interests of Britain - and that is against the interests of the EU, and a breach of their oath to the EU. However, much they claim to be honourable; such a system could never work. Nor was it ever planned to work, except in the interests of the EU.

Neither is the system transparent, since the Peers in the House of Lords, are not required to register their EU pensions. Such a disclosure would automatically imply that they have also signed an oath to the EU.

This is not just about "Brexit" it applies to every law that is passed, whether it is in Britain's interest or not.

Therefore, the only reason for their presence in our Parliamentary system is to look after the interests of the EU; so they should not be allowed vote. They should only reside in the location to which they have their true loyalty – the EU.

When the "EU" Lords enter "our" Parliament, where all members have to swear an oath to our Queen (and hence the British people) they would automatically breach their obligations to the EU.

So our Democracy, and Parliament itself, are little more than a sham when it comes to EU - UK relations.

The House of Lords in its current form must be abolished, and re-balanced, in order to ensure that our Parliament is placed in a configuration which maintains a loyal UK majority vote - whichever Political Party is in power.

### **Article 50 and the Loyalty of the Lords? \***

Whilst there are a number of areas where the government would be placed at a disadvantage when negotiating our departure from the EU, there are two particular areas, which the Lords appear to be concentrating on. They seem to be deliberately plotting to tie the hands of our negotiators, and place the advantage with the EU.

These two areas are:

- (1) trying to force the government to guarantee the rights of EU citizens currently in the UK, without first requiring that our own British citizens, within the EU member states, are also fully protected in exactly the same manner; and guaranteed by the EU,
- (2) a plot to try to force the government to concede the final agreement between the UK and the EU to Parliament.

We will soon discover the true loyalty of the Lords (EU and UK) in the Upper Chamber of "our" Parliament.

The very fact that these two requirements have been pushed to the fore, shows that those devising the amendments (plots) are clearly loyal only to the EU - whether they have sworn an oath to the EU or not, and irrespective of the fact that they will have certainly sworn an oath to the Queen, and thereby, to the British people.

It is quite astonishing that under the first Lords' plot - the rights of EU citizens are placed higher in importance to the rights of our own citizens, currently residing in the EU member states; by those who seek to attach amendment (plot 1) to the Article 50 (TEU) Bill.

Under the second plot the Lords show their loyalty is truly towards the EU and against the interests of the British people - since they seek to determine what is best only for the EU.

In fact, they have already shown; through their "EU" Lords spokespeople, their utter disdain and lack of respect for the British people, by their determination to stop our government implementing the will of the people. As was established through a properly constituted Referendum.

The Lords, in majority, refuse to accept the result of the 2016 Referendum vote, in order to protect the EU, not for the good of our country.

To place the actions of the Lords (and others) in perspective - when the Conservatives were elected in 2015, the opposition (all of them) were unable to implement their own plans and therefore, subsequently, used the Unions to attempt to remove the government with what should be considered as, a coordinated programme of public disobedience.

These actions by the Left, took place because they had no power in Parliament to change the government's plans for a Referendum - nevertheless they have not succeeded in removing the government - so far, at least.

They (the Left) also tried the same, and other methods, after the Referendum vote, but realised that the only way that they would have any way of controlling the outcome of the EU Referendum, in favour of the EU, would be to interfere directly through Parliament.

That was only possible using the courts, and since the highest courts are controlled by the EU - they have allowed those who are loyal to the EU to bring their power into the Upper House, in order to protect the EU.

They failed to make much headway in the Lower House of Parliament, at that time, though.

The key element of this Parliamentary attack though was to prevent Theresa May from using the Royal Prerogative; which had been used to bring all the previous EU Treaties into UK law, without Parliamentary scrutiny.

That included the Lisbon Treaty (2007) upon which a Referendum was promised in the 2005 New Labour Manifesto - and promptly reneged on.

Be in no doubt that any action to prevent the invocation of Article 50 (TEU) by Parliament, and in particular the Lords, has nothing to do with what is best for Britain - only what is best for the EU.

Those who vote to add any amendments to the Article 50 (TEU) Bill will receive their 30 pieces of silver from the EU, for their loyalty to a foreign power, if they haven't already.