

18th July 2018

Taking Merkel's "Schilling"

The title phrase relates to the idea that by accepting a coin with the image of the head of the leader (King or Queen etc) of a country or group then you join their army or effectively swear allegiance to that leader - and in reality that is what the UK would be signing up to if it accepted the "Chequers Accord" ("White Paper") - the equivalent of Merkel's "Schilling"

The "Chequers Accord" was identified by Martin Howe QC at Lawyers for Britain ([18/7/2018 - lawyersforbritain.com](https://www.lawyersforbritain.com)) as the same as the Association Agreement between the EU and some accession countries . *"Martin concludes that the Government's proposed UK-EU legal dispute procedure is based on EU deals with Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia and notes that as far as he is aware, "no other non-member state has agreed to being bound by rulings of the ECJ"*

In dictating / presenting / agreeing to such an arrangement Merkel is probably showing her true feelings about Brexit and the British people - and it looks like May and the rest feel the same.

We would be signing up to the EU Armed Forces, Corpus Juris, the Euro, Unified Taxation - straight from our bank accounts to "Fund the Objectives of the EU (Germany)" and everything else that is wrong with our current relationship with the EU through the Lisbon Treaty (2007) - it is certainly the case that the White Paper was either given to May by Merkel or it was approved by Merkel.

Unfortunately, it is little more than a starting point for negotiations with the EU - capitulating further even on the terms of that surrender document. The British people deserve better than to be sold out by their Prime Minister, all the Opposition Political Parties and a majority of its MP's, Peers, Judiciary and its Civil Service.

Fighting like "Cats and Dogs"

Currently our Parliament is in the throes of trying to keep the Prime Minister in place and ensure that the "Chequers Bill" goes through the Commons - before the Summer Recess - the European Research Group (ERG) represented by Jacob Rees-Mogg tabled four amendments to the Bill in order to mitigate the effects of some of the more onerous parts of the Bill.

The Four Amendments:

- Demands that the UK should scrap an offer to collect taxes and duties on behalf of the EU unless the remaining 27 member states pledge to do the same for Britain.
- Force the government to commit itself in law not to allow a customs border down the Irish Sea.
- Require the UK to have a separate VAT regime from the EU
- Force the Prime Minister to table primary legislation if she wishes to keep Britain in the customs union.

Meanwhile the Tory Remainers' - the usual suspects - "Heidi Allen, Kenneth Clarke, Jonathan Djanogly, Dominic Grieve, Stephen Hammond, Phillip Lee, Nicky Morgan, Bob Neill, Antoinette Sandbach, Anna Soubry and Sarah Wollaston".

Some of whom had been seen previously in a secret meeting at Chatham House with A Campbell and A C Grayling on the 14th of June, 2018 - "a tea and cucumber sandwiches, without the crusts" party, no doubt - plotting amendments of their own to nullify the four ERG amendments, which will no doubt continue when the Bill reaches the House of dishonourable Lords.

The Whips must be thinking that they should give-up this madhouse occupation which is now more like trying to "herd cats" - with two "strays" Cable and Farron apparently mysteriously absent from proceedings; disappearing instead of voting - out on the tiles perhaps?

Looking at the voting numbers which are very similar generally it appears that some 300 MP's certainly have accepted Merkel's Schilling without question - by voting for the Bill - whereas the remaining 300 odd are either not sure, keeping their "powder dry" or simply don't want to see Corbyn in Number 10 Downing Street.

Fighting the Wrong Battle

The problem is that the Prime Minister and the political "elite" are deliberately fighting the wrong battle - all the energy is going into "fine-tuning" an agreement which is designed to keep Britain in the EU in the short and long term and prevent the UK competing, directly or indirectly with the EU - because the EU would be at a disadvantage - they are working together to keep us under control.

Our establishment really is at war with its own population and the "Chequers Accord" is little more than a "skirmish" the government have run away from the real battle and hope we won't notice.

The real problem is quite straightforward and goes to the heart of the matter - the EEC was a trading relationship which is desirable - the EU is a political project which as far as British people are concerned is highly undesirable - that is the fundamental difference and why it was done by stealth for the past 45 years.

The British public should be campaigning for the UK to revert to the "Davis Mutual Recognition Model" agreement - which the government deliberately side-lined at Chequers - the type of agreement which the EU already has with other countries, but does not involve political union with the EU and more damagingly under the legal control of the ECJ.

We are in a unique position in that regard because we are fully aligned with the EU and therefore there should be no difficulty in continuing to trade; and maintaining the "complex supply chain" methodology (designed for greater national integration) - and that could proceed as we diverge from the EU - that overcomes all the pretend difficulties that have been invented.

The difference is that we would trade with the EU as a sovereign nation and would comply with the EU where it is in our interest - at an inter-government level - not as a captive nation (Vassal State) - under the "Chequers Accord" supranational model.

The EU would object of course but we in Britain value our independence and the EU has agreed to the same arrangement in Canada - and it would be possible to make the agreement more EU friendly under that proviso if the EU was not so paranoid and obsessed with Empire building.

Lobby our MPs to have the Davis "Mutual Recognition" inter-governmental agreement model put before Parliament and properly debated instead of fighting a phoney battle designed to fool us into believing that the "Merkel-May Accord" is the only option for the UK - leading us in only one direction towards another Referendum - where the options will be "Merkel-May" or revoke Article 50 and Remain.

We should be looking after our own people not enriching the international Banking Community and the Multinational Corporations - they don't care where they reside as long as they can exploit its people and infrastructure - and get away without paying any tax.

We provide a copy of the Davis draft "White Paper" for Reference below:

The Alternative Brexit White Paper. A draft from DexEU. 1) Mutual recognition, not ongoing harmonisation.

Last updated: July 12, 2018 at 10:41 am

“The UK proposes that the future trading relationship should be underpinned by a comprehensive system of mutual recognition which covers a broad range of sectors and regulatory activity. As part of a dynamic regulatory relationship, the comprehensive system of mutual recognition would establish a broad range of reciprocal measures allowing compliance activity undertaken at a national level to be recognised in both the UK and EU markets and recognise the underlying technical requirements.

This compliance activity would include features of existing Free Trade Agreements, for example mutual acceptance of “good practice” inspections such as Good Laboratory Practice and Good Manufacturing practice, conformity assessments, accreditation practices. It could also include licensing regimes, such as those used to move products with security implications, and recognising labelling requirements.

To ensure that both parties can rely on each other’s authorities to comply with the relevant rules, the mutual recognition of conformity assessment and inspection will continue to be based on a jointly agreed accreditation framework, as is the case for other similar international agreements. In some sectors, nominated individuals are required to interact with authorities or perform a certain role, for example a Qualified Person is required for testing and batch release of medicines for the EU market. The UK proposes a system of mutual recognition, which would enable authorities and businesses based in either the UK or the EU to conduct compliance activity for the UK and the EU markets.

In order to fully secure the UK’s objective of one approval in one country for both markets, the comprehensive system of mutual recognition would include provisions for recognition of equivalence of technical requirements. Mutual recognition of each other’s regulations and compliance activity capitalises on the fact that the UK is entirely aligned with the EU on day one and respects that businesses with highly integrated supply chains and trade want to minimise the disruption they could experience upon exit.

The EU has established a range of measures with other countries to make it easier to operate across different regulatory areas, whilst reassuring both parties about public safety. In many cases, these agreements have brought divergent regulatory regimes closer together, or are underpinned by commitments to align with EU regulation.

For example, the EU has agreed mutual recognition provisions in free trade agreements with Canada and South Korea as well as standalone mutual recognition agreements with New Zealand, USA and Australia, which address barriers to divergent regulatory regimes by recognising the competence of authorities to designate third party organisations to carry out testing. Mutual recognition of conformity alone, however, will not be enough for the EU-UK's future relationship not meet the principle of having only one relationship because it does approval in one country.

By contrast, arrangements within the EU-Switzerland bilateral have a closer regulatory relationship for manufactured goods, which has resulted in a greater degree of market access. The EU-Swiss agreement is a mixed model, with a mutual recognition agreement across a broader range of sectors underpinned by recognising the equivalence of legislation, which means that single assessments can be accepted in both markets for relevant products. In the UK's proposal, this system would be supported by a robust governance mechanism.

Checking products before they go on sale is only part of the story. The UK has always, and will continue, to carry out a robust programme of risk-based market surveillance to ensure that products which are dangerous or potentially harmful to the environment do not reach consumers. This includes both intercepting non-compliant products as they enter the UK, as well as checks on products already on the market and exchanging information with market surveillance authorities in other member states. It protects consumers in both the EU and the UK: and means that UK exports to the EU do not pose a greater risk to consumers in the EU than they do today. To support a comprehensive system of mutual recognition, the UK and EU should continue to exchange information to ensure effective market surveillance in our respective territories; and allow reciprocal access to relevant databases and systems.”

DexEU's Alternative Brexit White Paper – Canada Plus Plus Plus. 2 Agricultural, food, and fish products. Outcome equivalence.

Last updated: July 12, 2018 at 11:20 am

Executive summary

This section outlines the UK position and principles in the future economic relationship with the EU on agricultural products (which includes food and drink, fish and fish products).

Some areas are not directly covered in this paper and are being considered in more detail in other section of the White Paper, for example on manufactured goods and state aid, and will be referenced when this is the case.

Introduction

International trade in agricultural products

[The global market for Agriculture and Food and Drink manufacturing imports, excluding the UK, was worth around £974 billion in 2016.] As with other products, agricultural products are subject to tariffs and heavy regulation that manifests as non-tariff barriers.

The WTO Agriculture Agreement provides rules for Member States on market access, domestic support, and export subsidies. Tariffs on all agricultural products are now “bound”, meaning that they are committed and difficult to increase. The progressive replacement of import restrictions, such as quotas, to tariffs (“tariffication”) has made markets substantially more predictable. A nation’s domestic support, or subsidisation of its agricultural industry, can make the market less predictable and can have a direct effect on production and trade.

One form of non-tariff barriers is Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) measures. The measures are based on a range of international standards that give common requirements for the protection of the human, animal, and plant life and health.

The WTO SPS Agreement sets out the basis rules on food safety and animal and plant health standards and allows countries to set their own standards. The (W)TO requires its members to form regulations based on science, rather than as a means to discriminate between countries with similar standards, although this has not prevented the proliferation of SPS measures that have increased considerably in recent years, increasing the requirements for exporters.

SPS are policy actions intended to protect public, animal, and plant health in relation to trade in animals, plants, and related products. In the UK, Defra and the Food Standards Agency each lead on key elements of the UK's SPS policy, the latter with regard to human health. Defra leads on other policy issues in the area of animal health and welfare that is not covered within SPS measures, for example pet travel.

Objectives

The UK is in a unique position, since it starts from a point of full regulatory alignment on Day One after leaving the EU. It is therefore possible that a solution is achievable and within the grasp of both Parties.

The UK will approach negotiations with a flexible and imaginative nature. Whilst we are seeking a bespoke agreement, the UK has reached deep agreements with near neighbours in the past, allowing for the free flow of agri-food products across borders.

For this reason, the UK is seeking a model which both the EU and the UK can agree:

- 1. An enhanced trading relationship based on trust*
- 2. Robust governance mechanisms to ensure that the UK can continue to meet*

its commitments into the future, with flexibility in how those are delivered,

and

- 3. Respecting the integrity of the Single Market, ensuring both parties continue*

to commit to high standards.

The position on agricultural products is underpinned by the following overarching objectives for the agri-food sector:

- 1. **Maximise trading opportunities for the agri-food sector**, ensuring open markets for each other's products and securing flexibility to ensure the UK can make the most of the opportunities Exist presents for its farmers and exporters,*

- 2. **Protect public, plant and animal health, animal welfare and the environment**, ensuring the upmost safety of agricultural products and maintaining animal welfare and the environment standards at least as high as the EU, and*
- 3. **Champion the consumer, safeguarding consumer confidence, food supply and food prices**, providing continued access to the best available products.*

The UK's position on agricultural products is to seek an agreement to achieve the same outcomes with the flexibility to achieve those outcomes in ways best tailored to both parties' circumstances. The preferred approach of 'outcome equivalence' is explored further below.

Outcome equivalence

Outcome equivalence is when two parties agree to achieve the same outcome with flexibility as to the method by which that outcome is achieved. It is a concept used in existing FTAs (such as the EU's FTA with Canada – CETA) to facilitate trade where two countries have similar (“equivalent”) but not identical regulatory regimes. It would enable the UK to tailor its regulatory environment to best suit UK businesses and consumers, ensuring our farmers and exporters are able to make the most of the opportunities presented by our withdrawal from the EU, whilst facilitating trade by minimising delays and costs at the border.

For the UK, actions or positions are equivalent if evidence shows that they achieve the same outcomes. The UK has publicly committed to evidence-based policy making for many years, arguing consistently in the EU for agri-food regulatory decisions to be focussed on achieving outcomes, leaving flexibility as to how those outcomes should be achieved.

The UK Government therefore proposes:

- 1. Whether two polities in this area are equivalent should be determined by whether they achieve these goals to the same extent, with the existing regime used as the baseline*
- 2. If a new policy does not result in significant increase in risk, it is deemed equivalent to the existing regulatory regime and can be introduced by the proposing party. If it does, then that new policy would not be deemed equivalent*
- 3. The UK and EU agree to a definition of “a significant increase in risk” and the scientific methods to be used to determine this to prevent disagreements in the regulatory cooperation mechanism discussions*

4. *The regulatory cooperation mechanism is set within the UK's proposed architecture for the economic partnership as a whole, which is further explained in the chapter on governance. For agri-food, the scientific review of a new proposal would be carried out by an SPS sub-committee to the Joint Committee, which would draw on relevant expertise as necessary.*
5. *In the event that the SPS sub-committee could not reach an agreement or that the parties failed to reach a mutually agreeable solution, the issue could be escalated to an overarching joint committee or ultimately a Dispute Resolution Body.*

Agencies, systems, and databases

Associated with this, is the UK's future relationship with EU agencies, systems, and databases. We will seek continued engagement and cooperation with relevant EU agencies and appropriate access and exchange of data and IT systems to ensure food safety and protect public, animal, and plant health for the mutual benefit of the EU and UK citizens.

Having appropriate access and data sharing arrangements will be important in facilitating the oversight to ensure the safety of products placed on the EU and UK markets and ensuring open markets for each other's products. Ongoing collaboration with EU agencies, such as the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), and access to and exchange of appropriate data will underpin the approach of regulatory equivalence.

Mutual recognition

As applies to goods in general, the UK will also seek to agree areas of mutual recognition of certificates and documents for agricultural products that do not fall within the scope of SPS, for example organics, licences, and export certification.

Precedents

Although the UK is seeking an ambitious and bespoke agreement with the EU, there are helpful precedents in agreements reached with the EU and third countries that can be drawn upon. The EU has a number of bilateral and multilateral agreements that include agricultural products, such as with Switzerland, Mexico, and South Korea. These agreements have a range of provisions on market access for agricultural products. Some of these agreements reduce non-tariff barriers on the basis of regulatory equivalence, in the spirit of the WTO's multilateral SPS Agreement, which in some cases is achieved by the partner country aligning its rules to the EU's. The agreements

the EU has established with other countries show that there is a range of possible models for co-operation, including in ways that allow parties to pursue their own regulatory goals.

On the proposed regulatory cooperation mechanism, SPS sub-committees do exist in current EU FTAs. However, the approach to ensuring cooperation differs to that proposed by the UK in that in most EU FTAs, the two parties start with different regulatory systems and are moving towards convergence. In contrast, a UK FTA with the EU would need to allow for an initially harmonised regulatory system to diverge over time.

Equally, the commitments in the Joint Report for the island of Ireland require issues to be discussed on an ongoing basis, therefore a UK-EU SPS sub-

committee would need to meet more frequently and work more collaboratively than existing models.

With regards to access to agencies and systems, precedents are seen with countries such as Switzerland, which has preferential access to some market surveillance databases, to EEA countries, which have EFSA observer status and access to the EU food and feed rapid alert system, right through to third countries, where FTAs including data sharing arrangements.

A new partnership in agricultural products

Given the close historic relationship between the UK and the EU, it is in the interests of both Parties to go beyond such precedents and seek a bespoke and ambitious future partnership in agricultural products that is beneficial to both sides.

This should be driven by our mutual commitment to open and frictionless trade and providing both parties with the regulatory flexibility, whilst continuing to meet high standards.

It also means ensuring flexibility to ensure the UK can utilise its new state to establish new agreements across the globe. We are determined to ensure that our farm businesses can thrive in this new trading environment, competing successfully on the world stage.

Within our World Trade Organisation (WTO) obligations, the UK will also have the opportunity in future to establish its own tariffs, both unilaterally and in the context of new bilateral trading relationships. In formulating our tariff policy, we will ensure that tariffs are set in the best interests of UK consumers, businesses, and farmers.

Mutual Interest

Both the UK and the EU benefit from their close and longstanding trading relationship for agricultural goods, and easy access to the UK market is especially important for particular EU industries.

It is in the mutual interest of the UK and EU to continue to hold a close trading partnership. The UK remains a major market for EU agricultural products (which includes agriculture, food and drink, and fish products), with the EU exporting €36.7 billion of agricultural products to the UK in 2016. The main sources of these exports were the Netherlands (€6.3 billion), France (€5.1 billion), Ireland (€4.6 billion), and Germany (€4.5 billion). The UK is a particularly significant export market for Ireland and Cyprus, accounting for 39% of Ireland's global agricultural exports and 24% of Cyprus' agricultural exports.

Equally, the EU imported €15.4 billion of agricultural products from the UK in 2016. The main EU importers were Ireland (€4.2 billion), France (€2.8 billion), Germany (€1.5 billion), and the Netherlands (€1.4 billion). The UK accounts for 54% of Ireland agricultural imports, whilst Malta and Cyprus import 10% and 8% respectively of their agricultural imports from the UK.

Providing continued recognition and protection of Geographical Indications in the EU and UK

This paper outlines the United Kingdom's (UK) position and approach to ensure a smooth and orderly withdrawal from the European Union (EU) and the freest possible future economic relationship in regard to geographical indications (GIs).

DexEU's Alternative Brexit White Paper – Canada Plus Plus Plus. 3) Governance and political oversight of the future relationship

Last updated: July 12, 2018 at 2:43 pm

The governance arrangements within the overarching framework should consist of two core parts: political oversight and a joint committee. There should also be provision for consultation. The specific formation and arrangements for this framework would, of course, be a matter for discussion.

4.2.a Political oversight

The political oversight level would provide strategic direction and be the forum for the highest level decisions about the Partnership. It would provide for ministers and leaders from the UK and the EU to set the direction for the

development of the future relationship; discuss and determine how and when changes to the relationship are necessary and ensure accountability to our Parliaments.

This should take the form of regular (e.g. biannual) leader level summits, and formal and informal ministerial dialogue where it is needed.

This political forum will give the parties the necessary flexibility to respond to any unforeseen challenges' For example, enabling the partnership to respond rapidly to new global crises or to change its approach in response to changing objectives over time. The political forum will effectively act as a future-proofing tool for the partnership.

Interparliamentary dialogue between the UK Parliament and the European Parliament can also be provided for if this is relevant for the agreement in question.

4.2.b Joint committee

Within the overarching framework, the Joint Committee would be made up of officials from both parties and be jointly chaired. The committee should be responsible for the functioning of the partnership, following the direction set by the Political oversight forum.

The Joint committee will provide a means for the parties to exchange information and consult each other. This process of consultation and exchange will help avoid disputes arising, and ensure consistent interpretation and application of relevant provisions of the agreements.

Where relevant, the committee will be able to make binding decisions to drive forward the partnership and resolve issues. This will facilitate the implementation of the various components of the partnership, and mitigate disputes that may arise.

Where appropriate, the Joint Committee may establish sub-committees and working groups on a sectoral or policy-specific basis. The Committee will also be able to carry out joint monitoring and supervisory functions to identify emerging issues.

Many international agreements, such as CETA, the free trade agreement between the EU and Korea and all US free trade agreements establish joint committees to oversee the agreements.

4.2.c Consultation

Consultation will ensure that the parties can exchange information and advice from each other's experts where mutually beneficial to the functioning of the agreements or cooperation within it. This consultation will mainly, but not exclusively, be conducted through the political oversight forum and the Joint Committee.

For example, to ensure there is a sufficient exchange of expertise, perspectives and information, the UK and the EU should facilitate the exchange of expertise. This will enable the partnership to function effectively.

Update: We include Boris Johnson's resignation speech in the Commons, which was not as disloyal to Mrs May as might have been expected - it is worth reading in its entirety - since much of his speech was dissected in the Press only or mostly on the basis of an expected "attack".

Johnson summarised the expectations of the Leave voters and how they were not represented by the "Chequers Bill", and gave an optimistic note stating that it was not too late to deliver the "Brexit" that was required.

Since there was no suggestion of a large majority in favour of the latest Remain amendment to tie the government to the "Customs Union" - it was defeated 307 to 301 - with the help of four from Labour (Kate Hoey, Graham Stringer, Frank Field and John Mann) - well done - for her efforts though there are moves to try and have Kate Hoey deselected - appalling behaviour from the EUphile Labour Party.

So, there are grounds to indicate that the "Chequers Bill" will be modified, to produce a better UK "Brexit" negotiating position as far as the Leave voters are concerned - whether May can remain in post is not certain.

Boris Johnson's speech:

Full text: Boris Johnson's Brexit speech

The Spectator

14 February 2018 11:44 AM

The other day a woman pitched up in my surgery in a state of indignation. The ostensible cause was broadband trouble but it was soon clear – as so often in a constituency surgery – that the real problem was something else.

No one was trying to understand her feelings about Brexit. No one was trying to bring her along. She felt so downcast, she said, that she was thinking of leaving the country – to Canada. It wasn't so much that she wanted to be in the EU; she just didn't want to be in a Britain that was not in the EU.

And I recognised that feeling of grief, and alienation, because in the last 18 months I have heard the same sentiments so often – from friends, from family, from people hailing me abusively in the street – as is their right.

In many cases I believe the feelings are abating with time, as some of the fears about the Brexit vote do not materialise. In some cases, alas, I detect a hardening of the mood, a deepening of the anger. I fear that some people are becoming ever more determined to stop Brexit, to reverse the referendum vote of June 23 2016, and to frustrate the will of the people. I believe that would be a disastrous mistake that would lead to permanent and ineradicable feelings of betrayal. We cannot and will not let it happen.

But if we are to carry this project through to national success – as we must – then we must also reach out to those who still have anxieties. I want to try today to anatomise at least some of those fears and to show to the best of my ability that these fears can be allayed, and that the very opposite is usually true: that Brexit can be grounds for much more hope than fear.

There are essentially three types of concern about the momentous choice the nation has made.

1. STRATEGIC

The first is that this is simply a strategic or geo-strategic mistake. On this view Britain is an offshore island comprising fewer than one per cent of humanity, and we need to be bound up in the European Union for protection – partly for our protection, and partly so that Britain can fulfil its historic role of providing protection for the other countries of the European continent. I come across quite a few people who think that Brexit has cast us adrift – made our geostrategic position somehow more vulnerable, while weakening the security of the whole of Europe.

2. SPIRITUAL

The second anxiety is essentially spiritual and aesthetic – that by voting to leave the EU we have sundered ourselves from the glories of European civilisation. People believe that we have thrown up a figurative drawbridge, made it less easy to live, study, work abroad; and decided to sacrifice the Europeanness in our identities. They fear that the Brexit vote was a vote for nationalism and small-mindedness and xenophobia. They think it was illiberal, reactionary and the British have somehow shown the worst of their character to the world; indeed that it was in some sense actually unBritish.

3. ECONOMIC

And the third objection is the one that occupies most of the debate – the economic fear that we have voted to make ourselves less prosperous; that membership of the EU is vital for UK business and investment, and that the panoply of EU legislation has helped to make life easier for companies and for citizens. People fear the disruption they associate with change, and that our friends and partners in the EU may make life difficult for us. Sometimes these economic anxieties are intensified by the other fears

– about identity or security – so that hitherto recondite concepts like the single market or the customs union acquire unexpected emotive power.

Well I believe that whatever the superficial attractions of these points, they can be turned on their head. I want to show you today that Brexit need not be nationalist but can be internationalist; not an economic threat but a considerable opportunity; not unBritish but a manifestation of this country's historic national genius. And I can see that in making this case now I run the risk of simply causing further irritation. But I must take that risk because it is this government's duty to advocate and explain the mission on which we are now engaged; and it has become absolutely clear to me that we cannot take the argument for granted. We cannot expect the case to make itself. That was the mistake of the pro-EU elite when they won the last referendum in 1975. As the *Guardian* journalist the late Hugo Young points out in his book, *This Blessed Plot*: *"The most corrupted trait I kept encountering was the sense – so prevalent among the Euro-elite, that having won the decision they had won the argument. Many exhibited the unmistakable opinion not only that the battle was over but that the other side, however loud it shouted, had simply lost and should now shut up."*

And he went on to say:

"The noisier the contest became during the early 1990s, the heavier the silent gloating that accompanied it, from the class that knew it commanded every operational forum from the ante-chambers of Whitehall to the boardrooms of big business, from Brussels committee rooms where a thousand lobbyists thronged, to the outposts of the Commission."

Well the boot is now on the other foot, at least in theory. For all their power and influence – every major political party, the CBI, Barack Obama and so on – those voices did not prevail. But is this the time for the referendum winners to gloat? Should we sit in silent self-satisfaction? Of course not.

It is not good enough to say to remainers – you lost, get over it; because we must accept that the vast majority are actuated by entirely noble sentiments, a real sense

of solidarity with our European neighbours and a desire for the UK to succeed. All I am saying is that by going for Brexit we can gratify those sentiments – and more. So let us take the three anxieties in turn.

1. SECURITY: A STRONG BRITAIN AND A STRONG EU

To all who worry about our strategic position and the supposed loss of Britain to European security I can offer this same vital reassurance that the PM has made so many times and that I believe is welcomed by our partners. Our commitment to the defence of Europe is unconditional and immovable. It is made real by the 800 British troops from 5th Battalion The Rifles I saw recently at Tapa in Estonia, who have since been relieved by 1st Battalion The Royal Welsh.

Already this country is the single biggest spender in the EU both on aid and defence. Although we represent only 13 per cent of the EU's population, we contribute 20 per cent of defence spending – and the RAF's giant C17 transport aircraft represent 100 per cent of the heavy lift capacity of the whole of Europe – as well as 25 per cent of the overseas aid budget.

It makes sense for us to continue to be intimately involved in European foreign and security policy. It would be illogical not to discuss such matters as sanctions together, bearing in mind that UK expertise provides more than half of all EU sanctions listings.

We will continue to be Europeans both practically and psychologically, because our status as one of the great contributors to European culture and civilisation – and our status as one of the great guarantors of the security of Europe – is simply not dependent on the Treaty of Rome as amended at Maastricht or Amsterdam or Lisbon.

2. SPIRITUALLY BRITISH, EUROPEAN AND GLOBAL

So let us next tackle the suggestion that we are somehow going to become more insular. It flies in the face of the evidence. It was my Labour predecessor Ernie Bevin

who said, "my foreign policy is to go down to Victoria station and go anywhere I damn well please."

That is pretty much what the British people already do. We have a bigger diaspora than any other rich nation – 6m points of light scattered across an intermittently darkening globe. There are more British people living in Australia than in the whole of the EU, and more in the US and Canada. As I have just discovered we have more than a million who go to Thailand every year, where according to our superb consular services they get up to the most eye-popping things.

The statistical trajectory suggests that this wanderlust is most unlikely to abate. In 2016 the British people paid 71m visits to other countries – and that is a 70 per cent increase since the mid-1990s, and now more than one foreign trip per person per year.

If we get the right deal on aviation and on visa-free travel – both of which are in our mutual interest – this expansion of UK tourism will continue, not just beyond the EU, but within the EU itself; and we will continue ever more intensively to go on cheapo flights to stag parties in ancient cities, meet interesting people, fall in love, struggle

amiably to learn the European languages whose decline has been a paradoxical feature of EU membership.

There is no sensible reason why we should not be able to retire to Spain (as indeed we did long before Spain joined the EU), or anywhere else. We can continue the whirl of academic exchanges that have been a feature of European cultural life since the middle ages, and whose speed of cross-pollination has been accelerated by the web as well as by schemes like Horizon or Erasmus – all of which we can continue to support, and whose participating scholars are certainly not confined to the EU.

For those who really want to make Britain less insular, the answer is not to submit forever to the EU legal order, but to think about how we can undo the physical separation that took place at the end of the Ice Age.

Fly over the Channel at Dover and you see how narrow it is, the ferries plying back and forth like buses in Oxford street, and as you measure the blue straits with your fingers you can see that this moat is really an overgrown prehistoric river that once flowed down from Norway and was fed by its tributaries, the Thames and the Seine and the Rhine.

In 1986 Margaret Thatcher and Francois Mitterrand had the vision to heal the rupture with a first dry crossing; and it is notable that Eurotunnel is now calling for both sides of the Channel to prepare for a second fixed link. It does indeed seem incredible that the fifth and sixth most powerful economies in the world, separated by barely 21 miles of water, should be connected by only one railway line.

I accept that the solution is still a few years off – though the need will be upon us fast – but I say this to signal something about the attitudes that should inform Brexit. It's not about shutting ourselves off; it's about going global.

It's not about returning to some autarkic 1950s menu of spam and cabbage and liver. It's about continuing the astonishing revolution in tastes and styles – in the arts, music, restaurants, sports – that has taken place in this country not so much because of our EU membership (that is to commit the fallacy known in the FCO as post hoc ergo propter hoc) but as a result of our history and global links, our openness to people and ideas that has brought 300 languages on to the streets of London, probably the most diverse capital on earth.

In that sense Brexit is about re-engaging this country with its global identity, and all the energy that can flow from that. And I absolutely refuse to accept the suggestion that it is some unBritish spasm of bad manners. It's not some great V-sign from the cliffs of Dover.

It is the expression of a legitimate and natural desire for self-government of the people, by the people, for the people. And that is surely not some reactionary Faragiste concept.

It is to fulfil the liberal idealism of John Stuart Mill himself, who recognised that it is only the nation – as he put it, “united among themselves by common sympathies which do not exist between themselves and others” that could legitimate the state.

It was only if people had this common sympathy that they would consent to be governed as a unit, because this feeling of national solidarity would “make them cooperate more willingly than with other people, desire to be under the same government, and desire it should be government by themselves or a portion of themselves exclusively.”

And there is good reason for insisting on this national solidarity, or common sympathy, because government involves tremendous impositions, by which we collectively agree to taxation that pre-empts half our income, and obedience to laws not all of which we think are necessarily sensible.

If we are going to accept laws, then we need to know who is making them, and with what motives, and we need to be able to interrogate them in our own language, and we must know how they came to be in authority over us and how we can remove them.

And the trouble with the EU is that for all its idealism, and for all the good intentions of those who run the EU institutions, there is no demos – or at least we have never felt part of such a demos – however others in the EU may feel.

The British people have plenty of common sympathies with the people of France, but it is hard to deny that they also share common sympathies with plenty of non-EU people – the Americans, the Swiss, the Canadians, the Pakistanis; and that is one of the reasons why we in the UK have had such difficulty in adapting to the whole concept of EU integration.

To understand why EU regulation is not always suited to the economic needs of the UK, it is vital to understand that EU law is a special type of law, unlike anything else on earth.

It is not just about business convenience. It is expressly teleological. It is there to achieve a political goal.

The aim is therefore to create an overarching European state as the basis for a new sense of European political identity.

British politicians, Labour and Tory, have always found that ambition very difficult. It is hard to make it cohere with our particular traditions of independent parliamentary and legal systems that go back centuries.

And in spite of sheeplike coughs of protest from the UK, the process of integration deepened, and the corpus of EU law grew ever vaster and more intricate, and ever more powers and competences were handed to EU institutions, culminating in the Treaty of Lisbon.

We now have arrangements of such complexity and obscurity that I ask even my most diehard of Remainer friends if they can explain their Spitzenkandidaten process – which has genuinely delighted the MEPs as much as it has mystified the UK; or the exact relationship between the EU’s Charter of Fundamental Rights, justiciable in

Luxembourg, and the European Convention on Human Rights whose court sits in Strasbourg.

How many in this room knows the answer to those questions, let alone the name of their Euro-MP? And that is the point I sometimes make to those who hail me in the street with cheery four letter epithets. At least they know roughly who I am and roughly what I do.

If we wanted to find the person responsible for drafting the next phase of EU integration – in which Tony Blair would presumably like us to take part – we wouldn't know where to find them, let alone how to remove them from office. That is why people voted Leave – not because they were hostile to European culture and civilisation, but because they wanted to take back control. That is why it is so vital not to treat Brexit

as a plague of boils or a murrain on our cattle, but as an opportunity, and above all as an economic opportunity.

3. THE BREXIT ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Which brings me to the last crucial reassurances that my side of the argument must give. We would be mad to go through this process of extrication from the EU, and not to take advantage of the economic freedoms it will bring. We will stop paying huge sums to the EU every year and as the PM has said, this will leave us with more to spend on our domestic priorities, including the NHS.

We will be able to take back control of our borders – not because I am hostile to immigrants or immigration. Far from it. We need talented people to come and make their lives in this country – doctors, scientists, the coders and programmers who are so crucial to Britain's booming tech economy.

It was my proudest boast as Mayor of London that we had 400,000 French men and women in the British capital – high-earning and high-spending types – while only about 20,000 UK nationals were living in Paris. We must remain a magnet for ambition and drive.

But we also need to ask ourselves some hard questions about the impact of 20 years of uncontrolled immigration by low-skilled, low-wage workers – and what many see as the consequent suppression of wages and failure to invest properly in the skills of indigenous young people.

We do not want to haul up the drawbridge; and we certainly don't want to deter the international students who make such a huge contribution to our HE economy, with 155,000 Chinese students alone.

But we want to exercise control; and if we are going to move from a low-wage, low-productivity economy to a high-wage, high productivity economy – as we must – then Brexit gives us back at least one of the levers we need.

It is very striking that since the Brexit vote the fortunes of UKIP – the one stridently anti-immigration party in this country – have gone into a long deserved eclipse; and that is because people feel they are being heard in their desire at least for control. And the contrast is very striking with some Schengen countries, where no such control is possible, and where the far right is on the rise.

And as the PM has said repeatedly, we must take back control of our laws. It would obviously be absurd, as Theresa May said in her Lancaster House and Florence speeches – which now have the lapidary status of the codes of Hammurabi or Moses – if we were obliged to obey laws over which we have no say and no vote.

As the PM said at Lancaster House remaining within the single market “would to all intents and purposes mean not leaving the EU at all.”

The British people should not have new laws affecting their everyday lives imposed from abroad, when they have no power to elect or remove those who make those laws. And there is no need for us to find ourselves in any such position.

To those who worry about coming out of the customs union or the single market – please bear in mind that the economic benefits of membership are nothing like as conspicuous or irrefutable as is sometimes claimed.

In the last few years there have been plenty of non-EU countries who have seen far more rapid growth in their exports to the EU than we have – even though we pay a handsome membership fee.

In spite of being outside the stockade, the US has been able to increase its exports twice as fast.

And for those of us within the stockade, the cost of EU regulation was estimated at 4 per cent of GDP by Peter Mandelson and 7 per cent by Gordon Brown.

It is only by taking back control of our laws that UK firms and entrepreneurs will have the freedom to innovate, without the risk of having to comply with some directive devised by Brussels, at the urgings of some lobby group, with the aim of holding back a UK competitor. That would be intolerable, undemocratic, and would make it all but impossible for us to do serious free trade deals.

It is only by taking back control of our regulatory framework and our tariff schedules that we can do these deals, and exploit the changes in the world economy. It is a striking fact that our exports to the EU have grown by only 10 per cent since 2010, while our sales to the US are up 41 per cent, to China 60 per cent, to Saudi Arabia 41, New Zealand 40, Japan 60, South Korea 100 per cent.

Those figures reflect the broader story that the lion’s share of the growth is taking place outside the EU, and especially in the Asia-Pacific region.

In a world that demands flexibility and agility, we should be thinking not of EU standards but of global standards, and a regulatory framework to suit the particular

needs of the UK, a country that already exports a higher share of its GDP outside the EU than any other EU country.

We already boast an amazing economy, very diverse and different from rest of EU.

We are the nation that has moved the furthest up the value chain of the 21st century economy.

We are a nation of inventors, designers, scientists, architects, lawyers, insurers, water slide testers, toblerone cabinet makers. There are some sectors, such as AI or robotics, or bulk data, or bioscience where we excel and where we may want to do things differently.

Of course we will need to comply with EU regulation in so far as we are exporting to the EU. (though we should realise that the single market is not quite the Eden of uniformity that it is cracked up to be: you try becoming a ski instructor in France; and

I discovered the other day that we have totally different standards for flame retardant sofas, to say nothing of plugs)

But in a global marketplace, where we are trading in products that hadn't been conceived even five years ago, serving markets that were poverty stricken only 20 years ago, it seems extraordinary that the UK should remain lashed to the minute prescriptions of a regional trade bloc comprising only 6 per cent of humanity – and when it is not possible for us or any EU nation to change those rules on our own.

In so far as we turn increasingly to the rest of the world – as we are – then we will be able to do our own thing.

We will be able, if we so choose, to fish our own fish, to ban the traffic in live animals, end payments to some of the richest landowners in Britain while supporting the rural economy; and we will be able to cut VAT on domestic fuel and other products.

We can simplify planning, and speed up public procurement, and perhaps we would then be faster in building the homes young people need; and we might decide that it was indeed absolutely necessary for every environmental impact assessment to monitor two life cycles of the snail and build special swimming pools for newts – not all of which they use – but it would at least be our decision.

Freed from EU regimes, we will not only be able to spend some of our Brexit bonus on the NHS; but as we develop new stem cell technology – in which this country has long been in the lead – it may be that we will need a regulatory framework, scrupulous and moral, but not afraid of the new. The same point can be made of innovative financial services instruments, where the FCA already leads the way.

We will decide on laws not according to whether they help to build a united states of Europe but because we want to create the best platform for the economy to grow and help people to live their lives. And when we are running ourselves – when all these

freedoms open before us – we will no longer be able to blame Brussels for our woes, because our problems will be our responsibility and no-one else's.

And indeed no one should think that Brexit is some economic panacea, any more than it is right to treat it as an economic pandemic.

On the contrary, the success of Brexit will depend on what we make of it. And a success is what we will make of it – together. And that very success will be the best thing for the whole of continental Europe – a powerful adjacent economy buying more Italian cars and German wine than ever before.

And so I say to my remaining remainer friends – actually quite numerous – more people voted Brexit than have ever voted for anything in the history of this country.

And I say in all candour that if there were to be a second vote I believe that we would simply have another year of wrangling and turmoil and feuding in which the whole country would lose.

So let's not go there.

So let's instead unite about what we all believe in – an outward-looking liberal global future for a confident United Kingdom.

So much of this is about confidence and national self-belief.

We love to run ourselves down – in fact we are Olympic gold medal winners in the sport of national self-deprecation

And in the current bout of Brexchosis we are missing the truth: that it is our collective national job now to ensure that when the history books come to be written Brexit will be seen as just the latest way in which the British bucked the trend, and took the initiative – and did something that responds to the real needs and opportunities that we face in world today

and had the courage to break free from an idea – however noble its origins – that had become outdated, at least for us.

Konrad Adenauer said that every nation had its genius, and that the genius of the British people was for democratic politics. He was right, but he didn't go far enough.

Yes, it was the British people who saw that it was not good enough for Kings and princes to have absolute power and who began the tradition of parliamentary democracy in a model that is followed on every continent.

It was also Britain that led the industrial revolution and destroyed slavery and the British people who had the wit to see through the bogus attractions of protectionism and who campaigned for free trade that has been the single biggest engine of prosperity and progress.

And to my constituent I say – don't go to Canada, or anywhere else, lovely though Canada is.

This is the country that is once again taking the lead in the shaping of the modern world and it is our stubborn attachment to running ourselves that will end up making our society fairer and more prosperous.

In its insistence upon democracy, its openness, its belief in the rights of the individual, in its protection of our legal system its scepticism about excessive regulation its potential for devolving power downwards and in its fundamental refusal to discriminate between all the other peoples of the earth and in its central distinction between the EU institutions and our eternal love for European culture, values, civilisation

Brexit is not just the great liberal project of the age, but a project that over time can unite this country. So, let's do it with confidence.

The alternatives are clearly laid out – continue as a subjugated people (under Merkel-May) or Leave with our heads held high, as masters of our own destiny, with the WTO Most Favoured Nation rules.