

EU Referendum : Frequently Asked Questions

Issue No. 2 - 25th March, 2016

Here is a list of the most frequently asked questions about the EU Referendum and what would happen when Britain leaves the EU. Every effort has been made to make the answers as accurate and as factually correct as possible. During the course of the referendum campaign, further questions will no doubt arise and updated versions of this document will be published.

1. **Would Brexit endanger jobs and trade, and could the EU put up trade barriers against the UK?**

When we leave the EU, it cannot put up arbitrary trade barriers against the UK, since that would be in breach of World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules governing trade, which ALL EU countries have signed up to. And even if they could do so in breach of WTO rules, why would they want to? We have a massive trade deficit with the EU; they sell us far more than we sell them. Britain currently exports goods and services to the EU to the value of £228.9 billion, whereas their exports to us amount to £290.6 billion, making a trade deficit with the EU of £61.7 billion. Germany, Spain, France, Italy and all the rest will still want to sell us their cars, wine and holidays, etc. **Trade will continue as normal.**

Britain has the fifth largest economy in the world - while we have a trade deficit with the EU, we have a trade surplus with the rest of the world. Our trading success stems from hundreds of years of experience, from English being the international language of business and science and from the trust that foreign companies put in the English legal system and contract law.

2. **What about the EU's Common External Tariffs?**

- The EU was formed as a Customs Union, not a Free Trade Area, and against non-EU countries it erected certain trade barriers known as the Common External Tariffs. However, the WTO has been negotiating down trade barriers for many years, and as a result these are now generally low.
- The pro-EU organisation British Influence states that "*Outside the EU, British exporters would have to pay 15% on average for food and 10% on cars to trade with the EU*", but this is mere scare-mongering. The EU sells Britain far more than we buy from it, and it would clearly not be in the EU's interests to impose the Common External Tariffs on UK exports since - if we did the same thing - the damage to their trade would be more than to ours.
- The Eurosceptic organisation Business for Britain issued a report stating that if the Common External Tariffs were levied on British exports, they would be at an average rate of only 4.3%. Business for Britain further calculates that the total cost to business would be lower than the current UK net contribution to the EU budget (which is, of course, ever-rising).
- When we are outside the EU, it will be cheaper for the British government to pay exporters' tariffs FOR them rather than paying into the EU budget as it does now.

3. **Would leaving the EU exclude Britain from the Single Market?**

- The EU and the Single Market are not the same thing: Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein are members of the Single Market but not the EU.
- The EU has 28 members, the Single Market 31. In common with other nations, we do not need to be in either grouping in order to trade with member states. In any case, World Trade Organisation rules prevent the erecting of arbitrary or unilateral trade barriers.
- Outside the EU, Britain could negotiate a trade deal with the EU from a position of strength.

4. What about trade deals that the EU has negotiated with the rest of the world - would we be excluded?

Britain is a major trading nation and the fifth largest economy in the world. Outside the EU, those countries which have signed trade deals with the EU would certainly want to continue mutually-beneficial trading arrangements with the UK. They would have a great incentive to quickly agree to a continuation of trade on the same, or very similar, terms. When Britain regains its seat on the WTO and control of its own international trade policy, we will also no doubt negotiate better trade deals for ourselves - as we did for hundreds of years before we joined the EU.

5. Isn't about 50% of our trade with the EU?

- **No, it isn't.** This figure is highly exaggerated, since it refers only to international trade and so excludes all domestic trade, which is much higher. But even considering only international trade, according to the Government's Pink Book, 44.4% of our total exports in goods and services in 2014 were to EU countries.
- That figure is reduced when we take into account the so-called 'Rotterdam effect'. Exports transiting through Rotterdam are counted as exports to Europe, even when they are destined for other non-EU countries, such as China. Even a conservative estimate of the Rotterdam effect reduces the total figure to about 42.8%, so it is fair to say that under 43% of our international trade is with the EU.
- Figures published by the Office of National Statistics show that only 15.6% of UK businesses are concerned with exporting or importing. Of these, no more than 5% trade with the EU. While approximately 20% of our economy is concerned with international trade, approximately 80% is purely domestic (i.e., within the UK itself). Of that 20%, only around half the exports go to EU countries - and yet 100% of our businesses have to comply with EU laws and regulations.
- Britain's trade with the EU has been declining over the last 25 years. In 1999, 54.7% of our international trade was with the EU. By 2014, that had reduced to about 42.8%. While this trade is important to Britain, it would not be endangered when we leave the EU since, as already demonstrated, the EU cannot put up arbitrary trade barriers against the UK.

6. Is it true that 3 million jobs depend on trade with the EU?

- **No, it isn't!** This old chestnut continues to raise its head despite being discredited long ago. The figure arose from a study by the National Institute of Economic & Social Affairs in 1999 which calculated that "three million jobs" are associated with trade with the EU.
- This report has been repeatedly misrepresented by various people, including former Deputy PM Nick Clegg MP, who said that three million jobs are "at risk" if we left the EU. The Institute's Director, Martin Weale, has repudiated the claim, describing the misuse of the report for propaganda purposes as "pure Goebbels".
- These jobs depend on the continuation of trade, not on continued EU membership. Using similar assumptions that arrived at the figure of three million jobs in the UK being associated with EU trade, we can arrive at a figure of 5 to 6.5 million jobs in the EU being associated with trade with the UK. Once again, it is clear that *"they need us more than we need them."*
- Millions of jobs elsewhere also depend upon trade with Europe, for example in China, India and Japan, but those countries do not find it necessary to join the EU in order to trade with Europe!

7. Which way should farmers vote? What's in their best interests?

Farmers are complaining about the prices they get for their hard work, the EU's 'red tape' and much else, but given the chance for a new, fairer deal by leaving the EU in June, many say they will reject it and stay with what they have.

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) we have had to get used to was not designed to help British farmers, and takes little notice of the very different methods used in the UK compared to much of the rest of Europe.

It has been said to hinder, not assist, our farmers in their work.

One of the farmers' biggest worries seems to be the loss or reduction of farming subsidies if we leave the EU. However, George Eustice, the UK's Farming Minister, has confirmed that subsidies will not only be maintained outside the EU but actually be increased in many cases. This can be done because the CAP currently costs the UK at least £16 billion per year, and some sources put it even higher at £18 billion.

However, very little of that actually reaches our farmers in the UK; the bulk of it is spread around the remainder of the EU. Once we stop sending it abroad we will not only reduce the tax burden on the UK taxpayer but be able to increase payments to our farmers. This will go hand-in-hand with a big reduction in EU 'red tape', which merely reduces efficiency and increases costs.

There are other benefits, too. Outside the EU, animal welfare can be vastly improved by:

- *increasing the maximum penalty for deliberate cruelty to animals*
- *banning testing by companies on animals*
- *banning the export of live animals for slaughter*
- *abolishing, creating or modifying other farming procedures in ways impossible under EU regulations*

Leaving the EU and returning to a British system - run for UK farmers and overseen by the UK government in Whitehall as it was before we joined the EU - appears to be a 'win-win' situation for all involved. It is hard to see why many farmers, but by no means all, are against the idea.

8. I keep hearing about fishing rights; what's all that about?

For many hundreds of years, the UK was self-sufficient in fish, but EU entry in 1975 saw many of our traditional fishing grounds simply given away to other member states.

This was an extraordinary betrayal of our fishing industry and fishermen.

The main thing to consider now, is that from self-sufficiency before the EU we have gone to importing 66% of our fish, much of it taken from what used to be our OWN waters. We can contrast our situation with that enjoyed by other traditional fishing nations outside the EU.

**Greenland and Iceland are thriving outside the EU,
and retain FULL control of their legal fishing areas.**

See here "**Stolen Seas**" by Ray Finch, the full story of the tragic loss of our fishing industry.

9. If the UK leaves the EU, what would happen to UK citizens living in Europe? Could they be deported?

Firstly, "Europe" is not the EU. The UK is and always will be "in Europe", barring a gigantic earthquake or asteroid strike.

- About 1.3 million British citizens live in EU countries, while about 3 million EU nationals live in the UK. (*This fascinating comparison parallels the trade statistics.*) The top locations for Britons living on the continent are:

Spain 319,144	France 171,346	Italy 65,975	Cyprus 38,844	Belgium 24,915
Ireland 249,392	Germany 99,909	Netherlands 47,297	Poland 35,829	Sweden 20,839

- Most British people living in the EU are either engaged in skilled work, own property or are retirees living on their pensions. People living legally in any EU country are certainly not going to be expelled. One reason for this is that many retired British people live in European countries (for example, the 18,067 living in Greece) that are either poor or suffering from the Eurozone's austerity policies; the income foreign residents provide is highly valued.

The lie implied in the question simply reveals the scare-mongering lengths to which the Remain Campaign will go.

10. If I own property in an EU member state, will it be safe?

The property rights of individuals are enshrined in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the European Convention of Human Rights. The governments of countries cannot, therefore, take any kind of “revenge” on British property owners out of pique at a British decision to exit the EU. Furthermore, there are millions of Europeans who own property in the UK.

11. If the UK leaves the EU, would I lose free access to member states' services when I travel to Europe?

- Britain has reciprocal health benefits with those European countries with comparable national health services: Germany, France and Holland for example. There is no reason why such reciprocal arrangements could not be continued on a bilateral basis when we leave the EU.
- Many other European countries simply do not have a public health service comparable to ours; to use their health services, British citizens either have to pay or take out private health insurance.
- The current system does not work in Britain's favour, anyway. Figures recently published by the Department of Health show that while Britain paid EU countries more than £674 million for treating British citizens abroad, we received only £50 million back in payments for EU citizens treated here. For example: France received £150 million but paid Britain only £6.7 million; Spain received £223 million but paid Britain only £3.4 million; Germany received £25.9 million but paid Britain only £2.2 million.

Labour MP John Mann said, "*Sorting this scandal out would transform the NHS finances.*"

12. Hasn't the EU helped to keep the peace in Europe?

- This is pure mythology (aka lies). From 1945-1949, peace was kept in Europe by the British, US and French armed forces stationed in Germany; from 1949 onwards, by NATO and the continued presence of predominantly US and British troops to counter the threat from the Soviet bloc. France left NATO in 1959 and did not fully re-join until 2009.
- The disintegration of the USSR in 1991 removed the main military threat to Europe, but new risks have arisen. These can best be countered by NATO and co-operation between democratic nation states, not by European political and economic integration.
- Democratic nations tend to settle their differences by diplomacy, not war. The biggest threat to peace in Europe is posed by the creation of an undemocratic, centralised “United States of Europe” and the removal of powers of democratic accountability and control from its citizens. The EU intends to create its own armed forces by merging those of its member states, all in order to enforce its Common Foreign and Security Policy. The safest future for Europe lies in democratic nation states co-operating with each other and in an alliance, such as NATO, of independent states set up to counter external threats. Abdicating control of our foreign, security and defence policy to the EU would, as a minimum, have unpredictable results, and potentially would be a recipe for disaster.

13. Aren't we stronger on the world stage in the EU, and would we not lose influence outside it?

- **Actually, the opposite is true.** The more centralised the EU becomes, the more power we surrender to it and the less influential we become in the world. Britain still has a seat on the UN Security Council and is a member of over 100 international organisations. However, we lost our independent seat on the World Trade Organisation in 1973 when we surrendered it to the EU.
- The EU's ambition is to have a seat in its own right on the UN Security Council, taking over those of Britain and France. **Being a part of the EU makes Britain less influential, not more so.**

14. Would Britain be 'isolated' outside the EU?

No, it would not. Are the USA, Canada, Australia, India, Japan, China, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, New Zealand, Brazil, Mexico - and all the other countries in the world which are not members of the EU - 'isolated'? Of course not. But do they make their own laws, and trade, and prosper outside the EU? Obviously, they do.

15. Shouldn't we remain in the EU in order to influence its decisions?

- If you think so, do consider these facts. In 1973, 2 of the 13 (15.4%) EU Commissioners were British; this has now reduced to 1 out of 28 (merely 3.6%, a worse than four-fold reduction).
- In 1979, 81 out of 410 (19.8%) Members of the European Parliament represented Britain. Now we have 73 MEPs out of 751 (9.7%).
- Most decisions in the Parliament are made by a simple majority vote. Even if all the UK MEPs of all parties were to agree (which never happens), we can easily be outvoted: British MEPs cannot protect Britain's interests.
- In 1973 we had 17% of the vote in the European Council (comprising Heads of Governments); this has now reduced to 8.2% (29 out of 352 votes, each Member State being allocated votes according to the size of its population). Most areas of domestic policy are now under the control of the EU and are decided in the Council by a Qualified Majority Vote ('QMV'). Again, when trying to protect our national interests, we are outvoted. The Lisbon Treaty introduced a revised system of QMV. A qualified majority is reached if at least 55% of member states vote in favour (in practice, 16 or more out of 28) and the proposal is supported by member states representing 65% of the total EU population. This so-called 'double majority' is obligatory as from 1st April 2017. A 'blocking majority' must include four Council members representing more than 35% of the EU's population.

Under this system, because we are outvoted, we are repeatedly forced to accept laws we don't want. If you still think Britain has the ability to influence decisions or to protect our own interests then consider this fact: **since 1996, when records began, Britain has objected to 55 new laws in the Council of Ministers - and we have been defeated all 55 times and ALL the offending measures have become law. How can that possibly be considered 'being stronger in Europe' or 'defending our national interests'?**

16. Why do more countries, for example Turkey, want to join the EU?

- The six countries that set up the European Economic Community ('EEC') in 1957 were Germany, France, Italy, The Netherlands, Luxembourg and Belgium, all countries devastated by WWII. The driving force behind the creation of the EEC was the need for an economic and political pact between Germany and France, historically the main instigators of European wars. Since then 22 more countries have joined, many for less idealistic reasons.
- In any given year, typically only three or four countries are net contributors to the EU budget. Germany is always the top contributor, with the UK usually in second or third place. Aside from the top three or four contributors to the EU budget, most countries take far more out than they put in.
- To illustrate the point, 2004 saw the accession to the EU of ten smaller, mostly poor, Eastern European countries, which joined for the financial and other benefits they could obtain. The same is true of those countries waiting to join such as Albania, Belarus, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia-Herzegovina, Turkey and Ukraine. These countries are certainly not doing so in the hope of making donations to the massive EU budget; they want cash handouts, and to be able to export their excess populations and unemployed to Europe. Turkey, for instance, is not even in Europe (97.0% of its land mass is in Asia). It has a population of 77 million, and if it joins it will be the second most populous country in the EU - and the poorest. **You can work the rest out for yourself.**

17. If we left, would we lose millions in EU grants?

- Firstly, there is no such thing as 'EU money'. There is only taxpayers' money, and the UK is always a net contributor to the EU budget; **every single year bar one we've paid in far more than we got out.** As stated before, Germany always pays the most, with Britain usually in the top three or four. The one and only year that we got more out than we paid in was 1975. Coincidentally, 1975 was the last time we had a Referendum on the EU!

- The EU's own figures show that out of the 37 British regions (as classified under the EU's system for Regional Aid), 35 are net contributors to the fund; only West Wales and Cornwall are net beneficiaries.
- In total, the UK gets back £1 for every £3.55 we pay in. Over the budgetary period 2007-2013, the UK paid in about £29.5 billion, but received only £8.7 billion in return. Many of Britain's poorest and most deprived regions are therefore subsidising the regions of other EU member states.
- Neither is this money well spent: between 2007 and 2013, the European Regional Development Fund's payments to Wales totalled £2 billion, yet the effect on unemployment in Wales was insignificant.

We would be better off not giving the money to the EU and instead deciding how to spend British tax-payers' money to best effect ourselves, in our own country.

18. How much does EU membership cost?

A simple question with a complex answer: even the British government doesn't quite seem to know exactly how much it hands over to the EU each year. The table below shows a summary based on current government estimations for 2016-2017:

WHAT THE EU COSTS THE UK	
GROSS ANNUAL SUM PAID TO EU	£19,228,000,000
minus INSTANT REBATE	£4,444,000,000
minus SPENT ON UK BY EU (we have no decision-making power over the allocation)	£4,606,000,000
= NET ANNUAL COST TO UK	£10,178,000,000
NET DAILY COST TO UK	£27,884,932

However, please bear in mind that:

- our gross contribution is rising
- the rebate is declining (thanks to Tony Blair's 'renegotiations' of 2006)
- the EU spends £4.6 billion of our own money in our own country on projects they, rather than we, deem fit. A British government should be able to make better decisions than the EU on how to spend taxpayers' money in Britain.
- The indirect costs on the economy are much higher. These include the Common Agricultural Policy, the Common Fisheries Policy and over-regulation on business, to name just three. Professor Tim Congdon has calculated that the direct and indirect costs on our economy for 2015 to be 12% of GDP (Gross Domestic Product) or £190 billion per annum.

19. How many of our laws are made by the EU?

- Most areas of domestic policy are now under the control of the EU. Its legislation takes two main forms: Directives and Regulations. Directives must be transposed into UK Acts of Parliament. The UK Parliament has no choice in the matter, even if, in some instances, it may tinker with the details. And Regulations automatically become law, even without our Parliament debating them.
- The amount of law coming from the EU varies from year to year. In 2006, the German Parliament, under former President Roman Herzog, carried out a study that put the proportion of new laws originating from the EU at 84%. Gordon Brown, in a speech to the Confederation of British Industry in 2005 while he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, admitted that *"European regulations - of course - account for 50% of significant new rules for business"*. In the European Parliament, EU Commissioner Viviane Reding admitted that *"70% of British laws are made in the EU"*. So a reasonable estimate is that, in any given year, the proportion of our law that comes from the EU is somewhere between 50% and 80%.

- The rate of legislation passing through the European Parliament has somewhat slowed over the last eighteen months, and it is believed that a large amount of legislation is being deliberately held back by the Commission until the British Referendum is over. **If we vote to remain in the EU, the legislative floodgates will once again open.**

20. Other sources, like Nick Clegg MP, say that a much smaller number of our laws come from the EU. What is the truth?

Ah, the truth! If only! You may hear quoted figures of only 9%, or perhaps only 13%, as representing the percentage of our laws coming from the EU. That is a misrepresentation of the contents of a House of Commons Briefing Paper that stated about 13.2% of our laws come from the EU.

But the paper warns that the figure does not take into account the large number of EU Regulations that automatically pass into UK law. The 13.2% figure refers solely to Acts of Parliament required to transpose EU Directives into law. Taking Regulations into account, the recalculated figure is more like 65%. That is within the range described under answer 17, which was between 50% and 80% in any given year, varying with the EU's legislative output.

21. Has the European Arrest Warrant made us safer from criminals and terrorists?

- **No, it has not.** The European Arrest Warrant is just one part of an EU system of criminal justice being created which supersedes the British legal system. Britain was one of the first countries (it was back in 1870) to pass an Extradition Act. This act required prima facie evidence to be presented to the English extradition court for it to satisfy itself that there was sufficient evidence against the accused person to justify surrendering him or her to a foreign judicial system.
- The 1870 act worked well until the then Conservative Government replaced it with the Extradition Act of 1989, the small print of which allowed the European Convention on Extradition to be ratified in 1990. Crucially, this removed the requirement for prima facie evidence to be presented to the British extradition court.
- The Extradition Act 2003 removed further safeguards for the accused person. Under this act, 'extradition' became 'judicial surrender'. It allowed a British citizen to be removed to any other EU member state purely on the strength of a form completed by the relevant foreign authority - which can be based purely on 'suspicion'. No prima facie evidence is presented to the British court, and indeed they have no power to prevent 'judicial surrender'. This goes entirely against the centuries-old English legal protection enshrined in Habeas Corpus, which prevented imprisonment without evidence and without a charge being formally laid for a specific offence under British law. This is because of the EU doctrine of 'mutual recognition' which says all EU legal, judicial and penal systems are of equal standing - which is palpably not so. British citizens can be sent abroad purely at the request of a foreign examining magistrate and locked up for months or even years while investigations take place. In contrast, British Police cannot request extradition of a suspect to the UK, unless and until they have fully investigated and amassed sufficient evidence for a charge to be laid.
- All this highlights the fundamental difference between the continental and the British legal systems: under the former, people may be and are imprisoned for long periods while accusations are investigated, whereas under the British system people may only be imprisoned (on remand) after a specific criminal offence has been fully investigated and charges laid.

The British legal system evolved over 800 years as much to protect the innocent as to convict the guilty. Those principles are being sacrificed in favour of an EU system of criminal law.

22. Is it true that the courts can prevent extradition if the accused person's human rights are at risk. Is this true?

That may be the case in theory, but in practice it does not work. All EU member states have signed the European Convention of Human Rights. The English court will take the view that, because EU member states have signed the Convention, under the doctrine of 'mutual recognition' they cannot then be deemed to be in

breach of it - even if all the known facts contradict this.

For example, it is well-known that countries such as Greece, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and others, are frequently in breach of the Convention, because of their institutionalised corruption or because of the conditions in their prisons; nevertheless, suspects will frequently be 'judicially surrendered' to them - the author has been present in the English Court of Appeal when such a judgement has been made.

23. Don't we need to be in the EU to help protect us from organised crime and terrorism?

The EU's open borders policy has put us more, not less, at risk from criminals and terrorists. This policy has meant that Europe's criminals have migrated to where they think they can most lucratively operate, and that means countries like Britain. The EU's Freedom of Movement Directive (Directive 2004/38, Article 27/2) says that *"previous criminal convictions are not enough to justify exclusion"*. So even if we know someone to be a convicted criminal, we have no power to prevent his or her entry to our country. We have seen convicted murderers, rapists and paedophiles come from Europe to the UK and then commit more appalling crimes over here.

Metropolitan Police Chief Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe revealed recently that 29% of the Met Police's 250,000 arrests in a year were of foreign nationals (admittedly, not all being EU citizens), but of these, only 13% resulted in a charge or summons. The excuse for not being able to bring them to justice was because it was not possible to check their DNA, fingerprints or previous convictions, and so they were released.

Open borders also aid terrorists. We have seen terrorist attacks in a number of European capitals carried out by terrorists who can easily cross borders under the EU's Schengen open borders system. Britain is not in Schengen, but any EU citizen has the right to come to Britain if he or she so wishes. Europe has plenty of its own home-grown terrorists who have free access to the UK, but we also saw how, in the Paris attacks of November 2015, at least one of the murderous terrorists was operating on a forged passport.

Whenever these terrorist attacks occur, the EU uses the act as an excuse to call for yet more power over police and judicial matters, and to create or enlarge the EU's own security and intelligence services. Writing in the magazine "Prospect", MI6's former head (1999-2004), Sir Richard Dearlove, made it clear that Britain would be safer outside of the EU. He stated that leaving the EU would make it easier to deport terrorists and control our borders. He added that Europe would not turn its back on Britain or our intelligence services, because *"Britain is Europe's leader in intelligence and security matters give much more than they get in return"*.

When the UK is out of the EU, the organised crime and terrorist threat would not go away. But then we would be free to control our own borders, and we could continue, as we have always done, to share our intelligence with our allies. **But allowing our intelligence services to be merged with an EU intelligence service would be a tremendous mistake.**

24. Why does President Obama want Britain to stay in the EU?

Back in the 1970s, Henry Kissinger is reported to have said, *"When I want to speak to Europe, whom should I call?"* The story may be apocryphal but it highlights the fact that US foreign policy wants to deal with one central authority in Europe, rather than have the inconvenience of dealing with individual, independent nation states.

After WWII, the USA funded, to the tune of many millions of dollars, the European Movement, which covertly worked towards creating a United States of Europe. The release of declassified documents in 2000 showed that that the American Committee for a United Europe was, in fact, a front organisation for the CIA. The USA wanted a bulwark against the Soviet threat, and as stated above, the convenience of dealing with one central political power in Europe. There is evidence that the CIA also clandestinely funded the Remain side in the 1975 British Referendum.

America is primarily concerned with its own perceived national interests, and not Britain's. We know that the USA has interfered in the domestic politics of many nations around the world - so why would they not interfere with ours? We should also recall that President Obama has called for Turkey to become a member of the EU, which would invite another 77 million potential migrants to come to Britain, should they so wish. That is evidently not in the British national interest.

25. Why are big businesses calling for Britain to remain in the EU?

- **Some big business are, some aren't.** In February 2016, representatives of 36 FTSE100 companies signed a letter to "The Times" calling for Britain to remain in the EU. But that means the other 64 FTSE100 companies did not sign it. About 200 companies have committed to the Remain campaign - but that is a miniscule proportion of the 5.4 million companies registered in the UK.
- Some big businesses like the EU because they want to deal with one central regulatory authority. They can lobby for the kind of regulation they want and which they can comply with, but which their smaller competitors cannot. They also like the endless waves of cheap migrant labour that the EU's open borders bring.
- Other representatives of big businesses are equally vocal about wanting Britain to leave the EU - for example, Peter Hargreaves, co-founder of FTSE 100 company Hargreaves Lansdown. Writing in the Daily Mail on 25th February 2016 Mr. Hargreaves said, "*[EU] red tape and regulations have stifled enterprise in the UK, not helped.*" He added that Britain should be "*forging trading links with nations that have fast growth rates and dynamic economies. While we are in the EU we must wait on unmotivated, overpaid Eurocrats*". He concluded by hoping that the electorate would "*decide to leave this disastrous and stifling union*".
- Small and Medium Sized Businesses (SMEs) are even less enthusiastic about the EU. 200 bosses of SMEs signed a letter calling for Britain to leave the EU because of a "*constant diet of unnecessary regulations*" from Brussels that raise costs, cut profits and force up prices. The letter concluded that, "*We believe that our economy can do better without being held back by the EU, thus we should vote to leave*".
- The establishment is desperate to stifle any dissent: in March, the British Chamber of Commerce's Director General John Longworth was forced to resign for stating his personal opinion that we should leave. No one has so far been forced out of a job for saying we should stay in.

26. Haven't some big businesses threatened to leave the UK if we leave the EU?

- As stated in answer 23, in February 2016, 36 of Britain's top companies signed a letter to The Times arguing for Britain to stay in the EU, but almost two-thirds of the 100 top companies did not sign. Those that declined to sign included Barclays, Sainsbury's and Tesco. Other huge companies, such as Toyota, General Motors, BMW, Volkswagen, Airbus, Jaguar, Land Rover, Honda and Ford have all stated their ongoing commitment to UK manufacturing, whatever the result of the Referendum.
- John Mills, the millionaire Labour donor and founder of John Mills Ltd (JML), supports Brexit, as do Joe Foster and John Caudwell, the founders of Reebok and Phones 4U respectively. On 17th February 2016, 80 business leaders, including Pasha Khandaker, President of the UK Bangladesh Caterers Association, Moni Varma, owner of rice suppliers Veetee, and Tariq Usmani, CEO of Henley Homes, wrote to the Prime Minister saying that Britain "*was damaging trade with the rest of the world*". They continued, "*As long as Britain's trade policy is controlled by the EU, we cannot sign bilateral free trade agreements with Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Australia, New Zealand, or for that matter any other non-EU state*". They added, "*Vested interests on the continent sustain a relatively protectionist policy. We apply the EU's common external tariff to exports to Commonwealth countries - hurting customers and consumers here.*"
- Aircraft maker Boeing chose Britain for its new European headquarters in March 2016. Sir Michael Arthur, President of Boeing UK and Ireland, stated that "**The prosperous partnership between our country and our company goes from strength to strength.**" Boeing employs 2,000 staff in the UK and has invested £1.8 billion here.
- Interestingly, in 2013 Jim O'Neill, the former Chairman of Goldman Sachs' asset management business said, "*We should not be scared of leaving it [the EU] and exploring a world without it. The opportunities that arise from a dramatically changing world are huge and I don't think that a lot of people in our area, never mind in Brussels, are that interested or understand it.*"

27. Haven't senior members of the British armed forces said we are safer in the EU?

- A letter orchestrated by 10 Downing Street in February 2016 was signed by a number of senior and former members of the armed forces. However, this manoeuvre spectacularly backfired after it turned out that one of the claimed signatories had not signed at all. General Sir Michael Rose had not only not given his permission to be included, but had instead said that *"sovereignty and security are intrinsically linked and in the recent years we've seen the EU erode our sovereignty."* No. 10 was forced to issue a humiliating apology to Sir Michael.
- Other respected military figures have come out in favour of leaving the EU, including Colonel Richard Kemp, former Army Commander in Afghanistan, who wrote an article in the Sunday Express of 28th February 2016 stating that *"NATO is our main military alliance, not the EU ... By leaving the EU we will gain far greater control of our borders and better confront these challenges that have the potential to undermine the very fabric of our society."*

28. Some say that if we leave the EU, we would be like Norway and Switzerland, who have to obey most EU laws, pay a contribution to the EU budget, and have open borders. Is this true?

No, it isn't. When Britain leaves the EU, it will not be obliged to follow either the so-called 'Norwegian' or 'Swiss' model. The Norwegians chose to be members of the European Economic Area, not the EU. Switzerland has agreed over 100 bilateral treaties with the EU, which means it has adopted most EU laws without being a member of the EEA or EU. No genuine advocate of Brexit would suggest this outcome is desirable. Instead, we should adopt the 'Canadian', 'Japanese' or 'Singaporean' models: independent nation states that trade and co-operate without being members of the EU.

In reality, we want a British Model which would mean we do not have to obey EU laws, pay them any money or have open borders. We would be in a very strong position to negotiate our own trade deal with the EU - and indeed trade deals with the rest of the world. We would not have to join the EEA - and nor should we.

It is noteworthy that the Swiss Parliament recently voted to withdraw its 24 year-old application to join the EU, because the costs of EU membership are too high. In 2006 the Swiss Federal Government carried out a study that calculated that full membership of the EU would cost up to six times the cost of their existing bilateral arrangements with the EU.

29. If we left, would we still have to comply with EU rules in order to trade with member states?

Any country that exports goods or services to another country has to comply with that country's related rules. For example, when we export goods or services to the USA, we have to comply with the USA's own rules, specifications and laws. That is true of any country wishing to trade with another. As has been said earlier, the rules governing trade are agreed under the auspices of the World Trade Organisation, which constantly strives to bring trade barriers down.

30. Outside the EU, would we lose our Human Rights?

After the atrocities committed on the continent during the WWII, the European Convention on Human Rights was proposed by Winston Churchill. It was modelled on the protections enshrined for centuries under English Common Law. So, you can see that we had perfectly good human rights under our own laws before we joined the EU - and we will after we leave.

Under Tony Blair's Labour Government, the Convention was incorporated into UK law by means of the Human Rights Act (1998). This has subsequently led to all kinds of abuses and to it being described as a charter for criminals and terrorists. This is because of numerous decisions by the European Court of Justice. British Courts have found themselves powerless to deport foreign terrorists, murderers, rapists and paedophiles, all because the European Court of Human Rights ('ECHR') has decided that it might infringe their 'human rights' to do so.

In fact, leaving the EU would not make much practical difference to our situation regarding either the Convention or the ECHR. However, if a British Parliament decided to repeal the Human Rights Act, and remove our country from the jurisdiction of the ECHR, then we could return power to Parliament, and legal

jurisdiction to our own Supreme Court - but that is a separate issue.

31. Hasn't David Cameron 'renegotiated' our membership of the EU to deal with these problems?

- Mr. Cameron's 'deal' is, in fact, 'no deal' at all. There is not sufficient space here to address each one of his 'reforms', but in summary, neither do they amount to very much, nor do they return or repatriate any significant powers to the UK Parliament (despite Mr. Cameron's many promises to do so).
- The 'reforms' will require many changes to the EU Treaty (which will necessitate the unanimous consent of 27 other member states), and many amendments to existing EU Directives, which first have to be voted upon by the European Parliament and then additionally require the consent of the European Council (comprising Heads of the 27 other member states' governments) by Qualified Majority Voting.
- Martin Schulz MEP, the President of the European Parliament, has made it plain that how the EU Parliament votes cannot be guaranteed in advance, and that MEPs may decide to change the substance of the reforms - or even to reject them wholesale.
- Likewise, the European Council might decide to reject the changes, including the proposed Treaty changes. We simply do not and cannot know what will happen, because although the Referendum will be on 23rd June 2016, the changes to the Treaty and Directives will not happen until months or years afterwards.

Mr. Cameron is trying to sell the British electorate a pig in a poke.

32. Aren't both the Conservative and Labour parties in favour of EU membership?

Not quite. In fact, both the Conservative and Labour parties are riven with conflicts on this issue, as they have been ever since we joined the EEC in 1973. In the Referendum of 1975, leading politicians from each parties were to be found campaigning on both the In and Out side, and the same phenomenon may be observed now. At least 165 (about 50%) Conservative MPs have already declared themselves as Leavers in the coming Referendum, with many more expected to follow. These include many cabinet ministers like Iain Duncan Smith (since, resigned from the cabinet) as well as major figures such as Boris Johnson and Zac Goldsmith. Approximately two-thirds of Conservative Party members are believed to be in favour of Brexit.

The Labour Party is similarly conflicted, although they are not discussing it as openly. A number of Labour MPs have publicly declared in favour of Brexit: Kate Hoey, Graham Stringer and Kelvin Hopkins just for starters. A major Labour donor millionaire John Mills heads the Labour Leave campaign group.

Labour Leader Jeremy Corbyn was opposed to EU membership throughout his career, but now nominally backs the Remain campaign. While a majority of Labour MPs are in favour of remaining, this does not reflect the feeling of a very large number of Party members. Even Andy Burnham MP, a Europhile and former contender for the Labour Leadership, had to admit that despite campaigning to stay in the EU, *"If I was to lay money on it ... I would bet that Brexit is going to win"*. Even the usually Europhile Scottish National Party are not united on this issue. Jim Sillars, a major figure in the SNP and a former Deputy Leader, has written an excellent pamphlet arguing why Scotland should vote to leave the EU. Mr. Sillars sums the issue up succinctly when he writes, *"Should the Parliament we directly elect make our laws? If the answer is Yes, the coming-out of the EU is a must. If the answer is No, then you must accept having laws imposed on your society with which your elected government does not agree"*.

33. Has any other country ever left the EU?

Yes, one. Greenland left in 1985. Greenland along with Denmark and Britain joined the European Economic Community on 1st January 1973. However, Greenland's politicians soon realized that the Common Fisheries Policy was destroying their country's fishing industry. In their 1985 Referendum, 53% of Greenlanders voted to leave, which they subsequently did on 1st January 1986.

Conventional wisdom might dictate that Greenland is too small to survive on its own, and that it ought to be grateful to stay and to depend on EU handouts. The reality is quite different. Greenland has a workforce of only 28,000 and fish provide 82% of its exports; but it had the courage to leave and free itself of EU red-tape and

regulations - and from surrendering its fishing grounds to the Common Fisheries Policy. **The average income in Greenland is higher than those of Britain, Germany and France.** It may be cold in Greenland, but life is sunnier there than in the EU.

34. How can we leave the EU? What is Article 50?

Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty laid out the means whereby a Member State could leave the EU; however, were we to try and leave using Article 50, we might well find that we were never able to:

- Under Article 50, there is a two-year negotiation period which could be prolonged indefinitely by unanimous agreement of EU member states.
- Even if we did manage to leave using Article 50, we could find ourselves with a 'deal' that still required us to pay contributions to the EU budget, having to accept a large proportion of EU laws and with open borders to EU citizens. We simply do not know what that deal might be in the two or more years following us giving notice.
- Another great danger is that the British government could delay the whole process beyond the next General Election in 2019. Whichever party wins that election, it could then set aside the Referendum decision (which is, in any event, not legally binding) if they so wish, on the basis that a general election result trumps a referendum (formally put, that no Parliament can bind its successors), and we might never leave.
- The only sure way for Britain to leave the EU is for our Parliament to repeal the European Communities Act 1972. This would immediately return supremacy of law to our own Parliament and courts, and free us from control by the EU. Chaos would not ensue because all EU Directives (which have been transposed into Acts of Parliament) would remain in place. These could then be repealed when needed, leaving what laws we might need to interact with the EU (if, indeed, the EU itself continues to exist). The difference between the Article 50 method and the straightforward repeal of the European Communities Act is that the repeal puts the British Government and Parliament, and not the EU, in control.
- A full and detailed explanation of how this strategy would work has been outlined in a book by Gerard Batten MEP entitled “**The Road to Freedom**”.

35. What happens if the British people vote to remain in the EU?

Those on the vote to remain side of the argument have no positive arguments to put for continued membership, and their tactics are based on pure scare-mongering. Should the British be frightened into voting to remain, they should not imagine that the status quo in the EU will continue for long:

- *The EU has clearly stated how it will forge ahead with deeper and deeper political and economic integration.*
- *The EU intends to implement full economic and financial governance of its member states from Brussels.*
- *It wants to create its own armed forces to implement its own Foreign and Security Policy.*
- *It wants to import millions more migrants from Africa, the Middle East and beyond.*

To think that Mr. Cameron's feeble and ineffectual 'reforms' will protect us from any of this is delusional. The EU has always been about creating a United States of Europe (in substance, if not yet in name) and after the British Referendum, whatever the result, that project will resume its momentum. If the British people vote to remain in the European Union, it will be a decision they will soon come to regret. But Parliament should always retain its sovereignty, so a future British Government could make a unilateral decision to leave the EU.

36. But it's all so complicated. I cannot make up my mind. How can I decide which way to vote?

You will indeed hear many arguments, facts and figures from the Remain and Leave sides in the referendum campaign. If you feel it is all a bit too much to take in, then look at the question in another way and ask yourself these two questions:

- 1) *“If we had never joined the European Economic Community ('EEC' or Common Market) in 1973, would I now choose to join the European Union ('EU') knowing what it has become?”*
- 2) *“Do I want to live in a democratic, self-governing country where the electorate can sack the government and elect a new one? Or do I prefer to live in an undemocratic, and economically declining, 'United States of Europe' (in effect, if not yet in name) where the real government (the European Commission) is not elected and cannot be sacked?”*

Looked at this way, it is a simple choice.