

26th July 2018

## "Empress's New Clothes"

The Chequers "White Paper" certainly marked a moment in history for the UK when a Prime Minister turned on her own people and attempted to sell them out. The circumstances surrounding the announcement of the draft agreement of the new relationship between the UK and the EU took many people by surprise - not least those who had been charged with effecting a "Brexit" agreement on behalf of the British people.

*"She must have taken note of Joseph Goebbels famous quote "If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it."*

That is the problem with the EU - it is a big lie - it is not about promoting Peace it is about Corporate greed, promoting Globalisation, enriching Bankers and the liberalisation (privatisation) of the Member States Public Services' assets.

It must now be clear to practically everyone in the country that Theresa May is only in place for one reason - to prevent the implementation of the EU Referendum result by any means - that should be a very worrying to anyone loyal to the British Isles.

The "Remoaners" reacted with stunned silence, unable to believe their faculties when the details of the "Chequers Agreement" were revealed and the EU confirmed that 80% of the "deal" had been agreed; that is until the European Research Group (ERG) added four amendments to the proposed Bill and once they realised that the Leave MP's were about to spoil their quiet celebrations.

The "Chequer's Bill" can be likened to the famous short tale by Hans Christian Andersen "The Emperor's New Clothes" and the analogy lies with a "weaver", Theresa May promising to come up with a "Brexit means Brexit" - but never having any intention of delivering the "goods".

So, at the last minute, in parliamentary terms, she hands over a "deal" given to her by Merkel (but pretends it came from Robbins) and presents it as a "Brexit" *fait accompli* on the basis that the *"British people are too stupid to notice that it is actually designed to keep Britain in the EU as a Vassal (Slave) State"* in perpetuity.

The tale does not end with the child noticing the deception though because it is spotted by the British public immediately and a cry went up for May's "head" - so far though, the Tory MP's have not had the "balls" to replace her or perhaps she always had a "get out of jail card free" card from the 1922 Committee for doing her best to ensure that the British people can never leave the EU.

In a nifty set of moves, only matched by Edward Heath and Gordon Brown.

May sidestepped responsibility for continued negotiations, after temporarily grabbing it from the new "Brexit" secretary, Dominic Raab, then quickly passed the "hot Potato" to Robbins and the EU fanatical British Civil Service to continue "Polishing the Bill" ready for the Commons and Lords to corrupt it further in favour of the EU.

The Remain camp could not believe their luck - that she might be able to not only deliver the *coup de grâce* on the aspirations of the British Electorate, but that it could result in a de facto *coup d'état* on the British State itself.

Handing over responsibility for Brexit to our Civil Service is no different to handing it over to Blair or Merkel - no wonder Blair was so confident that "Brexit" could be stopped. Not only did he (and Cameron) flood the House of Lords with Europhile Peers, but he (they) also

politicised the Civil Service and knew that they could always rely on more than 75% of the Lib Dems, SNP, Greens, Plaid Cymru, Sinn Féin and most of all the Parliamentary Labour Party to betray the British people; at least in majority - not that any of them ever needed much encouragement.

**Having done a deal behind the backs of the public**, May then tried to sneak out 5 days early, but failed, and she subsequently went on Holiday - no doubt she will meet up with Merkel once again and finalise the 20% that had not previously been agreed with the EU to ensure that "Brexit really does Morph into Remain" - as it was always planned. Perhaps they will meet at the Kehlsteinhaus in southern Bavaria.

## The Draft Withdrawal and Implementation Agreement

The comments below refer to the oral statement by Dominic Raab to Parliament related to the "Draft Withdrawal and Implementation Bill" specifically comments on selected specific areas of the Bill.

Comments from Kier Starmer; Raab's answers follow immediately after in the text below:

"Paragraph 56 of the White Paper states that:

- "EU law will continue to have effect in the UK in the same way as now for the implementation period—that is, until December 2020—but section 1 of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act, which took 18 months to get through Parliament and received Royal Assent only 28 days ago, repeals the European Communities Act on exit day, 29 March 2019.
- *"So, the ECA (1972) is repealed, and before that comes into force, it is amended and saved. The Secretary of State says that just "parts of the ECA" are saved until 30 December 2020, but that is a huge understatement. Almost all of it is saved, with amendments not to the applicability of EU law, but to collateral issues."*
- "Section 6(1) of the withdrawal Act, which would extinguish the role of the European Court on the fixed date of 29 March 2019. But ... paragraph 80 of the White Paper preserves the full role of the European Court until December 2020. Again, the withdrawal Act will need major surgery."
- *"During the 18-month passage of the European Union (Withdrawal) Bill through the House of Commons, it was acknowledged that it contained sweeping provisions packed with Henry VIII powers. They were supposed to be strictly limited by a two-year sunset clause. The White Paper now proposes that those clauses should be extended: sunset is now December 2022."*
- "There was no mention of Northern Ireland in the Secretary of State's statement, and there is just a brief reference to it in the White Paper. I appreciate that elements of the Northern Ireland agreement are still being discussed, but with nothing substantive on Northern Ireland, the White Paper contains a huge gaping hole".

## Comment by Peter Grant (Glenrothes) (SNP)

"I am left wondering what would have happened if the Government had had their way and the House had risen five days ago. Would we have been left without a White Paper? Would the White Paper have been announced in a written statement to add to the 40 or so that have been sneaked out over the past few days without any attempt to allow for scrutiny by Members?"

**Comment by Mike Gapes (Ilford South) (Lab/Co-op)**

*"The Secretary of State said that UK nationals in the EU will be able to "live their lives broadly as they do now". Will he confirm that the existing rights to move freely between EU countries and to work and study in other EU countries will apply to all UK citizens currently living in France, Germany, Estonia, Poland and elsewhere?"*

**Raab's response:**

*"I share the hon. Gentleman's desire to nail down those reassurances for onward movement. That is our objective in the negotiations, but we have not yet finalised that aspect."*

**Michael Tomlinson (Mid Dorset and North Poole) (Con)**

*"Further to paragraph 104 on page 28 of the White Paper, will my right hon. Friend confirm that payment of the £35 billion to £39 billion that he cited is conditional on the final deal? After all, as he has said, nothing is agreed until everything is agreed."*

**Dominic Raab:**

*"If my hon. Friend looks at the White Paper, he will see that the principle of conditionality is written into it and is mentioned in several different paragraphs. It is a common principle of international agreements and international diplomacy when a deal is struck that both sides commit to adhering to and fulfilling their side of the bargain. If they do not, there are consequences for the rest of the deal."*

**Sammy Wilson (East Antrim) (DUP)**

*"I welcome the White Paper, especially the commitment that the EU will not be getting a penny of our money if it refuses to come up with a fair-trade arrangement that suits both sides. On that issue, is the Secretary of State aware that the Taoiseach said this week that he had been assured by the EU that there will be no need for any physical infrastructure along the Irish border even in the event of no deal? If that is the case, is that not proof that the issue is overhyped and that there is no need for a backstop arrangement that breaks the Union? Will he assure us that he will not accede to such an arrangement?"*

**Nigel Huddleston (Mid Worcestershire) (Con)**

*"I appreciate that the Secretary of State is trying to make the Government's position clear and simple for people to understand, but there is still a lot of confusion out there. One area that confuses my constituents is whether we will be able to conduct independent trade deals under the Government's proposals, so will he clarify that?"*

**Dominic Raab:**

*"I can tell my hon. Friend that not only will we be able to negotiate, but we will be able to conclude deals. The Department for International Trade is now embarking on a series of consultations about the substance of those free trade agreements so that the public and his constituents will understand the value and importance that the agreements will bring to the country."*

**Jonathan Edwards (Carmarthen East and Dinefwr) (PC)**

*"The Secretary of State knows that parliamentary arithmetic seems to be against the British Government. If they fail to get approval for their withdrawal agreement, they will face four options: they could extend article 50 in order to renegotiate; they could move a motion of no confidence to allow the formation of an alternative Government or another general election; they could call a second referendum; or they could crash out without a deal. Which option would he prefer?"*

## **Dominic Raab**

*"It will be incumbent on hon. Members on both sides of the House to think very carefully about how they vote when it comes to the meaningful vote. Unless it is approved and we have a deal, we will not be able to give effect to it. Not only would that be a serious position, but hon. Members on both sides of the House would be held to account for how they voted."*

## **Kevin Foster**

*"Thank you, Mr Speaker. You are a star, and I am sure you know how to do your scone correctly, too. The Secretary of State will be aware of the importance of the fishing industry to Torbay and across the south-west. Can he therefore confirm that, by 2020, the UK will be negotiating its own fishing policies as an independent coastal state?"*

## **Dominic Raab**

*My hon. Friend is absolutely right. In 2020 we will be negotiating fishing opportunities as an independent coastal state, deciding who can access our waters and, more importantly, on what terms.*

The above comments are added to give a flavour of the "Withdrawal and Implementation Bill" and the reaction of some Parliamentarians to certain questions on the Bill. Clearly the past two years since the EU Referendum vote the establishment has been stalling the Leave process by any and all means in order to present a *fait accompli* to the British public which is little different from staying in the EU - as if the EU Referendum had only been "advisory".

Theresa May needs to be removed as soon as possible and the "Chequers Agreement" needs to be scrapped - even if that forces a "No Deal" because the present "Deal" just keeps us trapped with no way out of the EU.

## **Why we can't stay in the Single Market?**

We cannot have a deal which includes staying in the EU under unacceptable conditions, such as:

- under the ECA (1972) Treaty or
- means being in the Single Market which is not just about trade; it is a regulatory regime designed to bring about a political union - and includes all the bad parts of the UK-EU arrangements.
- allowing unlimited and uncontrolled migration from EU into UK. This would include non-EU citizens from anywhere in the world who have been give EU passports to enable them to move from any EU country to UK
- submission to the primacy of the European Court of Justice. The remit of the ECJ is not to administer justice but to make judgments that further 'ever closer union'. This would make the UK Supreme Court no more than a body to rubber stamp EJC judgments with no right to question or amend them.
- accepting the supremacy of EU Corpus Juris over English Common Law and the Magna Carta. Free speech and individual rights of British subjects enshrined at Runnymede would be null and void. It involves arrest without evidence and by no more than rumour.

- It would be illegal for UK subjects to criticise the EU. The Spanish Advocate General of the EU Court of Justice has claimed that “Criticism of the EU is akin to blasphemy and could be restricted without affecting Freedom of Speech”- It is now a criminal offence to criticise the EU as of 2013-002 and 2012 – 033
- accepting all EU standards even when not applicable to UK. There are thousands of such standards and regulations that act as a ball and chain on our companies seriously restricting their ability to operate competitively. *Sadly, many of these Regulations were ‘gold Plated’ by our Health and Safety Exec to make UK commerce and industry even more uncompetitive. Before joining EU, British Standards were democratically set up by committees of those involved not bureaucrats who have never worked in ‘the real world’.*

The USA, Australia, New Zealand, China, India etc are not in the Single market and have no problems whatsoever trading with the EU.

The ‘Four Freedoms’ of the Treaty of Rome (1957) which applied to the EEC, EC and EU; are in fact chains to bind a country into permanent subservience to the EU. *(after [theeuroprobe.org](http://theeuroprobe.org) 2016-077)*